

success of the business world since they took charge of it. They certainly did their part in the War, and ever since then the cry has been for young men in business. Well, it is now coming to be believed that a little experience is valuable. In the newspapers every now and then we read that men of mature years are being consulted extensively on the present affairs of the world. Indeed, the leaders in some European countries would be disqualified because of old age under a measure of the kind that we have here.

I hope honourable members will pardon me if I refer to this Bill as a pussyfooting measure. I mean that the object is to push through the back door something that the Government would not dare push through the front entrance.

I am not going to worry my good friend from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) by suggesting that the Railway Commissioners are not worthy of larger retiring allowances, but I would remind him that those gentlemen are appointed for a term of ten years. On the other hand, judges, like the members of this Chamber, are appointed for life. I do not think there would be an overwhelming vote to change the life contract with any honourable members. My honourable friend went back to 1930. I do not know whom he is referring to, but I am glad he selected the first of March, because that allows me an additional leeway of a year; my birthday is on the 31st of March.

If the Government believes that legislation should be enacted to retire judges for certain reasons, I submit that the necessary legislation is already available.

An Hon. SENATOR: Where?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: My honourable friend from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) cited the statute which provides that if after investigation a judge is found to be inefficient he may be retired. If the Government believes that this should be done, let it face the issue and put this machinery into operation and retire a judge from the superior court, or even from the Supreme Court, when he becomes incapacitated. But I am opposed to an arbitrary age limit, notwithstanding Scripture, which my honourable friend may not have correctly interpreted. Some of our brightest minds, men on the Bench, in the professions, and in public life, have passed the Scriptural limit of three score years and ten and still are able not only to advise others, but to act as very competent executives themselves.

Now, this Bill leaves it to the discretion of a judge whether he shall retire at seventy-five

years of age. If a superior court judge is not fit to sit on the Bench, then he should be compelled to retire. There, to my mind, is the real point at issue. He should not be allowed to remain in office simply by sacrificing \$3,000 a year to the exchequer.

I should perhaps be prepared to go some distance in the direction of this Bill, but I am absolutely opposed to it on two grounds. First, the Government is seeking to do indirectly something that it has not the courage to do directly, and we become party—I do not want to be offensive—to the subterfuge. In the second place, although it is implied that after attaining the age of seventy-five years a judge is incompetent to discharge his duties, he is permitted to continue in office by sacrificing \$3,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Honourable members, a number of very interesting points have been raised this afternoon that were not raised in another place. It seems to me we should be given an opportunity for further consideration of the Bill, and therefore I move that the debate be adjourned.

The motion was agreed to.

CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL

SECOND READING

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved the second reading of Bill 93, an Act to amend the Customs Tariff.

He said: This is not a Bill in respect to which the House can exercise its full powers, but honourable members are entitled to detailed information before passing upon it. I am prepared now to make such a statement as may be deemed adequate, or to wait until the committee stage. Ordinarily we should go into Committee on the Bill, but, as it is a measure to amend the customs tariff, it would seem to be hardly worth while to debate the individual clauses. However, I am in the hands of the House as to the course to be pursued.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: What is the general purport of the Bill?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It has to do with the fixing of exchange for valuation purposes. It amends certain schedules, thereby altering the duties imposed. The schedules are appended to the Bill. They cover about six pages.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: Is there anything about the gold standard?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No, there is nothing about the gold standard; otherwise its explanation might take a considerable time.