

prevent my passing as an innovator who wishes to reform everything for the pleasure of reforming, and in order to prove that I am sustained by authorities, who are authorities both for myself and for the House.

This is what the report of Hon. Mr. Justice Jetté and Messrs. Lorrain and Weir says at page 22:—

“It will be said, perhaps, that judicial organization has no connection with procedure. The contrary is the case. Even if the procedure were excellent; if the organization which should put it into execution is defective, the evil will still exist, or rather the remedy will be inefficacious.

“‘Good administration,’ says Mr. Bertrand, councillor in the Court of Appeals, of Paris, ‘depends in a great measure upon the organization of judicial bodies.’

“With most nations this organization is different. With all there are complaints of imperfections and abuses. All demand reforms.

“The problem to be solved is to find an organization which while respecting the rules of justice and equity can dispose of the greatest amount of business in the simplest, most expeditious, most efficient and least costly manner for all concerned.

“This reorganization, then, is in the front rank of the reforms to be introduced.”

Here, then is a report which emanates neither from the Government nor from myself, but from a body of distinguished men completely independent of the Government, and which says: “This reorganization, then, is in the front rank of the reforms to be introduced.” Already the late Mr. Justice T. J. J. Loranger, in the report presented in 1882 by the first commission appointed for the consolidation of the Code of Procedure, insisted upon this capital point. Mr. Pagnuelo, in his excellent work entitled: “Letters on Judicial Reform,” published in 1880, had also pointed out this reorganization as necessary. Hon. Mr. Laflamme and Mr. Edmond Larue, in brochures published in 1882, equally mention it as the compeer with reform in the Code of Procedure. There is no doubt that of all the reforms which we may attempt, these, wisely combined, would produce the most considerable results.

I cannot better terminate these remarks than in supporting myself upon the authority of an eminent man who has recently been taken from us. I mean the Hon. Mr. Rodolphe Laflamme, who in 1882 wrote on the question of judicial reform. The opinion of Mr. Laflamme is one that everybody respects. As a lawyer he was at the head of his profession. I had lately charged him to represent in England the interests of the Province of Quebec in a case of the highest importance, which he pleaded with so much ability, so much science, so much zeal, that Sir Horace Davey, one of the most distinguished members of the English Bar, paid me the compliment of thanking me for having sent Hon. Mr. Laflamme to give him the assistance of his legal talents. To-day, the eminent lawyer, the frank friend, so loyal and large-hearted, the former Minister of Justice and Attorney-General of the Dominion, has disappeared, and I profit by the occasion of so important a question as that which I am now discussing, and which he had so well studied, to render to his talents, to his merits, and, above all, to the act of courage and of faith which illuminated his death, a public and solemn testimony.