

be happening generally in the readjustment of the post-war period. The increase would be an increase of one-third. The increase would reflect itself automatically in the number of dollars for the retirement pensions but will not be wholly reflected in those provisions. There were provisions in the Judges Act of 1920 whereby judges who were compelled to retire at the age of seventy-five, whether of the federal courts or of the district or county courts, would retire on an allowance equal to full salary. It is not proposed to increase the number of dollars for such cases, and it is not proposed to take from the number of dollars provided by the statute as it at present exists. Thus a county or district court judge is entitled to retire on full salary of \$5,000, which is the full salary at the present time, though under this resolution the salary would be increased as from January 1, 1947, his retiring allowance would not go beyond \$5,000.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is there a provision for the retirement of judges at seventy?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: No; that provision is not changed. The only judges we can retire are judges of the federal courts or judges of the district and county courts. The retiring age is still seventy-five, and I am not proposing to change that at this time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Is there a provision for the pension being the same after seventy-five years of age, regardless of the number of years served thereafter by a judge rather than retiring voluntarily at seventy-five?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: That provision has existed heretofore. A judge did not increase his pension rights by serving beyond seventy-five years of age.

If I might be permitted to suggest it, I think the house would be in a better position to consider and discuss the proposals if it allowed the resolution to pass and the bills to be introduced and read a first time. Then they would be immediately available for distribution. Hon. members need not feel they are being committed by the adoption of the resolution, but further discussion might, I think with more advantage take place on the second reading of the bill when hon. members will have before them exactly what the proposals are in the form in which they would appear on the statute book if the bills were adopted.

Mr. JACKMAN: Can the minister say how much the increase will amount to in dollars?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It will be an increase of one-third.

Mr. JACKMAN: In dollars?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: One-third of the total amount in dollars that is required for the judicial salaries. I did not make the calculation, and the figures in the estimates include travelling allowances. There is no increase in that regard. It would not be an increase of one-third of the total amount that appears in the estimates but an increase of something of the order of \$600,000.

Mr. BRACKEN: Would the minister say a word about the last sentence of the resolution dealing with the payment of annuities to wives and widows in certain cases?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: There is no change in principle there. The hon. member knows that two years ago we provided that a judge on appointment could declare his option to take for himself in his own name only two-thirds of what he would otherwise be entitled to as pension rights and to have the other one-third placed in the name of his wife. If the pension were thus divided, the survivor kept his or her portion after the death of the consort. There is no change in that regard. But perhaps anticipating an objection such as that made this afternoon by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), instead of amending merely the figures, the bill that is being proposed is a consolidation of the whole act so that hon. members will have before them in the bill just what the Judges Act would look like if the bill were adopted.

Mr. BRACKEN: It means no change in principle?

Mr. ST. LAURENT: It means no change in principle.

Motion agreed to, and the house went into committee, Mr. Golding in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. St. Laurent thereupon moved to introduce bill No. 249, to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. ST. LAURENT moved for leave to introduce bill No. 250, respecting judges of dominion and provincial courts.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

At six o'clock the house took recess.