

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): No. I have it here.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then what is the date?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): February, 1930.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Very well. In making an appointment after that, the government did not see fit to increase the salary to \$7,500. A very competent man was found in the city of Ottawa who was willing to accept this position at \$6,000, with free office, free staff, free everything; and I never heard any complaint at all about the work done by the former registrar for \$6,000. To me it does seem a little strange that in war time we should increase this salary by 25 per cent. I am going to register a protest against the principle, and I shall have to leave it there. I wish to point out to the committee and to the country that this is not economy in the normal activity of government in war time.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I should like to support what has just been said by the leader of the opposition. During a time like this, when we are appealing to the people of Canada to make sacrifices and our people are making them, I think it is very difficult to justify an increase of 25 per cent in the salary of the registrar, who last year received \$6,000. To me it seems that all these allowances are entirely out of line with what is being received by the great majority of the people of Canada, and I think this amount should be left as it was.

Mr. POULIOT: Some months ago, when I saw some criticism with regard to the readjustment of the salary of the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, I was very much surprised at the stand taken by some Tory members and especially by the Pickwickian leader of the opposition. Why single out this case, in which there is not an increase but a readjustment of salary, when we see all the promotions that have been made on the recommendation of the civil service commission throughout the various departments? Why single out this case? Is it because the present appointee was formerly a member of the Hepburn government, and the leader of the opposition wants to show his rancour towards Mr. Hepburn by criticizing one of his former colleagues? I wonder whether that is the reason. Why does the hon. gentleman not say something about Tories who have obtained promotions by being transferred from one department to another, men who are pests in some departments and who receive extravagant salaries? I would move that the salary of the leader of the opposition be

reduced to \$1. He is just as efficient as the other dollar-a-year men, and he should be treated in the same way. I should like him to tell the committee why he has singled out this case, whether it is to satisfy his rancour against Mr. Hepburn and his government.

Item agreed to.

95. Payments of gratuities to the widows or to any dependent children, of judges who die while in office, \$15,000.

Mr. GRAYDON: Would the minister give us the particulars with regard to this item?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): There is nothing in the law about it, but it is a tradition of very long standing that when a judge dies in office, an allowance or gratuity amounting to two months' salary is paid to his widow.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Referring to the statutory item of \$2,040,600 for judges' salaries and travelling allowances, may I call the minister's attention to a paragraph appearing on page 146 of the auditor general's report for the year ended March 31, 1940, and ask him to explain a certain apparent lack of uniformity:

Section 21 of the Judges Act stipulates that the travel allowance to a superior court judge shall be "in addition to his moving or transportation expenses, the sum of ten dollars for each day, etc." This was not uniformly applied. Judges travelling between Quebec and Montreal were paid on a basis of \$25 for transportation expenses; and judges travelling between Vancouver and Victoria on a basis of \$15 for transportation. Others were paid their actual moving expenses.

There we have three categories. Will the minister be good enough to tell us the reason for this lack of uniformity, and whether any steps, as suggested, I think, by the auditor general, have been taken to deal with the situation?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): So far as I remember, the auditor general merely calls attention to the discrepancy. He does not suggest a change. As a matter of fact, it is a long standing practice, and was in operation long before I came to the department. Judges of the appeal court in Quebec travel from Quebec to Montreal and from Montreal to Quebec almost continuously. It is an arrangement which went on in years gone by between the chief justice and the Department of Justice whereby, instead of sending their bills for \$10 a day, plus transportation expenses, they would be paid \$25 for each trip to Montreal or to Quebec. I am told that it works rather to the advantage of the department, and that while the amount is less, the