

"ments, fairly say to those of their opponents worthy of their steel?"—

"I've done as you have done,—that's what I could,—
Induced as you have been,—that's for my country."

To those who believe in the necessity of government, through the instrumentality of party, Mr. Wicksteed's testimony will be most encouraging. Besides "Current Events," which we may term the leading article of the "Canadian Monthly," there are several others deserving consideration. A writer, whose *nom de plume* is 'Sordello' has made a vigorous onslaught on the New Temperance Act. He maintains that the advocates of prohibition act in each constituency in concert, and exercise an influence far exceeding what they are legitimately entitled to, and he advises the licensed victuallers to unite and organize for self-protection. "Canadensis" has furnished an interesting article on "Uniform Non-local Time" which Mr. Sandford Fleming thinks a subject well deserving of discussion. It would not be possible for us to do any justice to this article in the space which we could devote to it, and we shall, therefore, merely refer to it as well worthy of perusal and reflection.

THE SUGAR QUESTION.

Mr. Alexander McGibbon has addressed a letter to the *Gazette* on the sugar question, which we reproduce as, from his practical knowledge of the subject, the writer is entitled to have his views fairly considered. We should hope that there would hardly be a second opinion as to the desirability of having our own sugar refineries at work, and doing a fairly remunerative business. The difficulty is to settle the amount of encouragement, or we should more properly say protection, which would be fair to the consumers. The duties fixed by Sir John Rose and Mr. Tilley in 1868 were thought by many too favorable to the refiners, but the refiners, on the other hand, complained that they were not sufficiently protective. The producers of the best grocery sugars in the West Indies complained bitterly of those duties, which were intended to stimulate the introduction of the low-priced muscovadoes to the exclusion of the crystallized centrifugals. Now, leaving aside for the moment all discussion as to whether the refiners or their opponents were right as to the merits of the tariff decided on by Sir John Rose and Mr. Tilley, it must be borne in mind that no change has been made in that tariff, with the exception of a reduction on the lower grades, which was admitted to be favorable to the refining interests. It may be doubted whether, under the circumstances, Mr.

McGibbon is justified in designating the present tariff on sugar as "a new system." The refineries went on for a considerable time under the present tariffs, and, no doubt, would have continued to do so but for the increase of bounty granted by the United States, and for the frauds perpetrated under the color test. Now we have invariably contended that the United States bounties should have been met by a countervailing duty, which would have effectually redressed the grievance complained of by the refiners as regards the introduction of what Mr. McGibbon terms "American whites." Our difficulty is this: we believe that the "Scotch yellow sugar" competes in the Canadian market with the "American whites" with advantage. Now let us, for argument sake, assume that by a countervailing duty, which we have always advocated, we succeeded in excluding the "American whites." How should we deal with the "Scotch yellows"? As far as regards that sugar it cannot be contended that either the late or the present government is chargeable with neglect. That sugar comes to Canada subject to full duties and without the benefit of drawback, and our refiners have no reason to complain of it. We fail to comprehend how Mr. McGibbon proposes to deal with the Scotch yellow sugar, which is largely consumed in Canada. We can conceive of no reason except the establishment of a system of bounties on exportation, that would justify a larger measure of protection than that which now exists, and which was sufficient to enable our sugar refineries to supply the consumers for a large period of years. Unfortunately, Mr. McGibbon's letter is obviously intended to serve a political object.

We shall not follow him into that discussion. The sugar question is one surrounded with difficulties, and is too important to be dealt with merely with reference to the political contest of the day. It appears that Scotch sugar refiners, without protection of any kind, are able to furnish an article which Mr. McGibbon assures us contains only 65 per cent. of sugar, while our own refiners, according to the same authority, furnished us with "pure sugar." Now it seems beyond doubt that "pure sugar" cannot be sold as cheap as an article containing only 65 per cent. of sugar, and yet our consumers prefer the cheap and bad article. To our mind the inference to be drawn from Mr. McGibbon's letter is that Canadian sugar consumers have a most depraved taste. They will have Scotch yellow sugar in preference to the *pure sugar* of their own refiners, but we fail to

comprehend how a remedy is to be applied. We publish Mr. McGibbon's letter, and we entirely concur in his opinion that the "Scotch yellows" and "American whites" are not deserving of the patronage of the public, but, although we think the "American whites" might be kept out, without any sacrifice of principle, we confess that we have not yet seen any feasible plan of preventing the consumption of "Scotch yellows" by those who prefer the article.

FOOD ADULTERATION (3).

There is no better example of the error of popular beliefs than that respecting the adulteration of sugar. We all have heard and read numerous anecdotes of pious grocers who mixed sand with their sugars, a statement as lacking in truth as that of the "basswood hams" and "wooden nutmegs" of our Yankee neighbors. There is scarcely any article of food so free from adulteration as sugar, and we believe that no means have hitherto been discovered for adulterating what is known as white "granulated." Salt is used to a slight extent in Scotch refined, the light brown article known as coffee sugar in Ontario. The report of the department of Inland Revenue shows that the three samples furnished in October, 1876, to the Toronto analyst by Wm. Casswell of that city, all contained common salt; the first a "crushed sugar," ten per cent., the second, a mere trace (from bottom of same barrel), the third, Muscovado sugar, 1.7 per cent. of common salt. These statements are repeated in the report for 1877, recently issued. Samples were obtained in January, 1877, from the following Toronto firms, Cramp, Torrance & Co., Smith & Keighley (2 samples), F. Morrison, Frank Smith & Co., and W. Ramsay & Co., of each of which it was reported, "It contains no injurious substance." Of the twelve samples examined in Montreal in December, 1876, two contained levulose or inverted sugar, supplied by Kinlock and by Baird & Kinaird. Gibb, Laird & Co. supplied five samples, all of which were pure; those supplied by W. R. Ross & Co., Reford Bros. and others were also free from admixture. The sugars analyzed in Montreal contained a very high percentage of cane sugar as compared with those examined in other places, with the exception of that supplied by Whitehead & Turner, and by Ross & Co., of Quebec, which were also up to the highest standard. It would be interesting to know if this pure cane sugar was the product of the Redpath refinery which had ceased operations only a short time before, and why all the samples