

are, for the reason that amounts are charged to capital account which should be charged to current account, so that the public, in reading the statement of the Finance Minister, under those circumstances, would be misled as to what it really costs to run the country.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—There is a very great deal of force in what my hon. friend says, and I think that the accounts should be revised.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It is altogether an incorrect and improper mode of presenting the actual cost of running the government of the country.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is there anything in this last loan to meet the expenses of the Quebec bridge?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—The Quebec bridge at present is not costing us much, whatever it may cost in the future. If we are going on with the construction, no doubt it would be a charge against this amount, that is for the current year, whatever we may expend.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill passed through its final stages.

JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved the second reading of Bill (193), An Act to amend the Judges' Act.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—What are those judges in Ontario receiving now?

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—They were receiving \$2,400 and then they were increased to \$2,800. You will see they are fixed here at a certain sum beginning at \$2,500 and going up to \$3,000, with the exception of the judge of the county of York.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—In the counties of Gaspé and Chicoutimi, we have two judges who are receiving less than the other judges in the province of Quebec. By section 8 of chapter 138, Revised Statutes, there are six

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

teen judges of the Superior Court who receive \$5,999, and there are two puisne judges each of whom receives \$4,500. In 190, those salaries were readjusted. A resolution was passed by the House of Commons putting those two judges on the same footing as the others. The Bill based on that resolution was passed, but a mistake was made and the old figures were retained. The mistake was admitted by the Acting Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who was then Minister of Justice, and in a letter dated 27th February, 1908, addressed to one of those judges, he says:

My Dear Judge,—In answer to your letter of the 26th of February last, I have no hesitation in saying that the intention of the Department of Justice (and I believe I had the approbation of the government at that time) was to put all the judges in the rural districts on the same footing in so far as their salaries are concerned and when the resolutions were settled that the salaries of the judges of Gaspé and Chicoutimi should be \$5,000, like the others. Subsequently a change took place for which I cannot account. I was decidedly under the impression that I had given effect to my intention until my attention was directed to the legislation as sanctioned by the Governor in Council.

I have not had an opportunity to see the Minister of Justice, but you are authorized to tell him that I never deliberately made any change in the item in question, and that my intention has always been to keep the promise that I made to Justice Carroll, when he accepted the position of judge at Gaspé, that is to say to raise the salary of the judge of that district to the same figure as that given to other judges in rural districts.

So far as your district is concerned, the difference which exists in the salaries certainly should not exist. I know of few judges who have, in their districts, as many important cases as you have in yours.

Yours very truly,

C. FITZPATRICK.

This error that took place between the adoption of the resolutions by the House of Commons and the passing of the Bill, was brought to the notice of the government in this House by myself last year. Later we repeated our observations to the government, and when my hon. friend from Grandville (Mr. Choquette) was a member of the House of Commons he also called attention to the matter, and I do not understand why occasion was not taken, when this Bill was prepared, to correct the error of 1905. I know we have no right to amend this Bill, because it is a money Bill, but I