

the general feeling was, at least that of the legal profession. It has been stated that the entire legal profession is opposed to the measure. I cannot allow that statement to go uncontradicted.

We had here, for instance, the authorized representative of the section of the Bar of the district of Quebec, Hon. Mr. Langelier. There was only one detail in the whole bill to which the Quebec Bar objected. This was the provision which said that when the city judges would disappear, they would be replaced by those appointed to perform their duties in the country. With that exception, Mr. Langelier gave his adhesion to the bill, and in that he represented, as I have already said, the section of the Bar of the district of Quebec. We had also the Bar of Rimouski, represented by Mr. Pouliot, and the Bar of the district of Beauce, represented by Mr. Linière Taschereau. These gentlemen declared themselves in favor of the bill. It is true that the sections of Three Rivers, St. Francis, Bedford, St. Hyacinthe and St. Johns were opposed to the bill, and the Montreal Bar was represented by a gentleman who said he was authorized to oppose the bill. But I would like to call the attention of the House to what happened at the Montreal Bar.

The question was discussed for some time, and one of the most distinguished advocates of Montreal, a gentleman whom I am glad to count amongst my friends, Mr. Globensky, was instructed to draw up a report against the bill, that is to say, *on* the bill, and not *against* it; because at the first meeting of the Montreal Bar, if I am properly informed, the question was considered without any decision being come to either for or against the measure. Mr. Globensky, who was instructed by the council to draft a report, made a report against the bill. When the Montreal Bar was convened to take Mr. Globensky's report into consideration, there were only twenty-three members present out of over three hundred, and the vote stood thirteen against and ten in favor of the measure. I am pleased to be able to tell the House that distinguished men such as Mr. Geoffrion, Mr. Gustave Lamothe, Mr. Demers, Mr. Eugene Lafontaine, whom we have known to such advantage in this House, have declared themselves in favor of the bill. I say this merely to remove the impression that the whole Bar is opposed to the bill. I am still, at present, receiving letters from everywhere from my brother advocates, asking me not to refer the bill to the Committee on Legislation, but to have it passed this session.

Moreover, amongst the resolutions and petitions laid on the table of the House as supplementary to the return to an order of the House for copies of all correspondence on the subject, we laid on the table a great many petitions lately received from ratepayers of the province, from ratepayers of certain *chefs lieux*, from important localities in the province, asking us to have the bill passed. There is a reason which, above all others, favors the proposal I now make, viz., to refer the bill to the Committee on Legislation for further study. The honorable members of the House have observed that the draft of the Revised Code of Civil Procedure, so long and so anxiously expected, has been laid, in both lan-