

without emoluments suitable to their position.

We ought to take into account the cost of living and the large amount of work they have to do, and the very least they should have is \$5,000 a year. Under any circumstances, we should have the senior judge elevated to the position of chief justice. It is due to the Territories, it is due to his long service, and an additional thousand a year is well earned by him. I must say that in my opinion we ought to record a protest against the great addition to the cost of judicial administration in this country provided for by this Bill. Especially did it strike me in hearing the opinions of hon. gentlemen from Quebec, on both sides of politics, and gentlemen whose fitness to express an opinion on such a subject is undoubted. They state that in that province there is a large portion of it where there are a great many more judges than are necessary, though in other portions of the province we are told that judges have quite enough to do, and that in Montreal they are overworked. I think the Government should withdraw this Bill, and next year bring in one dealing justly with the judiciary all over the country, if necessary, to raise the incomes of those judges in Quebec, and most certainly in parts of the country where living is much more expensive. But what can we think of a measure brought in by a Government pledged to economy, which adds enormously to the cost of judicial administration in the province of Quebec, when we have it in evidence that that province is over-manned with judges, and that those judges are over-weighted with the amount of leisure on their hands? Sir, it is a monstrous thing for any Government to do, but it is especially monstrous for a Government of economy. I will not move the six months' hoist to this Bill; there is too strong a majority of economists opposing it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Cameron is not there.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Cameron), who was my friend, is now also my king, and I must not speak evil of dignities, but bow to the ruler of those vast Territories. I see before me still many economists; I see that the "Sun" newspaper of Toronto especially goes in for economy, and pats the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) on the back, calls him its white-headed, economical boy for the remarks he made on the resolution on which this Bill is founded. I will throw out a challenge to that hon. gentleman. If he will move the six months' hoist, I will support him, or if he will second the motion, I will move a six months' hoist, and I think, with aid from both sides of the House, we may be able to make a break, and stay a little the extravagant down-hill course of this

Government. Anyway, I protest against this Bill. I say if you are going to have this legislation, behave justly, and remunerate the judges of the Northwest Territories properly, because, according to the schedule of remuneration given here, they are not remunerated properly. Deal with this question in a comprehensive way, take back your Bill, and reorganize the judicial districts in Quebec. Don't let this country have the spectacle of such a scandal, for it is nothing else, as we see in this House, members rising up in their places and telling us that half the judiciary of Quebec have not enough to do, and yet we are adding to the expenditure, raising the salaries, increasing the number of judges with the highest salaries. I must say it is done with a very light heart. I must compliment the Government in that they are able to face anything like this, any extravagance, any tergiversation, with a smiling countenance, and with apparent confidence that the people will bear with it. If the people bear with it, the hon. gentlemen will have a certain amount of justification; but it seems to me that I see the handwriting on the wall, and that the day of reckoning may be much nearer than hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches imagine.

Mr. FOSTER. I am opposed to this Bill from start to finish, and I propose briefly to give the reasons why. I will qualify that statement by saying that I do not mean that in many cases we are paying our judges too much, but on the other hand, we are paying many of them too little. Whilst it is true that the salaries of many of our judges are not sufficient, I believe that it is incontrovertibly true that the amount of money that goes out of the public chest for the administration of justice, is quite enough, if not too much—that is the position I take. I will appeal to the inner sense of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, if he will not, if he makes an honest statement in this House—and I am sure he would make no other, if he felt it were politic to do it, if he were not restrained from doing it—if he would not say that in the provinces of this Dominion too much is paid for the justice that is administered, and that the crying want is reorganization and a redistribution instead of further squandering the public funds in the administration of justice. What are we paying for the administration of justice? We are paying out of Consolidated Revenue, \$98,375, and we are making payments authorized by statute of \$694,400, a total of \$792,775. We are crawling closely up to a million dollars for salaries of judges and allowances of judges in this country. I take it upon myself to state in this House that in province after province judges are falling over each other in their numbers, and they are not all doing an honest year's work for the wage they are get-