Correspondence respecting Mr. Thompson.

from what I personally knew of the business, that Basin ought to have gained his cause; but I did not hear all the evidence given.

Thursday, 21 January 1836.

Mr. Etienne Lebreux, of St. Thomas, in the county of l'Islet, joiner, called in; and being Interrogated, answered:

I HAVE known the Honourable John Gawler Thompson as judge of the provincial court of the inferior district of Gaspé, since the month of June in the year 1827, at which time the judge arrived at Paspebiac, in the county of Bonaventure, in the said inferior district, to replace the Honourable Alexis Caron, provincial judge of the said district, who died at Paspebiac in the winter of the same year. I lived at Perce, in the county of Gaspé, in the said inferior district, from the spring of the year 1826 to the fall of the year 1829, and I have regularly gone to Percé aforesaid every spring, since the year 1834 inclusively. I did so for the purpose of fishing for cod in the spring and fall, so that I remained at Perce during the years aforesaid, from the 10th or 12th of May until the 10th or 15th of October on the average, after which time I returned to St. Thomas, my usual place of residence. In the year 1833, however, I passed the winter at Percé. I was also employed by Jacques Lamy of Paspebiac aforesaid, as a joiner, from the 10th of September 1830, or thereabouts, to the 10th of May, or thereabouts, of the year 1831, at which time I returned to Percé to fish, as I have stated above. I was employed by the said Jacques Lamy during the whole of the said time, in constructing a house built by him at Paspebiac. The said judge occupies the said house, and it was built for his use, according to what the said Jacques Lamy told me, as did also the said judge himself, who came frequently to give us directions about dividing it, which we followed, with the approbation of the said Jacques Lamy. We were several workmen employed in building the said house. The said judge came regularly several times a day to give us his orders, and I must confess that I have frequently heard him talk nonsense, and repeat over and over what he had told us (which amused the workmen very much) in consequence of his immoderate use of intoxicating liquors. I did not see the judge drink on these occasions; but it is my intimate conviction that he was drunk. I have seen the said judge sober, and he certainly did not talk nonsense then, nor did he repeat his words over and over as he did when he was under the influence of intoxicating liquors. One time among others, (it was in March 1831), during the term of the court at New Carlisle, the said judge asked me to drive him to the said court, and I did so, as he appeared to me to be in a state of intoxication. I asked him when he got to New Carlisle, whether the court was going to sit, and remarked that I intended to return. He replied, you may go back; I do not think there will be any court to-day. He then got out of the carriage, walking tolerably well. I went into the room in which the court is held in the said court-house at New Carlisle, I went into the room in which the court is held in the said court-house at New Carlisle, and after having waited some time, I went into the judge's room to ask him whether there would be any sitting of the court. The said judge then said to me, "You may go back, I am pretty sure there will be no court to-day." He got up, but could not stand, in consequence of the quantity of spirituous liquors he had taken. I then left the judge and went back to Paspebiac. He got there himself almost as soon as I did, that is to say, about half an hour afterwards. He was then in a state of intoxication, and threw up what he had taken, at the side of his own house. I remember a conversation I had with the said judge relative to a certain action, in which the said Jacques Lamy was plaintiff, and François Dugué, commonly called François Jean Marie, was defendant, both being resident at Paspebiac aforesaid. As far as I can remember, this action was brought for verbal defamation; it was about term-time in the year 1831. I asked the judge what he thought of this busiit was about term-time in the year 1831. I asked the judge what he thought of this business, saying, that for my part I thought that François Dugué was not in the wrong, according to what Jacques Lamy, plaintiff, himself acknowledged. The said judge at first said to me, "I do not know who will win." But he afterwards said, "You know the said François Dugué, he is a man who does harm in the place, you know that he is a mischievous man, and even if he was in the right, the law must be against him." I do not mean to say that those were the very words used by the judge, but they contain the substance of what he said to me. The common report is, that the judge is a drunkard; and such was the common belief from the time of my arrival in the said district, until I left Percé in the fall of 1834. According to my own knowledge of the matter, the inhabitants of the county of Gaspé, and of a part of the county of Bonaventure where I have lived, have not confidence in the said judge; he is generally laughed at and ridiculed. The house of the said Jacques Lamy, in which the judge lives, is a large and handsome house; it is rented to the said judge at 60l. I remember that when the lease was made, it was calculated that the said Jacques Lamy was to give the judge more than 40l. worth of articles, while he was only to get 60l. a year for the use and occupation of his said house, and that the said Lamy would not therefore receive nearly the legal interest of his money, because a house, such as that was, must have cost the said Lamy from 700l. to 800l. I have heard that the distance from the place where the judge lives, to the court-house at New Carlisle, is six miles; it may be less. When I was in the employment of the said Jacques Lamy, the said judge bought every thing he wanted from him. There were a great many transactions between them, with the nature of which I am unacquainted. The said Jacques Lamy had at that time a number of actions pending in the provincial court. I have no hatred or animosity against the said judge, having never had any transaction with him; on the contrary, he was a very great man to me a very good man to me.