

These are the only two new appointments. The only other change, as I mentioned, is that in British Columbia. The chief justice, who was appointed a short time ago, by virtue of existing legislation, received some \$820 less than his predecessor, which brought his salary down to the small sum of \$5,000. It is not proposed to restore under this Bill, the salary as it existed from confederation, but it is proposed to increase the salary as admiralty judge by \$400, instead of \$600, giving him \$1,000, and making it correspond with the salary of other local judges in admiralty. That is the local judge—I use that language advisedly, because the local judge means the judge in admiralty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How much is this increase ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We give \$400, instead of restoring the salary paid to the late chief justice, Sir Matthew Begbie, who was an Imperial appointee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Who is the local judge ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chief justice ; and under this he will not have the salary of his predecessor, but he will be \$400 better off than he would be without it. We leave the salary as chief justice the same as it was, but this amount gives him a uniform salary as local judge with that paid to local judges elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) This adds \$400 to his salary ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has that effect ; but it has the justification of making his salary in admiralty the same as that paid in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to ; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the hon. gentleman has hardly satisfied the committee that this is a fair deal, at all. I understood from the hon. gentleman that it was not the intention of the Government to take up the question of increasing the judges' salaries at present. Now, you are practically adding \$400 to the salary of a judge who, if my recollection serves me right, receives as much in proportion to the work he does as any other judge in Canada. On what ground can Parliament justify singling out this one man from among all the judges in Canada and increasing his salary ? I do not think that this is a time for increasing judges' salaries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear. I agree.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In view of the stringent financial crisis which is still—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We are passing through it, though.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—It will be time enough to talk about increasing the salaries of officials when we get through it. From all indications, from the language of those who have the best opportunities of judging, we have a trying six months ahead of us, yet. I do not think that the expressions of the hon. gentleman hitherto justify him in asking the House to vote \$400 a year to this judge. The late Chief Justice Begbie got a very handsome salary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No; \$5,800 can hardly be called a "handsome" salary for a chief justice.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But he had more.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And \$600 in admiralty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Making \$6,400, besides travelling expenses. Comparing that with the salaries of some of the leading judges in Toronto and Montreal, and, judging by the amount of work they are called upon to do, he was very handsomely paid, indeed. If the hon. gentleman is going to attach salary to the office on account of it being a chief justiceship, irrespective of the work to be done, he should remember that there are other parts of the Dominion to be considered besides British Columbia. I am not pressing this course at this time ; I do not acknowledge it as the proper rule. Every one recognizes the enormous amount of work the Toronto and Montreal judges are called upon to do, and Parliament has made a discrimination in the salaries paid to them. I do not say that they are paid enough ; I am not in a position to be able to judge as to that. But I do not think the general condition of the country will justify the increase of the salaries of any judges, much less that of this gentleman in British Columbia. It has never been contended by anybody that he is overworked. Of course, we want to pay him fairly for the honourable position he holds, and the work he does. The salary attached to this office under the late Sir Matthew Begbie is an ample salary, considering the resources of the country, and the peculiar financial position in which we are placed. And the Minister himself has not suggested any reason whatever for the increase, but has merely stated his desire to pay him as judge in admiralty the same as other judges holding similar positions elsewhere. That is not argument. The question is, discharging the duty of judge in admiralty and chief justice as well, are his salaries combined, enough for the work he does, and the dignified position he holds ? I think they are.