

\$8,000 a year. We have twice that number of Ministers who receive the same salary. Perhaps hereafter we may have a Minister of Foreign Affairs, a Minister of War, and others. I wish it to be understood that I am in favor of giving the Judges a sufficient salary, not more nor less, and after we have settled upon their salaries we ought to abide by it, and I think the salary fixed three or four years ago is quite sufficient.

Mr. CURRAN. Although a member of the profession myself, yet, as I have the honor of representing a very large commercial and manufacturing centre, I think it my duty to add a few words in reply to the observations which have been given by the first and second speakers to-day in regard to the salaries of our Judges. I think it is the feeling of the commercial and manufacturing communities in this country that the Judges in our large centres do not receive adequate remuneration for their services. I think that the Bench is no longer considered a prize by those who occupy a high position at the Bar, and that it is desirable that the salaries of the Judges should be increased so as to enable them to occupy worthily the high position they hold in society, despite the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), and which have, no doubt, been made with a view to manufacture political capital in some county constituencies at some future election. Not to repeat what has already been said, I may simply make this remark, that at the time the salaries of Judges were fixed the duties of Judges were far from being as onerous, far from being as responsible as they are to-day. The great expansion of commerce, the great industries that have sprung up, our powerful telegraph and railway companies, have brought before our courts suits of immense importance; and I think it is only just that men who have to deal with millions in a single suit should receive salaries which would enable them to live as gentlemen, and to be beyond suspicion of being approachable; and I may remark in this connection that we have good reason to be proud of the high character of our Bench, and to put full confidence in those who occupy it, and certainly those gentlemen ought to be remunerated according to their talent and to the high position they occupy in society.

Mr. DAVIES. I quite agree with those hon. gentlemen who contend that the Judges should receive just such salaries as will enable the Government to draw the best talent from the Bar; I do not agree with those who contend that Judges are bound necessarily to be paid salaries which would enable them to live in a style befitting their high social position. I think we have struck the right test when we have to pay them such a sum as will draw from the Bar its best talent. Whether this is the result in Ontario and Quebec, I cannot say; but, so far as my own Province is concerned, I merely desire to say this: That we are peculiarly circumstanced there, and our Judges are paid about \$1,500 a year less than Judges who perform similar duties in the neighboring Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I have no hesitation in endorsing what my hon. colleague has said as to the increased cost of living in the Island—and I fear that state of things will continue if this Government remains in power for the next fifty-five years, as one of their friends has predicted; but I will go further than that, and say that with the present salaries paid to Judges, we do not get the best talent at the Bar, nor anything like it, and the Judges who are paid these salaries have to resort to outside means in obtaining a living, which is not creditable to the Judges themselves, or to the Bar, and is not conducive to the interests of justice. I hope that when the hon. gentleman does remodel the salaries paid to Judges, he will see to it that a Judge in Prince Edward Island, who has equal abilities to a Judge in Nova Scotia in the discharge of his duties, shall be paid at least the same salary.

Mr. LANDRY (Translation). Mr. Chairman, if I correctly understand the resolutions which are now before the House, they have not in view an increase in the salary of the Judges, and I cordially endorse them. A moment ago I heard an opinion expressed that we ought to increase the salaries of Judges resident in cities and not those living in the rural districts. I think if it ever becomes necessary to introduce resolutions as above, such a distinction will not be made. The greater part of our Judges residing in the rural districts are obliged very often to go to the cities, and to hear and try cases, and, therefore, are city as well as County Judges. My hon. friend the member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), remarked a moment ago that it was necessary to return to the customs of our ancestors. I think if we returned to these customs, instead of coming to Ottawa by railway we would have to go on foot; instead of coming in here spurred and booted, as we notice some of our colleagues at times entering this House, they would appear in a much more primitive costume. The hon. member is wrong in giving us information about the United States, which is not taken from official documents, but from little almanacks which are given to little children, who buy a bottle of the good Samaritan, St. Jacob's Oil or Soothing Syrup. The hon. member is wrong in giving these documents as official, and the statistics which he furnishes should not receive at our hands more consideration than they merit. In conclusion, I think that the resolutions now before the House, inasmuch as they do not increase in any manner the salaries of the Judges, should receive our support, and when the time comes, if ever, to introduce new resolutions, they will be so rendered as to give justice and satisfaction to all.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I regret that the discussion of this question has been confined to members of the profession, from which it might be supposed that lawyers only were interested in it, and that they were guided by selfish motives. That remark cannot apply to the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), because unfortunately for himself, from the present position of political parties in this country, he can hardly anticipate within his lifetime, I presume, to be invited to take a seat on the Bench. He is, therefore, free from any motive of that kind, and, perhaps, that may indirectly account for the fact that the view taken by the hon. gentleman is totally different from that taken by other speakers. He says, in his opinion, Judges should not receive salaries sufficient to enable them to drive horses. He is selfish in that view, for we find him daily on horseback, and I regret very much that the other day he was thrown from his horse—I hope that is not attributable to bad riding on his part. But if the hon. gentleman was fortunately in that pecuniary position which enabled him to ride on horseback every day, surely he should be willing to allow Judges to be paid salaries to enable them to take equestrian exercise, if they consider it necessary for their health. The hon. gentleman referred to salaries paid to Judges in the United States, and the statement he made, was, according to my recollection and present information, somewhat erroneous and misleading. He quoted the salary paid to the Judges of the Supreme Court at Washington, at \$10,000, which, I believe, is correct; he also referred to the salaries paid Judges of Louisiana, but he did not refer to any other States of the Union. From my information, I think that the salaries paid to Judges of the highest courts in New York State are from \$10,000 to \$12,000; and that larger salaries are paid in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and most of the leading States than are paid to Judges in any part of the Dominion. But I do think the reference to the United States was a fortunate one, because every one who has had an opportunity of mixing much in American business and legal circles must have, over and over again, heard complaints that the salaries paid the