

that law was against my policy as stated in the House and in the country.

The **PRIME MINISTER** Mr. Speaker, just one word on this point. My hon. friend says that his personal views were in favour of a reduction, but he yielded to the views of his colleagues. I can come to no other conclusion than that his views were one way, and the views of his colleagues the other way. It often happens that the members of a government are not all of the same mind; but after matters have been discussed, a policy is adopted. The policy adopted at that time was to increase the number of judges by one. The measure introduced by my hon. friend was to amend article 2315 of the Consolidated Statutes of the province of Quebec, which article provided that the Superior Court should be composed of a chief justice and thirty puisne judges. This number was increased by one judge, making the number thirty-one. Then the hon. gentleman introduced an amendment to section 2319, which provided that there should be one judge in the district of St. Francis. His amendment provided that there should be two judges in that district, one to reside in the town of Sherbrooke. But my hon. friend comes now and tells us that his own judgment was different. If so, he yielded to the judgment of his colleagues, and introduced that Bill; and now will he tell us that we are not to give effect to the legislation which he introduced, if not upon his own judgment, in deference to the judgment of his colleagues in the Government?

Mr. **ANGERS**. (Translation.) When the resolution preceding this Bill was introduced, I called the attention of the House to an anomaly, or rather, to an injustice which I thought should be remedied. But, as upon that occasion, the hon. Prime Minister was not in his seat, I think I am warranted in repeating the remarks I then gave utterance to.

The injustice I have alluded to is this: that two rural judges, Mr. Justice Gagné, for the district of Chicoutimi-Saguenay, and Mr. Justice De Billy, for the district of Gaspé, are paid a lower salary than their colleagues receive, \$3,500, while the latter receive \$4,000. Why not put those judges on the same footing as the other judges? In their capacity of judges of the Superior Court, do they not enjoy the same jurisdiction? I may perhaps be told that they have less work to do than their colleagues have. To this I may reply by invoking the argument resorted to by some hon. gentlemen in order to justify the increase of \$1,000 granted to Mr. Justice Taschereau, with the consent of this House. As his colleague, Judge Taschereau, Mr. Justice Gagné has to administer justice in two districts, and the number of cases he has to try is more considerable than they are in several other districts. Let me give a few statistics. But in this

Mr. **CASGRAIN**.

connection I may say that this is a ground on which I feel that one ought to tread with caution, since I have heard the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), when speaking on this very matter, giving statistics to show that in 1889 and 1891 there had been in the Superior Court in the district of Saguenay only two or three cases taken out. Those figures, are, to tell the plain truth, highly fanciful.

Mr. **CASGRAIN**. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman wishes to know where I took the statistics I have furnished the House. Those statistics were prepared from the official reports showing the judicial business done in the different courts of the province. I have drawn them from the speech which I delivered on the floor of the Quebec Legislature, when I introduced the Bill of 1893. Those statistics were furnished by the officials of the Attorney General's Office, and they are based on the reports which we had received.

Mr. **ANGERS**. (Translation.) I did not mean to say that in giving those statistics to the House the hon. gentleman had largely drawn upon his fancy, but that they are incorrect. I am a practising lawyer in that district, and I speak with knowledge. I have before me the statistics published in 1894 and 1897, and from those statistics I am able to show that, if it were fair to give Judge Taschereau an increase of salary on the ground that he is doing more work than some of his colleagues, I say that the same argument holds good in the case of the judge for the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. If the argument applies in the one case, it ought also to hold in the other case, and, to my mind, it is unanswerable.

To refer again to those statistics, it seems that for the year 1894 there were six cases tried in the Superior Court at Chicoutimi, and I must say that I am surprised at the small number of the writs issued. The way in which those statistics are prepared may perhaps account for this, because here is, I suppose, the way they proceed in preparing those statistics. They only take into account the cases which have been initiated and tried during the year, leaving aside the cases inscribed prior to that date.

Let me give some further statistics showing the number of writs issued in 1894 in some judicial districts: 1894—Chicoutimi, 6; Saguenay, 22.

I leave aside the cases of \$100 and \$200 tried at Hebertville and Baie St. Paul in the Circuit Court.

Let us now pass to some other districts, and give the writs issued for the same year: Arthabaska, 22; Beauce, 23; Joliette, 26; Kamouraska, 21; St. Hyacinthe, 18.

Let us now take the statistics for 1897: Chicoutimi, 16; Saguenay district, 18; which gives a total of 34 cases. Arthabaska, 20; Beauce, 32; Beauharnois, 34; Rimouski, 18; Richelieu, 16.