

Personally, and I think I can say this very sincerely, I have been very much concerned about the appointment of judges. I have very carefully read the briefs prepared by the Canadian Bar Association and many other organizations which have spoken about the method of appointing judges. I have also spoken to my colleagues about it and many of them have had long discussions on the whole problem of appointing judges.

● (4:40 p.m.)

Suggestions have been made by hon. members today and I have heard suggestions by some of my own colleagues respecting appointments, but no suggestion that I have so far heard is one that would ensure that better judges would be selected under the proposed system than have been appointed under the system that has been followed until now. There is a constitutional responsibility upon the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General and the government to name the judges. It is a responsibility which should not easily be thrown away. I have not closed my mind to any further suggestions as to other methods of appointing judges and of trying to be sure that the government is given the best possible legal minds in this field, but I must say that most suggestions and recommendations I have heard have not convinced me that by the utilization of any of these suggested methods we would in fact have better judges.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to tell hon. members that this is a question which has been very much on my mind and in the minds of my colleagues. We are very sensitive about it. We want to have, as all members want to have, a judiciary of which we can be proud. We, as all governments that have administered Canada, can be proud of the record of our judiciary.

I want to thank all hon. members who have taken part in this debate. I will take into account the suggestions which have been made and I hope that it will be possible to put some of them into effect.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

On clause 4—

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Mr. Chairman, did I understand the minister to say that the government is giving consideration, whether active or not, to the salaries of the judges?

Admiralty Act

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Chairman, what I did say was that the government was considering the revision of the judges' salaries but not necessarily in this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Chairman, may I put a question to the Minister of Justice?

Could he tell us for which judicial district the three judges will be appointed? Would there be one for Montreal to deal especially with cases of bankruptcy?

Mr. Cardin: Mr. Chairman, among the three judges to be appointed in the province of Quebec, one will deal with bankruptcies in the district of Montreal, another will sit in the district of Trois-Rivières and a third one will sit on the board of appeal of the Canada pension plan, in which the province of Quebec is participating.

[*English*]

Clause agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By leave, now?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cardin moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

ADMIRALTY ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEPUTY JUDGES, ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

Hon. Lucien Cardin (Minister of Justice) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend the Admiralty Act to authorize the appointment of not more than three deputy judges for each admiralty district and to provide for a certain change in the administration of the act.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Batten in the chair.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, is the minister going to make a statement?

Mr. Cardin: The statement will be very short indeed. I simply wish to say that the purpose of the legislation is to authorize the