

in view of conditions existing, which may vary from time to time. But I quite agree that we should not, under cover of granting a living allowance, enable a man to eke out an addition to his salary, that is improper. When this matter came up for consideration I made inquiry as to the conditions existing in the Yukon. My information is—my hon. friend may have better information—that since 1900 there has been no appreciable variation in the cost of living in the Yukon. The conditions now are about the same as they were at that time. I can see no good reason why they should vary. We must consider that almost everything that is needed must now be brought into the country at a considerable cost, which would add to the original cost of living. Then the cost of transport, I apprehend, would remain the same now as it was about that time. However, I may say to my hon. friend that I took the trouble, when George McCaulay was in the east, to send for him to come to Ottawa and explain what the conditions were. And I received from him the assurance that the conditions were the same, that the cost of living was practically the same as in 1900, and that of the additional sum of \$5,000, very little could be saved. That is the information I have. While I agree with my hon. friend in the principle he laid down, I have given him the information on which I have acted, and I appreciate the necessity of giving this additional remuneration.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the minister ask the sheriff whether he required \$5,000 more to live in the Yukon than a judge requires in the Northwest Territories of Manitoba? That is the very point.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Here is the position. I questioned him with respect to the difference in the increase in house rent, in the general increase in living, and the cost of ordinary necessities of life, whether or not it cost more to procure these ordinary necessities than it did here. I was told that it did, and is was on that information that I based my estimate.

Mr. FOWLER. There is no doubt it would cost more in the Yukon than it would either in the Northwest Territories or in the east. But the point I make is that it does not cost \$5,000 more, the difference is too great in the living expenses. The fairer way to get at it would be to attach to the office of the judge of the Yukon a certain salary, and if we give \$5,000 in this country, give him say, \$7,000 there, and let him pay his own living expenses. For it does not seem to be the right thing to make a certain scale for judge, a certain scale for a police magistrate and another scale for a stenographer; you are drawing distinctions that should not be drawn in a matter like this where one man is supposed to be as good as another, and considerably better sometimes. For that reason I object to giving

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

the extra salary. Give an increased salary, but don't say that the sheriff shall receive \$1,800, a judge \$5,000, a stenographer \$1,000. I do not think that is right at all.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not object to increasing the salary, I think the Minister of Justice is right in saying that the salary having been increased once, it would be difficult to change it. But I think the allowance should be reduced. I may mention that a day or two ago I saw a gentleman from Dawson, a political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, and he told me that the cost of living up there was very much reduced, in fact it was much the same as it is here, for the reason that the population has greatly decreased in Dawson; instead of being 40,000, it is now about 12,000. There are now ample provisions there, and rents are reduced. I think the living allowance should be reduced without touching the salary. Let the judge have \$5,000 a year and reduce the living allowance. It is not a right principle to make this difference between the living allowance of the judge and the stenographer, or any other employee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I may say to my hon. friends opposite that all the departments are considering the question of living allowances, and if there is any objection to allowing the item to pass, I am willing it should stand until such time as we have made a rule applicable to all the departments, and which will be consistent with the altered conditions in the Yukon. So far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to allow the item to stand for a day or two until I can get better information. I know where I can get it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the same question will come up in other departments. I think it ought to be looked into.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, with respect to all the departments. What my hon. friend has said is applicable not only to the Department of Justice, but to all the departments which have officials in the Yukon.

Mr. BERGERON. There ought not to be discrimination anyway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not agree that there is discrimination. I made a mistake when I said that Sheriff Eilbeck was in the Yukon. That gentleman is now in a hospital in San Francisco where he has undergone an operation.

Living allowances of sheriff, deputy sheriff, clerk of court, assistant clerks, police magistrate and stenographers of territorial court at \$1,800 each, \$14,400.

Mr. SPROULE. How will your determination in reference to these salaries be affected by the fact that these votes have passed the House?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are not obliged to pay them. We only get authority to pay