

Now, I say, without fear of successful contradiction, judging from the quantity of business done, that a gross injustice is being done to the judge of Chicoutimi and Saguenay in not putting him on the same basis as the other judges, and that his salary should be increased to \$4,000. I further say that to contend that the salary of the judges of the same rank should be fixed on the basis of the work done seems to me a mistaken policy of economy and one little consonant with the sound principles of political economy. In my opinion, the rule to be acted upon in this matter is that judges of the same jurisdiction should receive the same salary. For, if you act upon the principle that the salaries ought to be fixed according to the amount of work done, there would follow from those premises this consequence, that a judge appointed to the bench with a salary of \$4,000 for a district where there are 200 cases to be tried in the year, would be liable to have his salary curtailed, if he had only 100 cases to try the next year. Another reason why the number of cases tried is not the best standard by which you may form an estimate of the competency and attainments of a judge and determine the salary he is entitled to, is this, namely, that in the trial of ten cases a judge may perform a larger amount of work and show greater legal ability and attainments of a higher order than another judge would do in trying forty cases. It is not only the quantity of cases tried that you should take into consideration, but also the quality of the work done; and a judge who has given forty good decisions is entitled to more credit than a judge who has rendered a hundred bad ones. Such things will occur in spite of all. Some judges have an unlucky hand, while there are others who were born under a lucky star. I have just pointed out how to obviate such consequences and troublesome complications. Put all the judges of the same class on a footing of equality by giving them the same salary. I think the arguments I have addressed to the House are most cogent reasons why the Government should accede to my views, and I trust they will see their way clear to remove the anomaly and the injustice which I have pointed out.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, I think he should not forget that the judge for Chicoutimi and Saguenay has to travel over long distances during the most inclement season of the year, and that is another consideration which should not be lost sight of.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) I may remind the hon. gentleman that, upon a former occasion, I drew the attention of the House to that point, and I agree with him that it is a consideration which should not be overlooked. As I have already stated, it took Justice Gagné eight days to cover the

distance from Malbaie to Quebec, about 90 miles.

As far as the administration of justice is concerned, I have listened with much interest to the remarks fallen from the hon. gentleman who addressed the House. For my part, I am in favour of remodelling the judicial system of the province of Quebec and putting it on a basis which is reasonable; and, as stated by the right hon. Prime Minister, that is a duty which devolves upon the local legislatures. All this House has to do is to take the condition of things which is in existence in each province.

Now, I wish to refer to certain strictures passed by some hon. gentlemen upon the judges of the province of Quebec. These gentlemen seemed to insinuate that judge-ships in that province were made sinecures; that our judges had very little work to do, and were living on an extravagant scale, when compared with the justices in the province of Ontario. Let us again refer to the judicial statistics, and see whether the imputations cast on the judges of the province of Quebec are well founded or not, and also whether the praises bestowed on the Ontario judiciary are in strict accordance with the facts.

First, as to the matter of travelling allowances, I am free to confess that in a few cases an exorbitant amount was charged, and I think it regrettable that such a construction should have been put upon the proviso of the statute, "except that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed for." What are the facts? I find that in the province of Ontario, last year, the judges drew in travelling allowances the sum of \$27,500. And yet I think I am safe in saying that in the province of Ontario travelling is much less expensive than it is in Quebec, as the whole province is served with railway facilities, while the cost of travelling in several districts of Quebec is much larger, owing to the lack of railway communication. Yet in spite of all these railway facilities, the judges in the province of Ontario last year drew \$27,500 for travelling allowances, whereas in the province of Quebec there were paid out in travelling expenses to the judges only \$21,012.

There is another point which some hon. gentlemen emphasized, when they represented the judges in the province of Quebec as sinecurists with hardly any work to do. What are the facts, Sir?

There are in the province of Ontario 80 judges, whereas there are only 41 in the province of Quebec. Now, the population of Ontario is 2,114,321, while that of Quebec is 1,448,535, and from those figures it may be inferred that the judges of Ontario have more leisure time than those of Quebec have. I do not mention here the propensity of our people to litigation, which, all things being alike, ought to create more work for our judges.

I wish also to say a word or two concern-