

relating to the expenditures of judges or of any other parties in this country.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am not going to discuss the merits of the proposition now before the House from a Quebec or an Ontario standpoint, though the resolution seems to affect only those two provinces. But my object in rising is to express regret that while dealing with this question of the salaries of judges, the Government has not thought the time opportune to re-arrange the salaries of judges in the other provinces, especially those of the higher courts. In the province of Manitoba, where we have only four judges who are attending three large judicial districts, as the province is now divided, those four judges have to attend to all the criminal and civil cases belonging to the Court of Queen's Bench; they have to attend to chancery cases, to cases in equity, and they have also to sit in chambers after attending to the districts where they have quarterly sittings. I say that our judges are overworked, and are not receiving an adequate salary for their services. In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec the judges are receiving, some \$7,000, others \$6,000, others \$5,000 a year, while in the province of Manitoba the chief justice only gets \$5,000 a year, and the three puisne judges are only getting \$4,000 each. I hope that the Government will see their way to making a just distribution of the salaries so that our judges, who are, as I say, overworked in having to attend to all those courts, may be more adequately remunerated. They not only have to sit in cases in the first instance, but they have also to sit in review of those very cases; they have to sit as a court of appeal, while in the other provinces those duties are assigned to certain judges appointed for the purpose, whose duties are confined to those courts of appeal. In Manitoba the same judges have to attend to all those cases, and they get a mere pittance. In our province the living expenses are much higher than they are in the eastern provinces, therefore, I say, it is time that the salaries of the judges in Manitoba should be looked into, and that the Government should put them on the same footing as the judges of the other provinces. There should be no discrimination as to the salaries of our judges. In 1892 there was a proposition laid before this House whereby the salaries of the judges of Manitoba were to be increased by \$1,000 each, but I am sorry to say that the Government at that time did not see proper to carry out that proposition. There was a general redistribution of salaries proposed by the late Sir John Thompson at that time, but it appears that on account of some opposition coming from some of the provinces, the idea was dropped, and the intention to fix the salaries on a proper scale has been abandoned. I therefore hope that the pre-

Mr. SPROULE.

sent Government will take up this question and deal with it anew, in so far as Manitoba is concerned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understood the Solicitor General to say there was a radical change here in connection with the statute upon which there had been placed such a construction that \$18 for a day's attendance by a judge had been allowed, whereas under his resolution the amount should be limited to \$6. Now, I hold in my hand the old statute, and I fail to see a difference in that respect, and I will point out my difficulties to the hon. gentleman. I would like him to explain how he considers this change is brought about. The clause to which I have reference relates to the Superior Court judges, because the resolutions include Circuit Court judges with the Superior Court judges. Now, the resolution reads thus:

That to each of the judges of the Superior or Circuit Courts attending as such, at the request in writing of the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, any court held at any other place than that at which he is directed to reside,—

And I call attention to this:

—for each day he is absent from the said place of residence, there shall be paid for travelling allowances \$6; but no travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review under the first section of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, 61 Vic., cap. 20, unless it is certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

That is the clause the hon. gentleman refers to. Then, in regard to the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, just preceding that, there is a provision of \$6 for each day's absence from his place of residence, provided that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed. That is, if it is one day he gets \$18. Now, the old statute has these two phrases:

To each of the judges of the said Court of Queen's Bench, attending any other court, for each day he is absent from his place of residence, \$6.

The same per diem allowance exactly. Then, there is a proviso:

Provided that any judge of the Superior Court required to attend, as such, the Court of Queen's Bench, appeal side or criminal side, elsewhere than at his said place of residence,—

I need not read the whole of it, but it says:

—the allowance shall be \$6 for each day's absence from his place of residence, except that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed for.

It seems to me that this refers to practically the same provision, with the excep-