



SUPREME COURT OF THE AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

Ms Yu-Lan Chan
Secretary
ACT Remuneration Tribunal
PO Box 964
Civic Square ACT 2608

9 September 2013

Dear Ms Chan

Thank you for your letter of 15 August, and for the opportunity to make a submission in the context of the present annual review.

All I wish to say at this juncture is that I remain of the view that the remuneration of the master of the Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory should be set at 85% of the salary of a judge of the Supreme Court. That is the position which obtains generally in the rest of Australia, with the effect that in those jurisdictions with an intermediate court, the remuneration of the master is the same as that of a judge of the District Court or County Court.

There is a better argument for maintaining the proportion in this Territory, because the jurisdiction of the master is substantially wider than in many other parts of Australia. The master of the Supreme Court of the Australian Capital Territory has the same jurisdiction as single judge of the Supreme Court in its civil jurisdiction. As far as I am aware no master of any other Australian court has such an extensive jurisdiction, or such judicial responsibility.

I am not sure whether the Tribunal will be reconsidering the remuneration applicable to my position as a retired master deemed to be continuing in office for the completion of actions which have been heard but not yet finally determined. In that regard may I say that my wish to complete outstanding judgments by November will not be realised. It is likely to take me several more months to complete all outstanding judgments. If this is an issue which the Tribunal will be considering, my submission is simply that my remuneration should remain on the same terms until I am able to complete the outstanding judgments.

Yours sincerely

David Harper