

not an educated man in the country! His intellectual powers will wane! His knowledge of things will diminish! He will fast become an incompetent Judge, intellectually and otherwise. Therefore it is better that Judges should not be allowed to reside in the country; and the expression used by the hon. member in this connection was, that in the country, a man's intelligence got rusty, and that in this case the man who lost his intelligence was a Judge. Verily do I regret the conduct of some Judges in the rural districts of Lower Canada, especially in the country below Quebec, which conduct justifies what the hon. member has said. I regret that the Judges appointed by the Federal Government, and who are compelled by a local enactment to reside in their districts—I regret, I say, that they should take the liberty of leaving the country and residing in town; they thus give cause to the hon. member for Durham's assertions. But because the Judges do not perform their duties, because they act contrary to law, because these Judges neglect the administration of justice in the places where they are bound to, it does not follow that such administration should cease to become necessary. More remains to be said. What is the conduct of those Judges who should remain in their districts? They take up their residence in the district of Montreal. With the system which they have adopted of preventing the transaction of business in the rural districts, there is nothing to be surprised at if that business should be so small; especially when one sees a Judge, who lives in the district of Montreal, and who should be residing 500 miles further off, in the district of Gaspé, on learning that proceedings have been instituted in his district, hastens to send money to the plaintiff in order to avoid going down to his district. I maintain that with such a system there is no cause for surprise at the cases in rural districts being but few, nor is there anything to be surprised at that one should hear the hon. member from Jacques Cartier exclaim that the Judges should be made to return to town from the country. But, Mr. Speaker, was the hon. member for West Durham thinking of his friend, who sits so closely to him, when he spoke as he did this afternoon in this House? Was he thinking of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), who resides in the county of Arthabaska, who practises in that county, and who has become the French-Canadian leader of the Liberal party in this House? Was he thinking also of one who was for a long time the leader of the Liberal party, and whom Providence has just been pleased to call from amidst us? Was he thinking of the Hon. Mr. Letellier, who was looked upon by the Liberal party as a man of great intellectual powers, which fact I do not dispute, and who was a highly-educated man? And where did that man cultivate his mind? Whence did he derive his talents? Why, in the country, in the district of Kamouraska. Many others are there who have distinguished themselves at the bar, in politics, in all the other professions and positions of life in the country; men who were in the first rank, and whence did they come? Why, from the country. I remember, Mr. Speaker, a name illustrious in Lower Canada, a name that is recalled to the mind with reverence, and before which all bow, that of Sir Etienne Pascal Taché, who was the leader of all Canada for a number of years. Whence had he derived all his knowledge, and where did he develop that high intelligence so characteristic of him? In the county of Montmagny. I might quote a number of other instances. I might even name a number of lawyers practising in country districts. I might name the lawyers of the Eastern Townships and of the district of St. Hyacinthe who sit in this House, and I would ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier if they are deficient in intelligence. Why then, Mr. Speaker, deprive the country districts of a Judge? By depriving them of a Judge, you deprive them of the members of the Bar, of a prothonotary, of a number of educated men, who, on the

Mr. CIMON.

administration of justice being centralized, will leave the country because they will not be able to make a living there. One must not imagine that the country populations are void of intellect and education, and that it is a disgrace to live amongst them. The decentralization of justice has been considered a great advantage, because it has encouraged many to have higher aspirations, and has given them the chance of making their mark. A number of young men have gone into country districts, where they have succeeded in building up a practice, and in developing their intelligence; a thing they could never have done in a crowded centre, and where they would have been lost among the large number of members of their profession. Where did these young men develop their intelligence? In the country districts, whilst pleading in the presence of the educated and intelligent Judges appointed to administer justice in those districts. I pretend that judicial decentralization has encouraged education in the country, has developed our country districts, and has aided in more rapidly spreading immigration into Lower Canada, for it is an encouragement to educated persons to go and settle in the country; and when there are ten, fifteen or twenty educated persons in a district, they necessarily dwell among the people, and accustom them to politics; and thus it is, Mr. Speaker, that, to-day, the population of Lower Canada is educated, and that it is acquainted with everything that goes on in Canada, and in the world. But, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see why it is that the hon. member for Durham has risen this afternoon to oppose the resolutions proposed by the Government. I do not see why it is that he has seized this opportunity of lecturing the Province of Quebec and its Legislature; and I fail to see why the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who should be jealous of the rights of his Province and of its independence, opposes the Federal Government, and joins issue with the hon. member for Durham on this occasion. The latter has said: "It is we who pay the Judges, therefore we have the right of giving advice to the Quebec Legislature; we have the right to say: 'We are going to suspend the salaries of these Judges until such times as the Local Legislature shall coincide with our views.'" And how much farther has he gone from that point? Even to speaking of the Civil Procedure, which does not in the least concern the Federal Government, but which belongs to the Province of Quebec; even to give the hon. members of the Local Legislature a lecture on Procedure; even to say to them: "You must amend the Code of Procedure; you must expunge the exceptions to the form, dilatory exceptions, and many other things that exist in your Rules of Procedure; and, until this is done, we are going to suspend the salaries of your Judges." With such a system, with such logic, Local Legislatures lose their independence; they become the mere instruments of the Federal Government; for at any time it may say: "We are going to stop your supplies, because you are doing what does not please us." I am, therefore, pained to see the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who should be jealous of the liberty of his Province—for we, members of the Province of Quebec, should be more jealous of the liberty of our Province than the hon. members of the other Provinces—I am pained, I repeat, to see that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier should have embraced the views of the hon. member for West Durham, and I say that both have displayed a want of logic in the profound speeches delivered by them in this House. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier wishes to bring all the Judges to town. The reason is easily understood. The hon. gentleman resides in Montreal, where he has his practice, and naturally he would gladly see business increase in the city of Montreal. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier would like to see, besides the two or three thousand cases which come before the Superior Court every year, all those also that are taken up in the rural