

provided by this resolution that fourteen judges, including the judge to whom is assigned the district of Terrebonne, and who resides in Montreal, will get \$5,000 of salary. There is nothing to be said concerning the salary of the judges who have exclusive jurisdiction in Montreal. But I beg to call your special attention to the salary of the judge for the district of Terrebonne, for whose sole interest that change in the law is proposed.

By the Act of 1889, 52 Vic., chap. 39, sec. 4, it is provided that thirteen judges residing in Montreal, but not including the judge of the district of Terrebonne, will receive \$5,000 a year.

Judge Taschereau is the judge to whom is assigned the district of Terrebonne, and according to the law of the province of Quebec he should reside in his district, that is to say, Terrebonne. But in 1889 he got the law of Quebec amended so as to permit him to reside in Montreal, and, at the same time, the law was amended at Ottawa so as to meet his case, that is to say, so as to permit him to reside in Montreal. Still, he was not to receive more than \$4,000 of salary, being the salary of a rural judge. He, however, found his way clear to increase his salary under the form of travelling allowance. By looking at the Auditor General's Report, I find that he has received the following amounts for travelling allowance :—

1894 (Page H—12).....	\$1,226
1895 (Page I—11).....	1,058
1896 (Page I—11).....	1,352
1897 (Page I—12).....	1,686

Forming an average for those four last years of \$1,331 over and above his statutory salary of \$4,000 a year. He has consequently received, since four years, \$5,331 yearly. He has consequently received more salary than any other judge of Montreal.

Now, how did he come to charge so exorbitant an amount for travelling allowance? He resides in Montreal, and I suppose that when he sits in Montreal he charges \$6 a day, as judges are permitted to charge when sitting outside of their district.

I am told that there is an agreement which can be found in the Department of Justice, that provided he could reside in Montreal he would sit in Montreal without extra charge.

If that resolution is adopted, and if the charges which he has made till to-day are correct, that judge will receive then very much more than any judge in Montreal, which is absolutely unfair and unjust.

I merely draw attention to the fact that if there is any unfairness, and it seems to me that there is, this change in the law is specially made in the interests of this one judge alone, because it does not change the salary of any of the other thirteen judges.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is quite right, the sole intention of that portion of the resolution is to meet Judge Taschereau's case—to remedy a gross injustice which has been done him in the past; and I am quite certain my hon. friend will agree with me when I explain the position to him. Judge Taschereau is assigned to the district of Montreal; his residence is in Montreal, and he acts in Montreal. I ask those hon. gentlemen who practice in Montreal to say whether or not there is a

judge in the whole district who does more work and takes a larger share of the performance of judicial duties than Judge Taschereau. Not only does he perform his duties as judge in the district of Montreal, and do more than his share—I use the words advisedly—of the judicial work there, but he also does the whole of the judicial work in the important district of Terrebonne. That being the case, am I not warranted in saying that a gross injustice has been done him in the past and the time has come to remedy it.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. Minister mean to say that Judge Taschereau was not assigned to Terrebonne but appointed to the district of Montreal?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was appointed judge for the district of Terrebonne and his residence was fixed in Montreal, and residing in Montreal he performed the duties of judge in that district, and saved us the necessity of appointing an additional judge there.

Mr. SPROULE. Does he charge \$6 a day when discharging his duties in Montreal?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, he charges \$6 a day when he performs his duties in the district of Terrebonne. Let me call attention to the law, chapter 27 of 52 Victoria of the Quebec statutes:

Eleven judges of the Superior Court shall reside in Montreal, and one of those judges who reside in Montreal is to be charged with the duties of the district of Terrebonne.

So that he is a judge residing in Montreal under the statute, and in addition has to discharge the duties of the district of Terrebonne.

Mr. SPROULE. Though he takes his salary as judge at Terrebonne, he charges \$6 a day when he works there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He takes the salary to which he is entitled as a judge residing in the district of Montreal, and then travels to Terrebonne for the purpose of performing his duties there.

Mr. MONK. I can corroborate what the Solicitor General says with regard to Judge Taschereau. He sits in the district of Montreal, and certainly those who practice in that district have no reason to complain with regard to his industry or his attainments either as a judge. What we have always understood is what the Solicitor General has stated, that he gets this allowance for travelling expenses when he goes into the district of Terrebonne, and I presume that allowance will continue even when he gets the \$5,000.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to know whether what is stated in the memo. which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) read is correct, namely, that Judge Taschereau not only