



ESTABLISHED IN 1880.

Published on the First and Third Fridays of each Month

BY THE

Canadian Manufacturer Publishing Co.

(LIMITED.)

63 FRONT STREET WEST, TORONTO.

FREDERIC NICHOLLS,  
Managing Director.

J. J. CASSIDEY,  
Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION. - - - \$1.00 per year

ADVERTISING RATES SENT ON APPLICATION.

OFFICERS OF THE

CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION.

- President - - - - W. K. McNAUGHT
- First Vice-President - - - JOHN BERTRAM.
- Second Vice-President - - - P. W. ELLIS.
- Treasurer - - - - GEORGE BOOTH.
- Secretary - - - - J. J. CASSIDEY.
- Chairman Executive Committee - FREDERIC NICHOLLS.

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATION :

63 Front Street West, Toronto.

THE ETHICS OF PROTECTION.

The sugar that is now consumed in Canada is all produced in foreign countries. But it is refined in Canada, and it has been estimated that those employed directly in the industry, and in the handling and distribution of it, number less than 1,000 persons. If the beet sugar industry were established in Canada as it should be, and supplied all the raw sugar we required, as it could do, in all its ramifications it would give employment to at least 50,000 persons or more. That is, where the refining industry as now operated gives employment to one person, the beet sugar industry would give employment to fifty persons. If we had a beet sugar industry it would be engaged in the production of raw sugar which would have to be refined in existing or similar refineries, and it would not necessarily destroy the existing refining industry. The sugar we now consume being produced in foreign countries, the money we pay for it goes to compensate labor in those countries—labor in which we are not specially interested. It would be very different if we had our own established beet sugar industry. With it the money we pay for sugar would go to compensate labor in Canada. Lands that are now not very profitably employed in producing other crops would be used for growing sugar beets, and this would afford a diversification of crops so essential in all well regulated farming com-

munities. It would afford much business in hauling the beets to the factories, in hauling the products away from the factories, it would supply large quantities of food for cattle, it would create a large demand for sugar making machinery, and in a hundred different ways it would create demands for Canadian labor. Then why not have the beet sugar industry? There is no possible doubt about the feasibility of growing the sugar beet and the manufacture of it into sugar in Canada. All that is necessary to establish the industry here, and to make it of importance second to none in the country, is to afford it such encouragement as is bestowed upon it elsewhere. Mr. Foster touched upon this subject in a very timid manner in his budget speech. He seemed to think that he was doing the Quebec people who have invested their time and money in the industry quite a favor when he proposed allowing them a bounty "for one year only" upon whatever sugar they might produce this year, forgetting, seemingly, that they had been induced to go into it because of the promises of the national policy that the industry should receive sufficient tariff protection. Mr. Foster certainly did not take into his serious consideration that the situation is more far reaching than is involved in giving a bonus upon whatever sugar may be produced there this season and the next. As the matter now stands these Quebec investors have nothing, whatever, to hope for in the way of protection to their industry after this season and next. Factories have been built and valuable machinery and appliances introduced into them at a cost of thousands of dollars, which, after this, will be utterly useless. What compensation does Mr. Foster offer these investors for the destruction of their industry? They will consider themselves the dupes and victims of misplaced confidence, and they will consider Mr. Foster's definition of the National Policy as a delusion and a snare. Mr. Foster proposes giving the proprietors of a few Canadian refineries a bonus of \$720,000 per year over and above what American refiners are allowed to charge for performing a similar service, and yet he is very emphatic in declaring that in giving a bonus to the Quebec beet sugar industry, equivalent to the protection they would have enjoyed if the duty upon raw sugar had not been removed, his proposition does not commit him or the government to the principle of bounty with reference to the beet sugar industry—that he does not propose to commit the government to that principle. Why not commit the government to that principle? The government is already committed to it in that the principle is a part and parcel of the National Policy upon which Mr. Foster and the government acceded to office. There is nothing more terrible in offering a bonus for the production of beet sugar in Canada than there is in protecting the sugar refining industry in Canada, and not as much of it as in allowing the sugar refiners \$720,000 per year in the way of excessive protection over and beyond what American refiners are allowed. This is not according to the ethics of protection. During the campaign, previous to the parliamentary elections in March, the announcement was made from every rural hustings in Canada that the government were particularly solicitous regarding the farmers, and that the National Policy was for their benefit as well as for that of the manufacturers. The beet sugar industry, if established, would benefit the farmers quite as much or more than any other class in the community, and here we have the Finance Minister, most solemnly asservating, protesting and declaring that in