

creditors. John J. Campbell made no application to the board for a hearing, because more than twelve months before that date he got a loan from the Farm Loan Board and paid all his creditors in full. Consequently neither he nor any of his former creditors paid any attention to the letters they got from the Registrar. This would look like a very keen desire on the part of an organization to drum up business and get work that pays so well. I am told that Jerome McEachren's case had been disposed of by the previous Board of Review, under the chairmanship of Judge Arsenault, and no one can tell why it was opened again. Neither Russell Peters nor any of his creditors attended court, because, I am informed, Mr. Peters made no application to the Board of Review, or any official thereof, and wanted no interference in his affairs. This trip to Souris would cost the taxpayers of Canada at least \$50 and expenses, and that seems to be the only reason it was undertaken.

I have not said anything yet about the tremendous cost of the administration of this Act. I have dwelt upon features which appeared to me to be of far greater importance. About a week ago I read in one of the Charlottetown newspapers an article which seemed to attempt to excuse or palliate the Prince Edward Island racket by saying that we were not worse than, if as bad as, some of the other provinces. We were compared with Nova Scotia, where the average cost per case was shown to be \$159.27 while the average cost per case on the Island was \$55.09. Every accountant knows that percentages can be made to prove almost anything if some of the factors in connection with the problems are withheld. Let us try to include all the factors. Nova Scotia is, I suppose, four or five times as large as the Island, and has—I am speaking from memory—four times the population. While only 113 cases were heard in Nova Scotia, 927 cases were heard on the Island. Evidently the Act was either greatly under-administered in Nova Scotia or tremendously over-administered in Prince Edward Island. Furthermore, where the cases are few and the distances to be travelled are great, the cost per case must necessarily be much larger than where the cases are numerous and the distances are short. If, for instance, only thirteen cases had been heard in Nova Scotia, the cost per case would be enormously enhanced. Let us compare the cost of administering the Act on Prince Edward Island with the cost of administering it in the whole of Canada, on a per capita basis. This would not be unfair to the Island province, I think, for the reasons already stated. The cost of administering the Act on Prince

Edward Island amounted to \$51,071.04. If the same cost per capita had been maintained all over the Dominion it would have amounted to more than six millions of dollars, whereas it really amounted to only \$1,424,772.69. I think the administrators in the other provinces were well paid; in fact, I think some of them were overpaid; but I leave that to honourable senators from the other provinces, if they wish to look into the matter. This comparison, I fear, shows not only that a great many things were wrong with the administration of the Act on Prince Edward Island, but also that the head office here in Ottawa had lost control of the situation on the Island, and had failed to keep any check on the expenditure there, or perhaps on anything else.

I have already stated that I consider the excessive expenditure in connection with the administration of the Act on Prince Edward Island the least serious part of the business. There are in this House many lawyers eminent in the profession. The two leaders of this House are outstanding men in law and business. I ask them in all seriousness to tell me if in their opinion it is possible for a judge of the Supreme Court in his right senses to deliver such judgments as Judge Saunders has delivered, or has allowed to be delivered, in connection with the working of the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act in Prince Edward Island. I assume, and I think I have a right to assume, that when Judge Saunders was appointed to the Bench he had a reasonable working knowledge of law and possessed a fair knowledge of business and a fair share of common sense. If he had these qualifications at that time, I am compelled to assume that he has lost them and is no longer able to do his work as a judge. This is a serious state of affairs and must be properly looked into.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I feel constrained to dissent from an expression of opinion as to the fitness of a judge to act as head of a court. The trouble, to my mind, is that he is assailed in his capacity as chairman of a board, and I feel that the honourable senator (Hon. Mr. Hughes) is on somewhat delicate ground. I do not know whether the gentleman referred to is a judge of the County Court or of the Superior Court.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: The Supreme Court, if that makes any difference.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I desire simply to express my fear that the honourable gentleman is beyond what may be deemed to be the proper ethics of Parliament.