

ting, not because the judges are not good men, but because they are too numerous, they are badly distributed. I am not going to except my own province when I make that statement. Any business or legal man will tell you that in many of the provinces a redistribution would give a better apportionment of the work and more money to do it, and it would leave this Parliament and the country in a position to pay judges what they ought to receive for the high services they render. What sums are we paying at the present time? In the Supreme Court there are six judges receiving salaries amounting to \$43,000 and a registrar at \$2,600, giving a total of \$45,600. There is the Exchequer Court with one judge at \$6,000, six local admiralty judges, now attached to the Exchequer Court, at total salaries of \$6,400, a registrar at \$2,000, making a total of \$14,200. In Ontario high courts there are fifteen judges with salaries of \$79,000, and 64 county judges with salaries of \$142,300; there are allowances to the high court judges of \$13,000, and allowances for the county court judges of \$12,800, or together in salaries \$221,300, and in allowances \$25,800 for the judges in Ontario. Next we come to the province of Quebec, and in that province they are all high court judges. There are 37 high court judges, getting salaries of \$170,000. In Ontario the total salaries of the high court judges and the county court judges amount to \$221,300. In Quebec the country has to pay 37 high court judges \$170,000 in salary and \$16,000 for allowances. In Nova Scotia there are seven high court judges with salaries of \$29,000 and six county court judges receiving \$16,400, and travelling allowances \$1,400, making \$45,400, with allowances of \$4,000 for the high court judges. In New Brunswick there are six high court judges, with salaries of \$25,000, and six county court judges with salaries of \$15,000, making for salaries \$40,000 and allowances \$4,000 for high court judges, and \$1,200 for the other judges. With great modesty, but yet holding an opinion on the subject, and knowing that we have good judges in New Brunswick, I may express my honest belief that half of the judges could do the work of the province. If that proposition holds with regard to New Brunswick, I believe it also holds with respect to Quebec and many of the other provinces. In Manitoba there are four high court judges and five county court judges, the former receiving in salaries \$17,000 and the latter \$14,000, or a total of \$31,000. In British Columbia there are five high court judges, receiving in the aggregate \$31,000 for salaries, and five county court judges receiving \$12,000 for salaries, or a total payment for salaries of \$33,000. In Prince Edward Island there are three high court judges, receiving in salaries \$10,400, there are three county court judges, receiving in salaries \$7,200, making a total of \$17,600, and allowances amounting to \$600. In the

Mr. FOSTER.

North-west Territories there are five high court judges with salaries aggregating \$20,000, five sheriffs with salaries of \$2,500, making a total of \$22,500. So in Canada we have 178 judges, two registrars and five sheriffs to whom a total amount is paid in salaries of \$640,800, and allowances paid under statute \$53,000. In the amount to be voted this year there are also some allowances and I had not taken into consideration this statement.

I want to emphasize my opinion as a layman in contradistinction to the doctrine set forth by the hon. Prime Minister, that this Parliament is reduced to the position that the opinion of a province must prevail with respect to the judges and judiciary of that province. I hold it true that the legislative authority which does not have to provide the money is never the safest kind of power to be absolute in the arrangements it may make whilst another legislative power provides the funds and assumes the responsibility. I must stand in opposition to that position and as being in accord with the hon. Solicitor General when I say it is the bounden duty of this Parliament to check the extravagance of provincial legislatures, pushed by party followers seeking high office, for with this temptation before them they can provide positions at the expense of the public funds of the Dominion and reward party men. The legislature of Quebec, and I take that province as an example, knowing as well as it knows the necessity that the judicial system of the province is crying out for reorganization, yet in the face of that cry, and every business man in the province is conversant with it. The provincial authorities are creating new judgeships. And yet the right hon. First Minister comes here and announces the doctrine: Make all the judgeships you like, reward all your party friends; we are the superior power, but we will humbly bow to your decision and ask the taxpayers of the Dominion to pay the salaries. Stated in plain English, that is the position which the Prime Minister takes, and he is the first Prime Minister who has taken it, and I doubt whether any Prime Minister after his time will assume his position. The Prime Minister himself, if he knows anything about judicial matters in the province, as he unquestionably does, knows there is a crying need for reorganization. How is the right hon. gentleman helping the movement along? By building buttresses and bulwarks straight across the path of any one who wants to reform the judiciary. He is placing vested interests in the province of Quebec or any other province as a bulwark against the effort of any man who wishes to reform it; he is adding to the public expenditure and is adding an unnecessary number of judges and is placing most effective obstacles in the way of reforming the judicial system in the different provinces. I have stated that there was good ground for saying that