

The following figures will give your readers an idea of the amount of protection enjoyed by the two rice mills in the Dominion of Canada, namely : Invoice cost of 1,500 bags imported rice—

360,452 lbs.—costing 1½c. per lb.....	\$3,856 34
Duty at Montreal, 1½c. per lb... ..	\$5,505 65
Duty on the bags at 20 per cent.....	60 00
Freight to Montreal	544 62
Marine insurance, etc., 2 per cent.....	117 14
	5,227 41
	11,084 75

This makes the cost of rice a fraction over 3c. per pound laid down in Montreal and gives the rice mills a protection of 80 per cent on first cost, and nearly 100 per cent if the freight and other charges are added to the duty.

According to the Blue-book Canada imported last year of

Cleaned rice, 3,543,568 lbs., duty 1½c. per pound.....	\$44,295 00
Uncleaned rice, 24,318,460 lbs., duty 17½ p.c. ad valorem	53,604 00

It will be noticed that the duty collected on three and a half million pounds of cleaned rice was nearly equal to that collected on twenty-four million pounds of uncleaned, and that the Rice Milling Company, who employ from 50 to 75 men (some people assert that they do not employ more than 20 hands), enjoy a protection of 1c. per pound, or equal to \$243,184 per annum. This is a nice little sum to make every year and they could well afford to spend some of it in lobbying at Ottawa in order to convince Mr. Foster that his Reform tariff of the 28th March, so far as the rice duty was concerned, was a very great clerical error.

When the rice mill found we were offering a better rice at 3½c. than what they were selling at the same price, they decided to squelch us and reduced their price to 3c. This ½c. per pound will reduce their profits this year by \$60,000, but they have a margin of \$180,000 left.

No one pretends that we can grow rice in this country, and the present duty is simply downright robbery ; the Government gets scarcely any revenue from what is milled here and the consumer is obliged to buy the lowest grade produced in order that the rice mill may make a fortune every year.

JOHN PINDER & CO.

MONTREAL, 14th May, 1894.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the statements in that letter are correct, a very strong case is made out, indeed, for the revision of the proposed tax upon rice. I cannot add anything to what is said in this letter. It means that rice, a necessary of life, an article not grown in Canada, which costs, in the finished state, in England, something like \$1.58 per hundred pounds, has a duty imposed upon it here for the benefit of the manufacturer amounting to nearly \$1.25 per hundred pounds. That is a direct tax upon the rice-consuming public of Canada, and it is clear that rice is used in large quantities here, as we imported 24,000,000 pounds last year. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that this high tax upon it is indefensible.

Mr. MULOCK.

Motion agreed to ; and committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Travelling expenses of judges in the North-west Territories... .. \$3,000

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a reduction of \$1,000. I presume that is owing to the improved facilities of getting from place to place now, as compared with former years ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Circuit allowances, British Columbia.. \$7,000

Mr. MULOCK. Is the scale of allowances the same in British Columbia as in the other provinces ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes ; Of course, the difference is made up in consequence of the expense of travel. The judges in British Columbia have to adopt very expensive means of conveyance sometimes.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking more particularly of the allowance of which the judges do not make a return.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is a per diem allowance in British Columbia.

Mr. MULOCK. You have not the same system there as in Ontario, of allowing a judge \$100 for expenses ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No ; nor in Quebec.

Mr. MULOCK. Has there been any comparison made of these two systems ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes. The system of per diem allowance is a more just and equable one. In the case of a brief term of a court, the circuit allowance of \$100 leaves a considerable emolument for the judge, while the per diem allowance would, perhaps, be given for only three days—the day going, a day coming, and a day for the sitting of the court. It is a much more fair and reasonable system ; but we have been unable to reduce the \$100 allowance where it is made, on account of the scanty allowance the judge receives.

Mr. MULOCK. There is a way of remedying that.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It seems not.

To pay two official arbitrators.... \$2,000

Mr. FLINT. What are the duties of these official arbitrators ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The two arbitrators who now hold office are what is left of the official board of arbitrators, to whom claims used to be referred against the Crown. The survivors of this board were appointed official referees of the Ex-