

administration, first, sent to the Penitentiary for an infamous offence; who was liberated by ministerial favour, and who, still by ministerial favour is preparing to carry his shame about from house to house, in every place where the duties of his new position will give him access; in the name and as the representative of the Government, during the approaching Census?

Shall celebrated forgers, ex-convicts and ex-inmates of our penitentiaries be allowed free opportunity to supersede honest people, as long as a coat of ministerial paint, conceals in their eyes the sins of the past and the failings of the present?

Is it the intention of the Government to keep before the public the scandal of such an appointment, which most probably would never have been consented to by the representative of the Crown, if His Excellency could have but for a moment thought that his signature confirmed the promotion to a trusted position of one who, through a glaring abuse of confidence, had been compelled to be the inmate of one of our penitentiaries?

**No. 2.**

By the Honourable Mr. Landry:—

May 16—Among the applicants for the position of Commissioner at Paris, left vacant, by the death of Mr. Hector Fabre, is there one answering to the name of Charles Avila Wilson? If so, what qualifications did he think himself possessed of, and what competency did he endeavour to impress upon the authorities in order to obtain the said position?

**No. 3.**

By the Honourable Mr. Landry:—

May 16—Is the Government aware that the Honourable Blaise Letellier, one of the judges of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec, whose residence is fixed by his Commission at Chicoutimi, within the district where he exercises his jurisdiction, has not yet seen fit to move his Penates there, but that he continues to reside in Beauceville, over 250 miles from the chief place of his judicial district?

If the government has not been aware, up to this day, of the residence of the Honourable Judge, can he continue to ignore it in the face of the positive assertion contained in the present question, and is it its intention to enquire from the Honourable Judge why he does not comply with the obligations imposed upon him by his Commission, while explaining to him that judges are appointed for judicial districts, and not judicial districts for judges?