

Judges Act

The salaries of the chief justices of the provinces will move from \$44,000 to \$58,000. On \$44,000 they pay \$17,640 tax. On \$58,000 they will pay \$25,840 tax. In other words, to gain that \$14,000, they pay another \$8,000 taxes. These are interesting facts, and when judges pay tax that money goes back to the same fund which pays the salaries.

An hon. Member: It comes off the cheque before they get it.

Mr. Woolliams: It is taken right at the source. I thank the hon. member. Judges of the territorial courts will receive \$56,000 instead of \$40,000. On the \$40,000 their income tax was \$15,503, and on \$56,000 it will be \$24,661.

The salaries of superior court judges rose from \$38,000 to \$53,000. On \$38,000 their tax was \$14,434. On \$53,000 it will be \$22,894. So in actual fact the figures will be 50 per cent or 60 per cent less than we are talking about today and, as my hon. friend says, it comes off the cheque before you get it.

The chief judges of district courts will receive \$44,000 instead of \$30,000. On \$30,000 tax was \$10,271, and on \$44,000 it will be \$17,640.

Other judges of county and district courts will earn \$40,000 instead of \$28,000. That is in the second phase. I have not referred to the third phase because it is not payable until 1976, and I am not a futurist. On \$28,000 taxes were \$9,287, and on \$40,000 they will be \$15,503.

If these judges, especially the senior men, have any savings or any other income, the tax increases accordingly, because we are operating under the progressive rate. I do not intend to name them, but I know that hon. members—at least one in particular pays the government more money than he receives as a member of parliament because he has other income. I would like to emphasize that here before the media.

An hon. Member: What media?

Mr. Woolliams: There is someone here from Canadian Press, anyway. I could have prepared the same chart with regard to members of parliament. Surely we do not all come here as poor as church mice. Some of us did make a little money before we arrived, even though we left home with no education and with holes in our pockets and at our knees. I am one who can talk like that. But the fact is we do have other income, so many hon. members are giving practically all their salaries to the Department of National Revenue. During the war such people were known as dollar a year men.

If the judges salaries did not increase, does that mean none of the men who are going to have these jobs, or very few would be more accurate, could not make almost double what they will be paid? One may say that after all they are serving their country and they should take much less. They are taking much less, but if we are not going to pay them more, what we will get will be from the bottom of the heap. How many Canadians would like to have the judiciary made up of men who came from law practices which made so little money they were glad to grab the job? What kind of judgments would we have from that kind of grey matter? We need men of some calibre.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

While I am on my feet I would like to make another point because of remarks already uttered. I always accept another man's right to express his viewpoint. I have said many times that if we all think alike, there is no thinking. I would not want to think that in this House of Commons we would have men who could not earn two, three or four times as much. I know men sitting on the Treasury Benches, I know men on the backbenches, and I know men on our backbenches who could do that manyfold. But they come here. I will not get into why they are here, but I will say that anyone who comes to parliament, if he stays here long enough, is making a great financial sacrifice. I think that is necessary. I do not think he can serve his country unless he does.

I must tell the House about the funniest letter I ever received. It was in regard to the increases in the salaries of members of parliament. I received this letter from one of my friends in my constituency. I did not know his age until I read his letter. He wrote, "Eldon, I served my country from 1914 to 1918 and never took my wife to the trenches. You do not need little Erva in Ottawa." I have not answered that letter. He may be right. That is but one letter. The writer suggested that because I was serving my country, I should be prepared to make sacrifices. I do not think we are called upon to make those kinds of sacrifices.

● (1520)

In the last few years many young members made a significant contribution to the life of this House. Many of them have children who need educating. Are they to be left in Vancouver or elsewhere while their father serves parliament? When children reach their teens they need their mother and father.

Similarly, are we to ask judges to make those kinds of sacrifices? Frankly I do not think this bill is out of line. By appointing Chief Justice McGillivray to the bench in Alberta the government showed a remarkable lack of partisanship. I cannot say what the judge earned as a counsel, but I think I could guess. In that case the government appointed a man of proven ability, intelligence, and character. I am sure it has made many similar appointments.

An hon. Member: Perhaps the government made a mistake.

Mr. Woolliams: Perhaps. Our judges have always been of high calibre. Let me tell the House a little story which impressed me when I was in law school and which shows that our judges are endowed with knowledge of human psychology, decency, and a sense of humour. I do not remember the name of the case. Some years ago a lady complained about noises coming from a tent pitched on the banks of the Red River. She complained to the RCMP about noises of revelry at night. When the RCMP investigated they found the occupants of the tent asleep, and a few empty wine and whiskey bottles as evidence of revelry. The occupants of the tent were sleeping off the effects of their revelry. The occupants of the tent were brought before the local judge on a charge of disturbing the peace. After hearing the complaint of the lady who had been on the opposite side of the Red River, the judge dismissed the charge. He said that the complainant was not annoyed by