

Bill (210) 'An Act to amend the North-west Territories Act.'—Hon. Mr. Scott.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill (206) An Act to amend the Judges Act.

The Bill was read the first time.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I move that this Bill be read a second time to-morrow. This Bill deals with salaries of the county court judges and district judges, giving certain increases. Clause 1 reads:

The judge of the county court of the county of York, \$3,500 per annum.

Sixty-nine other judges and junior judges of county courts and district courts, each \$2,500 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service, each \$3,000 per annum.

Hon. Mr. SULLIVAN—I think that is very proper. The salaries of county court judges of Ontario ought to be increased.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Does my hon. friend merely contemplate dealing with county court judges of one province?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I have not gone through the Bill. It affects county court judges in Manitoba, \$2,500 for the first three years, and after three years, \$3,000, and it makes provision with regard to the chief commissioner and assistant chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners, the same as was done with reference to the late chief commissioner, that his term as high court judge before his appointment to the commission should count in his pension.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Does it deal with one judge, or with the county court judges as a whole?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know what the increase is.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned until 11 a.m. to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT

THE SENATE.

OTTAWA, Thursday, July 16, 1908.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock a.m.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

LEASE OF SHOPS AT MONCTON.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. McSWEENEY inquired:

Have the government leased the old shops and grounds at Moncton, which were advertised last February, and tenders were closed about March? And, also, if lease has been closed, to whom was it awarded?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The answer to that question is 'no.'

PAY OF OTTAWA FIELD BATTERY.

INQUIRY POSTPONED.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired:

When does the government think that it will be able to lay on the table of this House the following documents, the production of which was ordered during the present session, at the dates mentioned:

(a) The statement indicating the amounts spent on the Deschambault wharf—February 14?

(b) The correspondence exchanged between the Department of Militia and Lieutenant-Colonel Davidson *re* latter's dismissal and the promotion of Sir Henry Pellatt to the rank of colonel—February 14?

(c) The statement showing what was the daily pay of the soldiers of the Company No. 2 of the Ottawa Field Battery in 1865 and 1866—March 17?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I have no answer to any of these questions.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I suppose the hon. gentleman could get those answers for the next sitting of the House?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Where everybody is working under high pressure it is not easy to see anybody and attend to one's own work, all the ministers are so busily engaged. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to give his question to some friend in the other Chamber, and have him ask the minister there.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I have no slaves in the other Chamber. My question No. 3 was answered yesterday, so it will be dropped.