

ing the salaries paid to the Quebec judges, as some hon. gentlemen seem to be under the impression that the judiciary in the province of Quebec is more burdensome to the public treasury than that of the province of Ontario. In 1896-97, I find that for salaries to the judges in the province of Ontario there were paid out \$221,900, whereas, to the judges of the province of Quebec there were paid only \$180,000 in salaries, which gives a difference of \$41,900 in favour of Quebec. Those statistics speak volumes, and I submit them to the consideration of the House.

While I am on my feet, I wish to touch upon a last point, to which I may revert later on, in Committee of the Whole. It is an amendment which I would suggest to the Bill now under consideration. At the last session of the Quebec Legislature the following enactment was passed:—

The three judges of the Court of Review are, however, taken from all the judges of the Superior Court of the province, at the discretion of the chief justice or acting chief justice, as the case may be.

As will be seen, all the judges of the rural districts are called upon to sit in review at the discretion of the Chief Justice. The Solicitor General has justly provided for the travelling allowances of those rural judges who are requested to sit in review. But, in my opinion, the best way to give full effect to that law was to embody in the Bill the very same words of the local statute which authorizes these judges to attend the court. I must express my regret at the present Bill not having been worded in the very terms of the provincial statute; because this Bill provides for the payment of travelling allowances only when it is certified by the Chief Justice or judge discharging the duties of Chief Justice, that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) This clause practically overrides the Quebec statute.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) It does, but this clause the only object of which is to meet the case provided by the provincial statute, does not go far enough.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) It is not my intention to participate at any length in the debate now in progress; but, as this question particularly concerns the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay which I have the honour of representing here, the name of which has been introduced into this debate by my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) when he spoke of Mr. Justice Gagné, I deem it my duty to say a word or two. I must say, from the very outset, that in equity—and on this point I agree with the hon. member for Charlevoix—the

Mr. ANGERS.

judges for the districts of Chicoutimi and Gaspé are as much entitled to an increase of salary as Mr. Justice Taschereau, whose salary by this Bill, is to be increased to \$5,000, but I hasten to add that, in my opinion, all our judges are sufficiently remunerated. In my opinion, Mr. Justice Gagné is sufficiently recompensed by the salary of \$3,500 which he gets, and Judge Taschereau who is paid a salary of \$4,000 gets an adequate remuneration for his services. If Judge Gagné is dissatisfied with his present salary, there is but one course open to him: let him step down from the bench and I have not the least doubt but that there will be found in both districts people willing to succeed him on the bench, and as well qualified as he is to fill up that position.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Here is a suggestion.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) As to the matter of judicial business, there is no doubt that the judge for the district of Chicoutimi has as much and even more work to do than the judges of Arthabaska, Rimouski, Gaspé and Beauce have to do in their own districts. But, although the judge for Chicoutimi may have more work to do than the judges of the districts I have just mentioned have, that is no reason why he should get an increase of salary. I think he is sufficiently paid, and so are also the other judges. In my opinion, it would be preferable for the Government to amend their measure not as suggested by my hon. friend, but in an opposite direction. It would be far better, according to my way of thinking, to curtail the salaries paid to our judges. The result would be that we would no longer see some of our colleagues seeking high offices and we would no longer hear the supporters of the Government saying that their colleagues are endeavouring to be raised to the bench or to some other position. Although, on principle, I am opposed to an increase in the salary of judges, still I believe that the honourable Judges Gagné and DeBilly are as much entitled to that increase as Judge Taschereau is. Judge Taschereau is no greater ornament to the bench than are his colleagues, Judges Gagné, DeBilly, and Larue. We are told that Mr. Justice Taschereau has to administer justice in the district of Terrebonne. Now, by the fact that he has continued to live in Montreal, where his presence is tolerated, he is not entitled to an increase of salary. The same favour was granted to Judge Gagné who resides in the town of Chicoutimi. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) has adduced as a reason in favour of giving an increase of salary to Mr. Justice Gagné the fact that he has to travel and thereby incur some expenditure.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; he should not put into my mouth the very opposite to what