

of nonsense talked in parliament about an increase of the judges' salaries generally. No doubt there were cases in the large centres where the cost of living was high and where in order to secure good judges larger salaries had to be paid according to the professional incomes which the appointees were receiving before being called to the bench. These things ought to be considered in fixing the salaries of judges, but to indiscriminately raise the salaries of all the judges in the country of a superior class by \$2,000 was neither wise nor expedient. Take the case of a judge in the city of Montreal, a hard worked man. It costs him double as much to live as a judge in the rural districts of Quebec, and yet he is given the same increase as the rural judges down the St. Lawrence. That is not right. The judges in Montreal, Toronto and other large centres should receive more increase than the judges in the small provinces. I do not consider the judges in the smaller provinces have the right for many reasons to the same increase as the judges in the larger provinces. The only case in the smaller provinces where the larger increase was justified is in Prince Edward Island. I never could understand why all the maritime provinces were not on the same footing in respect of judges salaries. I therefore say that the Act of last session is most unfair, unwise and not justified by any circumstances connected with the administration of justice in this country. I believe if the Conservative members of the Senate had had a representation in the counsels of the party when this Bill was before the caucus, it never would have been put on the statute-books in its present shape.

I come lastly to the salary of the leader of the opposition. To this I declare at once I am decidedly opposed. It is an innovation opposed to all my ideas of constitutional usage under British institutions. I believe you could strike no greater blow at the prestige of the leader of the opposition than to make him—I do not say virtually but even apparently in the eyes of the people—a beneficiary—a salaried official of the government of the day. I felt that I could not remain in a party organization with a leader occupying a position of this kind. The astute managers of the Liberal party

Hon. Mr. MILLER.

tried these same tactics once before in Ontario with Sir William Meredith and failed. But they caught Mr. Borden easily with the lasso they threw in vain for Mr. Meredith. I give due credit for astuteness to the gentlemen who have got the Conservative party into this hole, for until the Conservative party gets out of it, the Indemnity Act, the Pension Act, the indiscriminate increase in the salaries of the judges, all put together, will not be the occasion of greater loss of votes to the Conservative party than this one false step of making our leader in the eyes of the people a beneficiary of the government. This is the opinion I conscientiously entertain, and it is one of the reasons why I find myself in the attitude I am in to-day in regard to the party with whom I have been so long associated. You could do nothing better calculated to destroy the prestige of a party leader than to make him appear in the eyes of the people to be actuated by sordid or selfish motives, and a leader without prestige is good for nothing. He can inspire no enthusiasm in his party, and a political party without enthusiasm, especially a party in opposition is like a leader without prestige, also good for nothing.

Take the case of Sir John Macdonald, what was the chief cause of his prestige before the country, and half the battle in every fight, it was the knowledge of his unsordid and unselfish character; and that great statesman never uttered truer words than when on a memorable occasion he exclaimed, 'These hands are clean', and even his enemies did not insinuate for one moment that he could ever be tainted with personal sordidness, selfishness or corruption. And I am not so intense a political bigot as to be blind to the fact, that the self-same prestige which was half the battle with Sir John Macdonald is to-day also half the battle with Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I am not for one moment attributing any such motives to Mr. Borden and do not wish to be understood as imputing to him any thing of the kind.

Far be it from me to do anything so unjust. I do not believe that Mr. Borden is a sordid or a mercenary politician and, unlike his first lieutenant, the respected leader of the opposition has no need of becoming either a place hunter or a pension hunter, for he can by giving his time and talents to the practice of the honourable profession of