

It has already made a serious effort within the last two or three years to do so, unsuccessfully, in consequence of the great difference of opinion which appears to exist in the representative body as to the position the judges should hold with regard to salary. It appears to me that the discussion which has taken place here affords a very excellent object lesson as to the extent of these difficulties. While almost every hon. gentleman thinks the salaries of the judges should be increased, the views as to the extent and nature of that increase are as numerous as the number of gentlemen who spoke on the subject. It is this kind of difference of opinion—and, in fact, there are many kinds of differences of opinion about this subject—which renders it so exceedingly difficult to deal with. In the House of Commons, where a measure was introduced for the purpose of increasing the salaries, the diversity of opinion was so strong, and finally the opposition was so strong, that it was found impossible to proceed with the Bill. Now, to-day my hon. friend on my left thinks evidently that the salaries are large enough, that there were as good judges in his province at \$2,400 a year as there are now at \$4,000 a year, and I think that is very probable. For I remember, at a shorter date probably than my hon. friend himself could remember, when a man could live in this country for one-half the amount he can live on now—when the fortunes which judges, in attempting to maintain their social rank, had to compete with were not one-tenth or one-hundredth part of what they are now. It is not so long ago when the sight of a millionaire would have attracted crowds in the street; now there is not a town in the country where you could not find men who are several times millionaires. The cost of living is greater. Men threaten a change of dynasty or a reconstruction of society because they do not get the same price for eggs as they got last year. But eggs this year were three or four times as costly as they were in those years. And so with regard to other articles of food, and to clothing. It may be that in some respects the necessaries of life have not increased, but the requisites for maintaining one's social position have increased tenfold, and it is impossible, as hon. gentlemen concur in saying, for the best men in the country to be induced to take positions on the bench at the rates which we now pay in the larger centres of business and trade. My hon. friend from Ottawa appears to compare to some extent the rate of payment which we give our judges with the salaries paid on the other side of the line. In some respects my hon. friend is quite right. The salaries paid there to judges of the courts in certain centres of business are three or four times as much, in some instances, as those paid to judges in some of the important centres of this country. But there are many reasons for that, not the least of which is the very high rate of living which is rendered necessary on the other side of the line in consequence of the enormous taxation. There, the cost of everything required for living is much greater than it is here; and the other reasons to which I have alluded prevail even more strongly there than here. There the fortunes are enormous, and in the competition for social position there, even with the liberal salaries allowed the judges, they are practically nowhere. However, in a moderate way there is no doubt whatever that an increase in the salaries of our judges is necessary. Whether it shall be particu-