

clerks of the court, and stenographers, is \$1,800 each.

Mr. MONK. There is no distinction between the sheriff and the stenographers of the territorial court. But the allowance for the stenographers in the police court is not fixed at the same rate.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The stenographer for the police court gets \$1,200 salary and \$1,800 for living allowance.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does this practice prevail in the other departments with reference to the living allowances of officials in the Yukon?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand in all the departments. But I know that so far as the Yukon is concerned, a living allowance was granted to all the officials of the other departments.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understand that in the province of Manitoba the officials are allowed so much for their general expenses, but not a regular living allowance. They are allowed a salary and all expenses, but they have to produce vouchers for every expenditure. It is different in the Yukon, where they are allowed so much, whatever the expenditure may be.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the minister say how much jurors are paid in the Yukon? Are jurors and sheriffs paid in a different manner from the other provinces?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not got the information with respect to that, but I can easily procure it if the hon. gentleman wishes.

Mr. FOWLER. About Crown prosecutors, how are the fees regulated?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We pay Crown prosecutors in the Yukon exactly as we do all the other counsel employed by the department. When a Crown counsel has rendered a service he sends in his bill, which is taxed in the department in the regular way. Of course I may say that we allow parties something more in the Yukon than we do in the older provinces; but the bills are taxed in the regular way.

Mr. FOWLER. And the only fees he gets are what he gets from the department here?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot say as to that, but not in connection with his work as Crown prosecutor. He is supposed to receive nothing at all as Crown prosecutor except what he receives from the department. It would be a grave breach of propriety on his part to take fees from any one else in cases in which he is retained by the government.

Mr. FOWLER. But he is allowed to practice besides?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

5

Mr. FOWLER. How much was paid to the Crown prosecutor last year as fees?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not got that, I have only the Manitoba fees.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Pattullo was paid last year \$7,000.95; Mr. Noel received \$666. I think the minister ought hardly to dismiss this matter so easily. There is evidently something wrong in one or two particulars. This scale of living allowance was fixed when there was really a great difference in the cost between the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, for instance, and British Columbia. But everybody knows that that scale of living has been greatly reduced since then. Take the scale of living of a Northwest judge, for instance, you allow him nothing for his living, you give him a salary. Yet you give \$5,000 in the Yukon in addition to what it costs a judge to live in the Northwest Territories. It is paying a man for something which does not cost him the amount, whilst the idea under which it is paid is that it is to cover an actual expense. It is not a right principle, as my hon. friend knows, to pay a man something as a solatium or salary under the guise of paying it as a necessary expense. Now if this practice runs through all the other departments, as I suppose it does, then it is a very large item, besides being an unfair item and it is well worth inquiring into. I think some steps ought to be taken to reduce it to a fair scale. It is unjust to the police magistrate, who has just as good an appetite and eats just as much food, and as good food, as a stenographer, that the stenographer gets \$1,800 and the police magistrate only gets \$1,200. Why make that difference between them? The police magistrate ought to eat more, because the stenographer's work is lighter, but there is discrimination in the living allowance. I have no doubt this living allowance really becomes part of the salary, because the difference in expenses does not at all mount up to the allowance which is given here for the purpose of living expenses. I think my hon. friend ought to look into that matter. I noticed in the newspapers that a reign of economy has been inaugurated in the Yukon, and that many officials are being dispensed with. Probably the economies are taking place because there is less work. The other ministers also seem to be getting in a little work in this respect in their departments. I think it is unfair to discriminate, and a bad principle, to give to officials under the guise of a necessary expense what is really an addition to their salary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite agree that it is proper that we should have a certain specified sum for a salary, and that the sum paid should be the remuneration for services rendered by the individual to the government. Then in addition to that, if anything further is required, it ought to be