

he should have continued in such office of Judge in the County Court of either of the said Provinces for twenty-five years or upwards, then and in no other case, should such Judge resign his office and be granted an annuity for the term of his natural life. This was to say that he could resign after twenty-five years' service, but in no case except one of permanent injury could he resign before.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: A Superior Court Judge can resign after fifteen years.

MR. LAFLAMME said they could retire after that period, but the interpretation put upon it was that it was only upon the understanding they could not at that time efficiently discharge their duties as Judge. Not a single Judge had received his retiring allowance before twenty-five years of service, so that established the fact.

MR. MACKENZIE said a case came up a short time ago in which Judge Begby wished to retire at fifteen years, taking that interpretation of the Act, but the Government were not able to accede to that view.

MR. OUMET said all this was nothing to his argument. There were Judges who had retired from their office in Quebec, and supposing one of these gentlemen, whom he considered perfectly qualified to perform legislative duties, should be elected to this Parliament, what was to hinder him from taking his seat? Although he received a retiring allowance he was perfectly independent of the Government, and from his twenty years' experience in the administration of the law he was better qualified than himself (Mr. Oumet) or many other members of this House. Why should the country be deprived of their ability and vast legal knowledge? He thought this Bill would certainly be improved by striking those words "on retiring allowances," out of it. He was very thankful to the House for having allowed him to express his opinions, and he would be still more thankful to the hon. the Minister of Justice if he would choose to take notice of them and put them in practice in this Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MILLS said he quite agreed with the observations of his hon. friend from Laval, that no one should be disqualified without some reason, and he thought there was sufficient reason for assenting to the disqualification provided for in the section now under consideration. The right hon. member for Kingston, in discussing this question, stated that disqualification should be confined to persons who might be influenced by the Administration of the day. He did not agree with the right hon. gentleman. In dealing with the subject of the independence of Parliament, they were called upon to legislate with reference to any parliament or body, whether a political body or not, which possessed such influence as to interfere with the independence of Parliament, as much as with regard to undue influence exercised by the Crown. What were the facts of the case? This hon. gentleman did not call in question the principle of legislation upon the subject of officers of the Crown holding seats in this House. They were quite agreed upon that point. They quite agreed that persons appointed by the Administration who depended on the Administration for their salaries and were capable of being removed at any time, ought not to sit in this House. Judges who were appointed during good behaviour, who received their salaries under statutory authority, were as independent of this House and the Crown as any of the gentlemen alluded to by the right hon. member for Kingston, and yet he would hardly say that the Judges of the Supreme Court should be eligible to take their seat. It was quite as improper for gentlemen holding seats or drawing salaries from the Local Government, and holding permanent situations under it, in any one of the Provinces, to be eligible for election to this House. What would be the position of any officer of the Local Government who would take a seat in this House, if that Government came in and asked for aid. Supposing the Government of the Province to which the hon. gentleman belonged came and said they were poor; without the necessary resources to carry on the Government; that they required their subsidy to be increased; that they