

Mr. DOHERTY: The Bill is not printed for circulation as yet but its contents are absolutely, with one or two additions, the contents of the resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. DOHERTY: I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do we understand that the Bill is exactly in accordance with the resolution?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, except that there are two or three sections added. As a condition of this increase the judge in future will be bound to give gratuitously their services on all commissions to which they may be appointed by this Government or the Provincial Governments. In the second place, as a condition of this increase the salaries and emoluments of all judges accepting it become liable to taxation and likewise to fall under the taxation already imposed by the Income Tax Act. Thirdly, there is a provision—and that meets some of the criticisms that were made—that, as regards all judges who may hereafter be appointed, section 20 of the Judges' Act, which establishes a certain scale and entitles judges to retire with a full salary at certain dates and under certain conditions, is repealed. As regards judges actually in office now, any of them who become entitled under that section to retire with full salary will be entitled only to full salary as it stands to-day. This increase will not be taken into consideration in computing the amount to which they shall be entitled. I think these are the three provisions in addition to those in the resolution and it will be observed that all these additions are restrictive instead of extending advantages to the judges.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will the new legislation in regard to judges giving their services apply to commissions already in existence or only to those that are to come hereafter?

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is agreeable to the hon. members perhaps the details could be explained to better advantage in the committee.

Mr. LANCTOT: I object to the second reading as I have not seen the Bill and I want to see it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman object to the second reading?

Mr. LANCTOT: I want to discuss the Bill on the second reading, and I want the Bill discussed in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. gentleman wants to discuss it in committee?

Mr. LANCTOT: I must read the Bill before I am able to discuss it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion must either carry or stand.

Mr. LANCTOT: Stand.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the hon. gentleman does not quite understand. The second reading now is a purely formal matter. The Bill will be brought down and printed and we can go into committee and discuss it.

Mr. LANCTOT: That is all right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The second reading involves the principle of the Bill. If the hon. gentleman presses his objection the Bill cannot now be read a second time. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to object?

Mr. LANCTOT: I do not see what advantage it would be to the Government to pass the second reading of this Bill now. It can be done at another sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. gentleman specifically if he objects to the second reading now?

Mr. LANCTOT: Yes, I do.

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would return me the Bill I gave him as it is the only copy I have to give to the printer.

Motion for second reading allowed to stand.

#### CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD.

Rt. Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill 206 respecting the Canadian Wheat Board.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into committee on this Bill I desire to make a statement which I think is due not only to the House but is also due in fairness to some gentlemen outside of the House. It is in reference to a discussion which took place when we were upon the resolution which formed the basis for this Bill. The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) read a certain statement made by Dr. Magill in an address