

not reflect upon the honour of the bench could be made, and I hope that nothing will be said that will impugn the honesty or honour of the bench or of any judicial proceeding.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall respect your ruling. My hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) grew very wrathful because he thought I had made some discourteous references to the judges. I dare say that my hon. friend, like all other lawyers, is very anxious to stand in well with the bench. Now, I am going to confine myself—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must rise to a point of order. I believe it is not permitted, under the rules of this House, to impute motives. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has imputed to the hon. member who has spoken against an attack on the judiciary, the motive of having done so for the purpose of standing in with the judges. That is not only imputing a motive, but it is one of the grossest charges of a motive that it is possible to conceive

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a well-known rule of the House that no improper motive should be imputed to an hon. member. Unfortunately, I was reading when my attention was called to the question, and I did not catch the expression the hon. gentleman has used.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, if I said anything that very seriously wounds the feelings of my esteemed friend and that is unparliamentary, I am quite willing to withdraw it. Expressions which wound so very much are very apt to be pretty near the truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. However, Mr. Chairman, I shall comply with your ruling. I will tell my hon. friend what I am quoting from. I am quoting from a production which I have very much admired in this House for many years, that is, the Auditor General's Report; and if hon. gentlemen opposite, including my hon. friend from Montreal Centre, would give a little more attention to that valuable production, they would render considerably more service to their constituents than they do now. My hon. friend said I was charging the judges with drawing money for day's allowance in attending court in Montreal, when they ought to be living in their own district. I am not going to say whether they lived there or not; but I am going to give the facts as I find them in the Auditor General's Report, and leave hon. gentlemen who know the facts to draw their own conclusions. I have given the facts for 1895, and I will now give the facts for 1896. I find that Mr. Tellier—I am not going to say where he lives—has drawn \$1,506 as daily allowance at the rate of \$6 a day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman hear the Prime Minister's explanation of an item of about \$1,600 for Judge Taschereau, to show that there was nothing wrong in it?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will allow my hon. friend to present his side of the case when I am through, if he can offset this by any statement he can make.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was referring to your leader's statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am only complimenting my hon. friend the Solicitor General on the manly act he is doing introducing his Bill to put a stop to this condition of things, so that in the future the country will not be subjected to the payment of money which might well have been saved. Now, we will take the next: Mr. C. J. Gill drew \$1,140 in the same way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not wish to stop my hon. friend, but I would like to call his attention to the fact that in England, when members speak of the judges, they always refer to them as Mr. Justice So-and-So, and I think we should adopt the same rule here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will do that. I hope they are all justly entitled to be referred to in that way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen are exceedingly sensitive. I should hardly think there is anything wrong in that. If the hon. member for Montreal has any point of order with regard to that statement, I will sit down.

Mr. MONK. I think a point of order may fairly be raised with regard to that. I do not think it is in conformity with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, for an hon. member of this House, when called to order by you, and instructed to refer to the judges as they should be referred to, to say he hopes they are entitled to the title they should have.

Mr. QUINN. The reason I did not raise the point of order, in which I agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), is because I think it is the duty of the Government of this country to protect the judges. If they do not see that to be their duty, I think it will reflect more upon them than upon any private member of this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall proceed to quote from the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 30th June, 1897. I notice by it that Mr. Justice Gill drew \$1,830 for allowances. I find that other judges drew moneys in the same way. I find that Judge de Lorimier drew \$1,644 for travelling allowances and Judge Taschereau \$1,636. My hon. friend from Montreal prevents my pointing out where Judge Tasche-