

the whole charge paid by the Dominion. This pretext is utterly indefensible, and looks like persistence in an extremely bad system. It is, moreover, unfair to the Superior Court judges of the Province of Quebec, more especially those residing in the city of Montreal, where the cost of living is probably higher than in Toronto.

We append, from the *Mail* of Feb. 26, the report of what transpired in the Ontario Legislature:—

Mr. Macmaster rose to the notice of motion given by him for "an address to the Lieutenant-Governor for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Ontario and Government of Canada, in pursuance of a resolution of this House, passed during the session of 1879, with a view to have the allowance of \$1,000 a year, paid by the province to the judges of the Superior Courts, assumed by the Dominion." He said that by the constitution of British North America, judges were appointed by the federal Government, and were paid by it. Hence, in his opinion, the \$1,000 allowance was beyond the competency of the Legislature. He held that it was altogether inexpedient that the judges should receive anything whatever from the province. It was dangerous in every sense, reliable as the judges were. The province had no more right to fee the judges than the city of Toronto or any other place. It might be argued that the judges did special service for the province, and should have remuneration. It was argued that without this allowance, suitable and able men could not be got to take the bench; the Dominion allowance being insufficient. He was inclined to doubt this, and at all events it was the business of the Dominion Government, and not of Ontario. Therefore, he moved for the correspondence.

Mr. Mowat said that, as he had already said on a previous occasion, he would inform the House that there was no such correspondence. The resolution of 1879 did indeed express a desire for such communication, but it also expressed the opinion that the good faith of the province was pledged to a continuance to the present judges of the allowance. This resolution was carried by a vote of 55 to 25, in the majority being the present leader of the opposition. The speaker believed that what was then the opinion of the House was its opinion now. As to the competency of the Legislature to pass the Act, the Dominion Government had disallowed it the first year it had passed, but had allowed it to remain unimpugned in its reiteration in the next session, thereby tacitly acknowledging that the Legislature was right. Furthermore, even if the province prevailed upon the Dominion to increase the salaries of Ontario judges, the Government would be obliged to raise the salaries of judges throughout the country, and this would entail such additional expense to the country that Ontario's share of it would far exceed the allowance it now paid directly to the judges.

Mr. Meredith said that the Attorney-General was right in stating that the resolution expressed a cer-

tain opinion, but he had apparently failed to appreciate that the resolution asked that certain correspondence should take place. To this portion of the resolution no attention had been paid. With reference to the question of the allowance, the speaker held that there were grave reasons to question the expediency of the Act providing for it. He hoped that the Attorney-General would at all events see that the full import of the resolution of 1879 was attended to.

Mr. Macmaster said that there could be no doubt of the illegality of making the allowance. The terms of the Confederation Act distinctly showed this. The argument of the Attorney-General ament expense was begging the question. The Ontario Legislature had no right to supplement the salaries of the judges; the Dominion Government had. It was argued that the judges performed certain services for the province. Why should it not be argued similarly that they could perform services of any kind for anyone, and be paid by anyone, a state of affairs which would speedily upset the whole system of justice. The whole duty of a judge once on the bench was to devote himself to the administration of justice. Any proceeding which tended to trench in the slightest upon the independence of the judges should be done away with at once and for ever. If the correspondence referred to in the resolution for 1879, had not taken place, the sooner it did the better.

Mr. Mowat—It has not taken place.

Mr. Macmaster—Then I withdraw my motion.

ANGLO-AMERICAN COPYRIGHT CONVENTION.

Upon the question of an international copyright, the *London Law Times* has the following:

Her Majesty's Government lately received from the United States Minister here, a draft of a Copyright Convention which has been under the consideration of the United States Government, and on which they desire the views of that of Her Majesty. The Board of Trade have forwarded this draft to Mr. Blanchard Jerrold, as chairman of the English branch of "The International Literary Association," in order that he may call a meeting of English authors and publishers, and take their opinion upon the scheme. The Board of Trade say in their letter that the draft "is not, as they understand, sent in the form of a direct proposal from the United States Government."

The draft convention contains eleven clauses, with all of which it is not necessary for us to deal. Clause 1 gives to English authors the same protection, and for the same number of years, against unauthorized reproduction in America, as they now enjoy in England, and *vice versa* with American authors. A curious proviso says that this protection shall not be