salary ranges suggested by the Canadian Bar Association Committee on Judges Salaries and Pensions. The work carried out by that committee was of considerable help to the government, and the committee and its chairman, Mr. Douglas Brown, deserve the appreciation of the legal profession and the public at large—the ultimate beneficiary of an informed, capable but independent judiciary.

The committee pointed out in its report to the annual meeting of the Canadian Bar Association in Halifax in September of last year that the very position of esteem and independence held by the judiciary in Canada precludes its members from stating its own worthy case, and in no sense of the term can there be bilateral bargaining between members of the bench and the government. Recognizing this to be so, the Canadian Bar Association is to be commended for commissioning and supporting a committee to investigate the facts and present them for the consideration of the government.

Based upon available statistics, the Committee on Judges Salaries and Pensions came to the conclusion that increases granted in 1967 have been overtaken by the decrease in the spending power of the dollar.

Perhaps at no other time in our history has an informed and forward looking judiciary been of more importance to Canadians. This country faces many issues that in terms of their complexity and their relevance to the everyday affairs of our citizens are without equal in our past. Our courts share the burden of providing innovative and result-oriented solutions to these problems. We must strive constantly to maintain a creative and contemporary judiciary.

Canadians have come to recognize that law reform is not the sole preserve of the legislator; just as we here have the duty and the responsibility to bring the statutes of Canada into accord with contemporary thought, so must the courts strive to link the jurisprudence of the past with the cultural norms and social context that are Canada today and will be Canada tomorrow. If the courts are unable or unwilling to heed the words of those who would advance our legal traditions, if the courtroom door is barred to those who would reform through advocating the public interest, then we have only weak arguments to oppose those who find themselves in the streets advocating change by force or violence.

If participation is to be a meaningful word in Canada, we must provide ready access to the decision-making processes, and I would do the courts a disservice if I did not include the judiciary as a part of that process in Canada. We do not disparage or undermine the law when we consider change. Indeed, change is the very essence, the very heart, of our common legal heritage.

[*Translation*]

The Criminal Code has undergone significant amendment in the last few years and the bail reform bill now before Parliament brings about major changes in the law of arrest and pretrial detention. The courts are being called upon to be familiar with and speak knowledgeably about a criminal law that, because of the nature of our society, must be flexible enough to deal with crime in the broad spectrum—criminal activity that forms a continuum from petty theft to highly organized crime and street violence.

New issues are to be dealt with in the field of civil justice as well. Cases calling for the interpretation of provincial, as well as federal statutes are becoming more common. Problems involving landlord and tenant disputes, securities marketing, immigration, divorce and matrimonial proceedings all raise intricate jurisprudential questions.

To solve these questions, new concepts of exactly what a court is will be required. The new Federal Court Act, just recently proclaimed, is an example of the evolution of an older institution, a necessary evolution to keep our judicial system in step with the changes in our society and the changing role of law in that society.

Our courts must not only deal with matters of substance, but also be prepared to meet and thwart those that would bring about the orderly perversion of justice by using the criminal trial as a political platform. We cannot allow Canadian courtroms to be degraded with a "Chicago 8" trial; judicial proceedings are the visible manifestation of the rule of law and no disrespect should be afforded to a concept that is so much a part of our democratic order.

We hope to establish a tradition within the Bar of Canada that the practicing lawyer will feel morally bound to accept a judicial appointment when it is offered even if this decision will result in a substantial decrease in income or in the disruption of family life. If this tradition is to be nurtured—if we are to attract the men and women with the talent and vigour that we require—then we must be prepared to go some distance in making the holding of judicial office a viable career for those persons who still are relatively young and who are experiencing the peak expenditures of their lives because of family responsibilities.

In this regard, the bill will result in increased pensions to widows or widowers of judges with dependent children and brings such pensions into better accord with the financial responsibilities of judges with young families.

The Royal Commission on the Status of Women has stated:

"We believe that women are needed at all levels of the law to build up faith in the law and the courts as a neutral force that treats all people equally."

In anticipation of the appointment of more women to the Bench, the bill will amend the Judges Act so as to permit the government to provide pensions to the dependents of women judges on the same basis as to wives and children of male members of the Bench.

[*English*]

I have mentioned the challenges that the courts must meet in the future. I am convinced that there will continue to be an increase in the number of cases to be heard by the courts and, of course, without additional appointments the backload of cases would continue to expand. The bill now provides for the appointment of 12 additional judges, 11 of whom are for the provincial superior courts of Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. It is