

There is really no necessity to add to the number of the High Court judges. The question of expense, though a minor one, may be noticed. The proposed new Division will probably add some \$20,000 to the yearly cost of the Court. All sorts of schemes have been invented to supplement the present utterly inadequate salaries of the judges. It would be much cheaper to give to each of the present judges an additional \$1,000 per annum. But this is not the most important part of the subject. Is it fair to judges, or to suitors, or desirable as a matter of public policy, that various "pious frauds" in the line of indirectly increasing judicial salaries should be resorted to, or that they should have extra pay for outside work. The independence of the Bench is of vital importance both to the public and the profession—much more important than the benefit resulting from having an occasional enquiry more satisfactorily conducted. There might be danger of this independence being jeopardized by the growing practice of taking judges from their proper work to discharge extra duties with extra emolument. All these things give occasion to the enemy to blaspheme. The consequence is just what might be expected: unpleasant remarks are made in reference to the judges, with the inevitable result of lessening the esteem in which the Bench of this province has heretofore been held. We are on the down grade in connection with matters affecting the dignity of the Bench and the respect for it in the public mind. It is time that more thought were given to these matters. The country cannot afford to have the judicial pedestal lowered. The effort must be to raise it, for it is not what it once was.

And here we are confronted with a somewhat difficult matter to discuss without the danger of being misunderstood. Their lordships Chancellor Boyd and Chief Justice Falconbridge, the Commissioners in charge of the Gamey-Stratton Bribery Commission, have closed the enquiry and made their report. The finding of the Commissioners is viewed favourably or adversely according to party predilections. The Commissioners, though holding high judicial positions, did not serve in that capacity but as ordinary citizens, and as such their finding has been sharply criticised, whether rightly or wrongly it is not our province to discuss. We assume it is right because they so find; but it must be remembered that the country at large really sits as the jury and will not abdicate its functions as the final Court of appeal