

reau lives, because I have not got it in any authenticated report in this House.

Mr. QUINN. I asked the hon. gentleman not to point it out but to leave it to those who gave him the information, and who ought to have the courage, if they want to make these statements, to make them before the House, and not have the hon. gentleman do their dirty work for them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression is not parliamentary.

Mr. QUINN. Of course I did not intend to apply that term to the conduct of the hon. gentleman, and therefore cheerfully withdraw it, but I thought that the hon. gentleman should leave it to these people to do their own work in that direction, and have the courage to face this House and the country, if they think they are doing something meritorious.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had no intention of referring to the hon. gentleman's discourteous remark with regard to myself, because I always treat such remarks according to the quarter from which they come. The hon. gentleman has complied with the rules of the House and taken back the expression, but I had no intention of pressing him to withdraw it at all. Mr. Justice Ouimet has drawn \$798 for travelling expenses. I do not know whether he lives in Montreal or not, but he is supposed to live in his own district, and when coming to Montreal to be entitled to a certain per diem allowance. I see that he has drawn \$786, and presume he lives in his district. Payments of this kind have been increasing. In 1895, the judges drew \$17,442; in 1896, they drew \$20,058; and in 1897, \$21,012. These amounts they drew in addition to their substantial salaries. I compliment my hon. friend upon the introduction of this Bill. I do not think it has come a moment too soon, and I believe that in the interests of this country it is a prudent measure that should be passed in order that the law may distinctly define what allowances the judges are entitled to under those circumstances. I hope the Bill will have the effect of putting a stop to what I consider an injustice which the country ought not any longer to submit to.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not agree with the hon. member for Montreal that this is not a subject which should be discussed in this House. If I understand my duty here, it is to deal with any subject that requires expenditure of public money and see that more money is not expended than necessary. The system which has obtained for some time past in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario is such that more money is being spent than ought to be, and when we have a Bill under consideration which has for its object the remedying of that grievance, that is the proper time for us to criticise the system now existing, for it is the system we are

Mr. McMULLEN.

attacking and not the judges. I do not understand that we are attacking either the personnel or the character of the judges, but discussing evils which have grown up under the law and which an effort is now being made to remove. I referred to one of the cases before recess, but I find, like the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in looking over the Auditor General's Report, that I might refer to a great many. Here are ten judges in the province of Quebec, who have drawn for travelling allowances over \$1,000 apiece.

Mr. QUINN. In the province of Quebec—not in the district of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. In the province of Quebec, I mean. So far as my information goes, it is to the effect that the expenditure should not be so large for travelling allowances. I drew attention to one case, concerning which information was given me, and the hon. Solicitor General seemed to question the correctness of my information. I refer to the case of Judge Taschereau, which was the only case the information I got referred to.

I find there are several others who are—properly or improperly. I do not know which—doing the same thing. But the Solicitor General said that Judge Taschereau had a right to live in the city of Montreal, and he quoted the provincial statute, which he was kind enough to send to me. This law was passed in 1889 and it provides that article 2319 of the Revised Statutes of the province of Quebec is amended by striking out the words "ten of the judges shall reside" at the beginning thereof and replacing them by the following: "Eleven of the judges of the Superior Court, one of whom to be specially charged with the district of Terrebonne, shall reside." The authority I was quoting from and which I think thoroughly justifies what I said, was the Dominion statute of the same year, the language of which I have given to the House, quoting from chap. 39:

Thirteen puisne judges of the said court, whose residence are fixed at Montreal and Quebec, not including the district of Terrebonne, \$5,000 apiece.

Therefore, Terrebonne was left out. Now I wish to call attention to the fact that the provincial Act which the Solicitor General quoted came into effect on the day it was sanctioned, which was the 21st March, 1889. The Dominion statute that I have quoted was assented to on the 2nd of May, 1889, and was, therefore, of later date than the provincial statute. The question is, which one is the authority? I merely cited this to show that I was justified in making the quotation I did. According to that statute, if I am correct, Judge Taschereau had not the right to live in Montreal, and if he had not, I think it would have been improper for him to charge the travelling allowance appearing opposite his name here.