

\$4,000. And so, if to-day you grant an increase of \$400 a year to one judge, you will be called upon to repeat the transaction 195 times. Now, this is not the first attempt the Government have made to increase the salaries of the judges in an arbitrary way. Last year they introduced a proposition to authorize them to superannuate any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada who had been fifteen years in some minor position, in the Vice-Admiralty Court or elsewhere, on full pay, if they saw fit—a proposition applicable, in the first instance, to seven judges, and seven judges only. If that proposition had been acted upon, it is reasonable to suppose that it would have been extended until ultimately it found its way into all parts of the Dominion. Is it not reasonable to suppose that this proposition will be extended in like manner? I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, if he is free to tell me, why, frankly, he is asking the House to do this. The present incumbent has been recently appointed. He was a politician, the Attorney General of the province of British Columbia, and he knew what the law was and what his rights were going to be. How comes it now that the Government are asking the House to do this deed? Was there any understanding with this gentleman that the House would be asked to increase the salary? Will the Minister answer that?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, I will not answer it.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the answer I expected, and I will draw the inference.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You are welcome to draw an inference.

Mr. MULOCK. I draw the inference; I may not be warranted in doing so, but if the Government were frank with the public and the public's representatives, they would give us the information and we would not be compelled to draw inferences. I think nothing could warrant the action of the Government, unless there is some understanding between the Government and the judge that this application would be made. The fact that the Minister of Justice is unwilling to deny such a statement, is, I think, some justification for our drawing that inference. For my part, I object to this arbitrary and unfair method of dealing with the salary of this judge.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the Minister of Justice has made out a very good case in his efforts to convince the House that this man is entitled to the proposed increase. If it is based on increased cost of living, all the information that we have is that the cost of living to-day is not half what it was when Sir Matthew Begbie was appointed. At that time, a meal in the west cost \$1, whereas at the present time, I understand, living is nearly as cheap there

Mr. MULOCK.

as it is in the east. I do not think it can be due to an increase in the work of the admiralty court, because I do not think the extent of population and the amount of shipping in British Columbia would justify us in supposing that there has been any great increase. If there has been, I think it would be proper for us to ask the Minister of Justice to show that such is the case. Then, if it is claimed that this proposition is made in order to level up the salary to the salaries of other judges, I do not think that is a good argument, because it would then be our duty to inquire whether the other judges were not getting too much. I do not think it is a good argument to say that it is making an invidious distinction not to put the salaries of the judges in all the provinces at the same figure, because the provinces are not all equally important. I think the true ground on which to base the salary is the amount of work to be done, because it cannot be fairly argued that a man who does a smaller amount of work is entitled to as large a salary as the man who does more. I agree with those who hold that our judges are fairly well paid at present. If we compare them with other men in the country who are equally able, and who do as well the work entrusted to them, I think the comparison would be all in favour of the judges. Take the allied profession, the medical profession, and what is the amount of salary attached to the best positions under the Government? It is about \$2,000, or from \$2,000 to \$2,400 at the highest; and the men holding these positions are obliged to give all their time to them. The amount of money they have expended in acquiring a knowledge of their profession is just as great as that which lawyers have to expend in studying their profession, if not more, and their services to the community are worth quite as much as the services of the judges. Therefore, if that comparison is made, it must certainly be against the judges. But one hon. gentleman said that we cannot get the best men in the profession to take a judgeship when such a position becomes vacant. I do not think that is the usual experience. If you open a judicial position to which a salary of \$4,000 a year is attached, you will have all the lawyers in the country rushing after it and it will take a body of policemen to keep them away. I agree with those who say that this is only the beginning. An effort was made some years ago to raise the salaries of the judges all round. I am not one of those who believe that their salaries are too low. It may be said that I do not know anything of their work, but I believe that they are proportionately no better than men in other professions. Take ministers of the Gospel, and you will find that the salaries they get are much below those of the judges. The same holds true of the medical profession. There is no justification for the very high salaries the judges are getting and still less justification