

gone Judge Taschereau in the past. I do not think anybody could object to the Government removing both grievances at the same time.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry that I cannot agree with some of the former speakers. I think that there is very little in the proposed resolutions to recommend them to this House. Take, for instance, this one providing that the salary for an additional judge of the Court of Appeal for Ontario shall be \$5,000 per annum. We have got along in the province of Ontario with four judges in the Court of Appeal; and, in the opinion of many who are capable of judging the business might very well be done by three. With four judges no difficulty has arisen. The appointment of this fifth judge is simply an added expense to the Dominion, and justice will not be better administered than before. I think that this appropriation is entirely unjustifiable and that this clause of the resolution should be struck out. In these resolutions we are confronted with an additional expenditure in the Department of Justice of \$26,400. That would pay the interest, according to the way the Finance Minister is borrowing money now-a-days, on very nearly \$1,000,000. We know that there is less litigation throughout the country than there was, at any rate in all the eastern provinces, Ontario, Quebec, the maritime provinces. According to the statement of the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) there are a number of judges in Quebec who are not employed three months in the year.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is absolutely without foundation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has this foundation—the statement of a member of the Quebec bar.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I should like to know who he is.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You know him very well.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Probably it is somebody outside of Montreal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is practising both in Montreal and in Quebec.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not believe it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I give you my word; you can believe it or not as you please.

Mr. WALLACE. I was about to remark Mr. Chairman, that the business of the county courts in the province of Ontario has almost entirely disappeared. The senior county court judges, I am told, conduct the business of the county court, and the junior judges the business of the division court and business of that kind. The senior county

court judges have very little to do, except in the case of the county of York in which is situated the city of Toronto, and there, of course, the senior judge is kept very busy. But in the counties, of the province of Ontario generally these places are almost sinecures to-day; and yet we are proposing to increase the staff of judges. The present county court judges are not fully employed in many cases. I can state that with positive knowledge of what I am saying. With regard to the province of Quebec we have the evidence of the men who know. Yet in the face of this we are asked to increase the expenditure of that department, and that in the face of the fact that for the last two years the cost of living has decreased and all classes of the community have had to curtail the expenditure and live on less money. That being the case, I do not see why the judges should not be called upon to exercise a little economy as well. But, instead of that, we have the salaries increased and new judgeships created, making additions to the expenditure which are thoroughly unjustifiable and which, I believe, will not be regarded with favour by the people. Consider the expenditure under this head, I have here the Auditor General's Report, and I quote some figures respecting judges in the province of Quebec. One judge received for travelling expenses, \$1,830; another, \$1,182; another, \$1,644; another, \$1,198; another, \$1,050; another, \$1,750; another, \$1,428; another, \$1,686; another over \$1,000. So that most of the judges I have here indicated have been paid \$6 a day for almost every working day in the year. We know that, in the province of Ontario, at any rate, there is what the lawyers call the long vacation, extending, I do not know how long, but through the summer and part of the fall. Yet these men are drawing their \$6 a day apparently for every working day in the year. For instance, \$1,830, at \$6 a day would represent 305 days, out of a 312 working days in the year. Can anybody pretend that this is a fair charge or one that should be made or paid? Yet the Auditor General's Report shows that during the last fiscal year that amount was paid to one of the judges. Another judge, alluded to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), Judge Taschereau, drew \$1,686, as the hon. member for East Grey said. This judge was to live in the county of Terrebonne, but he got permission to live in Montreal. If he resided in Terrebonne, I presume he would not be entitled to mileage while administering justice in his own county. He goes to Montreal, however, and draws \$1,686 for travelling expenses, or at the rate of \$6 a day for 281 days. There were not that many days when court was held to justify such a charge. The Solicitor General said that that was a grievance in the past, but he was proposing to remedy it. But these resolutions do not remedy it; they do not meet