

as possible to be the third judge of that district. Now, with regard to Mr. Justice Taschereau, his case is one which deserves, I will not say the sympathy only, but the consideration of this House, because Mr. Justice Taschereau has been most unfairly dealt with. This is the way the case stands at the present time. The judicial business in the district of Montreal has always been congested, and there have been demands made from time to time to increase the number of judges in the district of Montreal. They have been increased from time to time, but still that increase has not kept pace with the increasing business. In 1889 or thereabouts, the government of the province, while not willing to agree to the suggestion of this Government for the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Montreal alone, did ask that there should be an additional judge who should administer justice in both the district of Montreal and the district of Terrebonne; so that Mr. Justice Taschereau, who has no more work assigned to him by the law than any other judge, is nevertheless appointed to administer justice in both the district of Montreal and the district of Terrebonne. If he were appointed for Montreal alone, he would be entitled to a salary of \$5,000, but because he has to perform the duties of a judge in the district of Terrebonne also, he only gets \$4,000 a year, the salary attached to this latter district. Now, nothing can be fairer, in fact, only full justice can be done to him by not only increasing his salary by \$1,000, but by increasing it by \$2,000. He should have the salary which is attached to the functions of a judge who administers justice in Montreal, which is \$5,000, and also an additional \$1,000 for discharging the duties of a judge in the district of Terrebonne. But we ask only that he should receive the same salary as is paid to other judges who reside with him in Montreal, who do the same work as he does, but do not perform the work that he is called upon to do in the district of Terrebonne.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When Parliament is being asked to make such a grant as \$792,775 for the payment of judges in Canada, and certain increases of which the Solicitor General has not given the exact figures, but before all the increases are met under the resolution, the original estimate will be increased this year by \$14,900—

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the judges require \$792,775?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. These amounts are set out on pages 22, 23 and 25 of the Estimates. I refer to the administration of justice, including the salaries of judges.

Mr. LISTER. The salaries of judges will not amount to \$100,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. Take, for example, the province of Quebec, now under consideration. The hon. gentleman does not realize that there are no less than 30 Superior Court judges already in that province, drawing from \$4,000 to \$5,000 each.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is aware of the number in Ontario—74.

Mr. FOSTER. 79.

Mr. COCHRANE. The judges in Ontario only get half the salaries of the judges in Quebec.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see, according to the Estimates, under "administration of justice," that outside of salaries for judges, there appears to be only the sum of \$98,375 to be deducted from the total of \$792,775. I am the last man to say that we want cheap judges or cheap justice; but when the amount is growing year by year and is assuming huge proportions, it seems to be the very serious duty of Parliament to investigate very closely the reason for further increase in the charges. I have always advocated, and been an outspoken advocate of bringing about such a condition of things that the judges actually required for the proper administration of justice will be paid much higher salaries than those any judges now receive. Public opinion is not ripe or educated up to the point to see the great importance and benefit to be derived by this country from having fewer judges, but judges better paid than any now in the land. But if we proceed on this assumption, to which the Prime Minister has given much support, to my great regret, we drift gradually into a most dangerous position. I am referring to the view presented by the Prime Minister that it should take a case of fraud or gross wrong on the part of a judge before this Parliament would be clearly warranted in refusing to grant an addition. The danger of giving strength or support to that proposition in the face of the admittedly large grant to be voted, whether we vote for this increase or not, is that there will never be any inducement on the part of a local legislature to grapple with this condition of things, which the hon. gentleman knows to exist in the province of Quebec to-day. I take Quebec, because it has been mentioned first—I am not singling out that province. But I happen to know something about the unfortunate condition in regard to the number of judges there, Superior Court judges in particular, and the absence of anything like a fair distribution of work among them. The Prime Minister pointed out that some of the judges are heavily worked. The hon. gentleman referred to certain portions of the province, but he did not refer to the many judges who have practically nothing to do but draw their salaries.