

colleague: when in opposition in 1881 protested against this clause but that Mr. Haggart and his friends had forced it through. It became law and they had to recognize that fact. He suggested that the best course to pursue would be for the new provinces to pass an act taxing the railway and then the matter would be settled by the courts, and they would determine whether Mr. Haggart was right or wrong in his view. There were good lawyers who thought that he was wrong and so there were two sides to the case.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, the Minister of Justice, declared that parliament would be violating every canon of decency and of good faith if an attempt were now to be made to impair a solemn obligation.

While contending for the observance of contracts Mr. R. L. Borden, the leader of the opposition, wished to distinguish between that and legislative powers. The province was bound to observe the contract, and perhaps this clause was a notice to them that it existed.

The discussion proved to be an interesting and an important one. In the end Mr. Scott's amendment was declared lost and the clause adopted without an amendment.

There are a couple of things about the new House of Commons which make it awkward for doorkeepers, policemen and others. It is difficult to become acquainted with every one of the 214 members, and so it happened the other day that one of the Dominion police at the entrance to the corridor stopped Dr. Walsh, the member for Huntingdon and a messenger tried to stop Mr. Crawford, the member for Portage la Prairie from going down stairs to the dining room to procure his lunch. It would hardly do to ask the members to wear a badge, and so we suppose that on

the rare occasions when employees do not recognize the members the latter takes it good naturedly though not exactly as a compliment.

Some papers have discussed the question of pensions for retired public men in Canada. In this country the majority of our public men are poor, largely by reason of the devotion of their time to public affairs. If they had devoted the same time and the same ability to the pursuit of wealth they would probably be well off. While in office the state provides a salary that gives the minister of the Crown sufficient income to live on, but the question arises, what is to become of him when he is forced to retire from office? He is not in a position to resume where he left off perhaps ten, fifteen or twenty years before, and he is equally unable to branch out in any new original fashion. To our mind it would be a most appropriate and just policy for the country to say in such case, we will set apart out of the public funds a few hundreds a year as an allowance for the retired minister, and in compensation for his public services. The principle has been recognized in this country in the case of Sir John Thompson whose widow received a vote of \$25,000 from Parliament. In England the law says that a minister of the crown who has been in office for a period of three years may upon retirement from office apply for a pension. This is to guard against the spectacle of a minister who has served the crown and has served the people even for so short a period as three years being compelled to take up some obscure employment. An old public servant either in a province or in the Dominion should not be allowed to retire without a pension based on the practice in England.