

should have reminded them of the arrangement by which legal gentlemen are stripped of their gowns. Let them look to it!

I now come to the learned member for Richmond. He says he will vote for the bill, but he objects to the preamble. "What!" he says, "how can the lawyers *enjoy* a monopoly that is *injurious* to them?" He thinks it bad logic. But I ask him if a man cannot *enjoy* a bottle of wine, that may be injurious to him? The monopoly of the bar keeps out the fresh minds that would occasionally come in and sharpen others by competition. Take the learned member for Annapolis. Most of us remember when he came into this House. It was a new field for him; and I ask the honorable gentleman himself if he has not learned more in the same time, since his entrance into this hall, than he ever did at the bar? Therefore, I say the preamble is right; the monopoly may be enjoyed, but it is injurious. Oh! but he says, It pretends that other people can teach the judges. So they can. There are a hundred cases where a witness can be put into the box and the truth never be drawn out by the lawyers. A case of poisoning may depend on the eliciting of a single chemical fact, and yet that fact may not be stated, and a man's life may rest upon the issue. So in various other cases, where scientific knowledge is required.

I went into the chancery court the other day, attracted there to hear this great case of *Doyle vs. Uniacke*, of which there have been so many stories told. If we were to believe them, an honorable and learned friend was to be taken into custody for running off with a sum of money, if not for the murder of a boy. The whole thing turned out to be a question touching the legitimacy of a child. I went there, however, and what did I hear? A volume of indecent literature. I do not believe there was a single doctor in Halifax who would not have discussed the subject with as much common sense, without understanding these million of facts, of which we hear so much. The judges quoted *The Edinburgh Review*, *Young's Night Thoughts*, and a very curious extract from *Gibbon*, rather too indecent to be repeated here. One of the counsel read an extract from *Miss Edgeworth's novels*; and the other quoted the great case of *Tittebat Titmouse*, in *Ten Thousand a Year*, as law authority. The honorable and learned member from *Pictou*, quoted much from *Judge Story's work*. Let me give him an extract worth all those he has urged:—

"In truth, the common law, as a science, must be forever in progress; and no limits can be assigned to its principles or improvements. In this respect it resembles the natural sciences, where new discoveries continually lead the way to new, and sometimes to astonishing results. To