

In the office of the Minister of Justice we have an obliging and able minister, and I sometimes feel sorry for him in the heavy work he has. Of what does the Department of Justice consist? In the first place it has all the powers of the attorney general of England. It has the power of the solicitor general of England; it has the duties of the home secretary over penal institutions. The Minister of Justice is also the Attorney General for Canada, and the department has the powers of the lord chancellor to appoint judges and to look into the conduct of their office. That is an important matter.

Recently a solicitor general was appointed in Canada to aid the minister in his work. Some of his work has reference to the War Measures Act and other war acts which were passed during the war. In the old days, as I understood it, the solicitor general had charge of penal institutions and the prerogative of pardon, which is a most important one.

I may say that there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in recent years with regard to some of those who have been chosen as judges by this department. I should like to find out whether the Canadian Bar Association has made any recommendations, and what these recommendations are. In the old country the bar associations do make recommendations to the lord chancellor.

I should like to refer to the county court bench. In Toronto we used to have as many county court cases, civil and criminal, as the rest of the province put together. In the old days we had three county court judges; Judge Morson, who tried division court cases, and who did as much work as any five or six judges. He had a junior judge, the late Judge Morgan, and as senior county judge, Judge McDougall, who was succeeded by two able men, Judge Winchester and Judge Coatsworth. We have an able and efficient senior judge in York county to-day, His Honour Judge Parker. He is one of the finest county court judges we have. But there is dissatisfaction with some appointments. We are going all over Ontario and bringing into the county of York judges who know little or nothing about the district over which they preside. That is a wrong principle. We brought in some who were not in the legal profession for years. One was a town clerk and another acted in a similar capacity in another county. They were appointed junior judges of York county and brought in to try judicial cases. It should not happen; that principle should be obsolete.

There is another matter to which I should like to refer, namely, two bills which I have before the house. As the committee knows, I

consented to allow my bills having to do with the Judges Act and motor car accidents to stand until such time as progress was made on other important bills. I was promised that I would have time to make some reference to them on the minister's estimates. The bill to amend the Judges Act states that judges should not serve as commissioners. A few of the judges who have been appointed have yet to hear a case in the law courts, or at least very few. The bill also states that they should not be appointed to travel all over to try commission cases which are political. In the bill I referred to the fact that congestion has taken place in the law courts as a result of judges being appointed as commissioners. In one paragraph I said:

The frequency, of recent years, with which judges are drafted for all kinds of such work impairs the efficient administration of justice and causes congestion in the law courts, and, as they are largely only fact-finding commissions when appointed, they duplicate the efficient powers and functions of parliament, of the committees thereof, and of the many outside boards of recent innovation in war work, and furthermore they are a costly adjunct to good parliamentary government of the people, by the people and for the people, cause delays and interfere with parliament's right to immediate solution of social and economic problems of urgency to good government, thus a system of "judicial commission government" is slowly being built up in Canada.

The second amendment was that courts of last resort must be bound by the decision of the judicial committee of the privy council. That is a good proviso. I referred to it last night. The judicial committee of the privy council is one court where the litigant can get substantial justice. We never would have had the cheap light and power movement in Ontario but for that great judicial institution and its decisions in 1912 and 1914.

Then there is another bill to which I should like to make a short reference, in regard to the terrible loss of life through motor car accidents. We see this parliament without five minutes to devote to the appalling loss of life which abuse of the motor car is causing in this country. After all is said and done, science has won the admiration of the world in the last seventy-five years. Why? Because scientists base their conclusions on facts, unlike the politicians, who argue from theories, opinions and all that kind of thing. With the motor car, as with every other invention, its use is one thing and its abuse is another. I had a return brought down in the house this year giving the number of lives lost through these road and other accidents. I need not take time to read that return, but every highway in the province has run red. This is one of Canada's greatest scandals. In the