

As to deferred dividends the replies are various. In regard to investments, the answers generally are that the company invests its funds in approved real estate mortgages, United States, County, railway and other high-class bonds and stocks and loans on policies.

THE INCREASE IN SALARIES OF JUDGES SESSIONAL INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND OTHER PAYMENTS.

Just as the gunners on Parliament Hill, Ottawa, were preparing to fire the customary salute announcing the prorogation of Parliament, elaborate resolutions were introduced into the House of Commons by which a large addition was made to the annual expenditure of the country.

The salary of the Premier was raised to \$12,000. The Leader of the Opposition heartily supported this proposal as all will who realize the great dignity of the position of Premier and his responsibilities.

The sessional indemnity payable to each Senator and Member of the House of Commons was raised to \$2,500. To this increase there are reasonable objections which will be almost universally expressed. The increase is based upon the great length to which Parliamentary Sessions are now extended. But this extension is largely owing to the very slack attendance of members in the House. It is quite usual to have only one-fourth of the members present during debates; indeed, a bare quorum is not uncommon. Were each member required to be in attendance daily in the House, or forfeit the amount of one day's indemnity, the public business would be so expedited that the Parliamentary Sessions would be reduced in length by at least one-half. But now, as a majority of members go off to their personal and private business for days together, weeks in some cases, they do not suffer in any way by a long Session, it is the country that suffers by the Legislative expenses being so greatly and so needlessly increased. To increase the sessional indemnity on account of long sessions is, practically, a bonus given to members for having absented themselves from Parliamentary duties. An attendance in the House of 50 days would exceed the average necessary were members to be duly assiduous in watching over and sharing in legislative work. As \$20 per day has been allowed to be a liberal indemnity, this would give the old time figure of \$1,000 as the sessional indemnity. When the great bulk of members are not in attendance over 50 days, \$2,500, which will average \$50 per day is certainly an excessive amount to allow for their attendance at Ottawa during such Session. The time table of the Senate, if published, would amaze the country.

The decision to allow the Leader of the Opposition \$7,000 yearly is a new departure. It has reasonable grounds. The office is recognized as constitutional, the duties are akin to those of the Pre-

mier, the responsibilities are heavy and duties exacting, they demand talents of the highest order and the work prevents the Leader of the Opposition devoting himself to his business or profession. Sir Wilfrid Laurier very justly and magnanimously said of this: "The Leader of the Opposition was as necessary as the Prime Minister, and it was essential that he should be put upon a footing of importance equal to that of ministers. This was not the growth of a moment, but was the result of years of public discussion."

He might have referred to one case of an eminent statesman, a Premier of Canada, being literally reduced to poverty when he was deprived of that office, to the scandal of the country.

What will be the effect of making a seat in Parliament the source of a higher income than the average enjoyed by members of the House of Commons? Will this attract a higher class of representatives, or, tend to make politics a trade? The probabilities do not point to the morale and the culture and the dignity of the House of Commons being raised by members earning \$2,500 by intermittent attendance in the House of Commons for 3 or 4 months.

The pension of \$3,500 yearly granted to ex-Cabinet Ministers who served 5 years in that capacity is open to very grave objections. While in office they were well paid, they had good opportunities of saving, as a rule they are found in Parliament enjoying a sessional indemnity, in either the Commons, or Senate, and a service of only 5 years is altogether an insufficient title to a pension of \$3,500 for life. As the country grows and parties and Parliaments change; the number of ex-ministers will increase until these pensions become a very serious item in the national expenditure. Ex-ministers, in some cases, would prefer to draw their pension and live at ease rather than engage in active political service with a higher income and proportionate expenses.

The advance in the salaries of judges is most commendable. These distinguished officials have long been underpaid. Though some few judges are alleged to have very light duties, the majority are hard worked, and could earn far more income at the Bar than on the Bench. This is not helpful in enabling governments to select the chief authorities and ornaments of the legal profession as judges, nor is it creditable to Canada to have members of the judiciary so pinched in income as to lead them to undertake duties outside those of their office.

PARLOUR FIREWORKS, now being introduced, have this great advantage, when a boy or girl gets his or her fingers blown off, or face burnt, or suffers some other injury, the sufferer can be promptly put to bed without the usual delay in being carried to a hospital. We recommend these new fireworks to mothers who wish to have a patient at home.