

Court judges. Otherwise we would be obliged to appoint a Superior Court judge in each district. Now, in some districts there is not work for more than two months in the year, while in other districts there is work for the whole year and more. This is why, on the one hand, the number of judges for cases under \$400 must be increased, while, on the other hand, a special court must be established for cases of \$400 and over, a court which, sitting in review, shall be a court of appeal for the District Court.

Provision for Summary Matters.

But I was forgetting a very important provision of the law referring to the jurisdiction of district courts. I spoke a moment ago of judicial centralization and decentralization, and I said that all cases under \$400, which, up to the present, were pleaded and judged at the *chef lieu* of the district, would so continue to be in future. But the answer may be made, as it actually was in a memorial addressed to me: "There are cases which come daily before the courts, motions, peremptory exceptions, *défenses en droit*, business in chambers, writs of prerogative, summary affairs, etc. What are you going to do about them?" I admit that in the most of the rural districts, writs of prerogative, questions between lessors and lessees, actions under the law of summary procedure, are pretty rare; but nevertheless, in order that nobody may accuse me of at all encroaching upon this question of judicial centralization, I declare in section 48 that in all these matters that I have mentioned, and which are enumerated in this section, the district judge has jurisdiction, subject to appeal to the Superior Court. This question is rather one of procedure, and more the subject of an article of the Code of Procedure. It may therefore be seen what a disadvantage it would be to pass this Act without at the same time adopting the Code of Procedure.

A Member—In summary affairs, will the district judge have absolute jurisdiction, and will there be an appeal?

Hon. Mr. Casgrain—The appeal will be before the Superior Court sitting in review and before the Court of Appeal as now constituted, or before both, according to the rules which at present exist in the Code of Procedure.

Changes since Last Year.

I have indicated, so far, in making the general *exposé* of the bill, the principal changes which are proposed in the measure that I have to present. But to enable the House to better understand and more fully seize the difference between the measure originally submitted and that which I will have the honor to lay before the House, and in order to show the care that I have taken to listen to the complaints and representations that have been made to me, I believe that it will be well to give in a succinct and definite manner the changes which exist between the original bill and that now submitted. There is first and foremost in the present bill, as I have already declared, a complete elimination of everything regarding the administration of criminal justice. In last year's bill, at the suggestion of parties who were well informed, and who had at heart