

appointed upon each committee, and I know that it is not pleasant work to have to decide between contending friends. But I may say that I think that all the members of that committee, the names of whom have been mentioned, will act according to the Golden Rule, and do unto others as they would like others to do unto them. The hon. gentleman from Marshfield seems indignant at the idea that the hon. Secretary of State should have mentioned the fact that political lines should appear, or Liberal proclivities should appear, in the naming of committees. Why not be frank among ourselves? We have been observant enough, and since the present government has been in power what have we seen? Party lines, straight party lines here in this House, with one or two laudable exceptions. I am not trying to blacken the character of my colleagues opposite. I do not believe that I am any better than my colleagues sitting in front of me, but I have been a politician since I was out of college, and I have found as many solid, dyed-in-the-wool partisans in this House as could be found in the other House.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—More sometimes.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—More, perhaps, sometimes, but as we grow older we grow stronger in our convictions, so that there is no need of becoming indignant at the fact that the question of politics had been mentioned. As the hon. gentleman has said, the pendulum is swinging from one side to the other. Let us recognize it, and I am quite sure that when the majority passes from one side to the other, the measure of justice that will be distributed to the opposition will be at least as large, and I hope, larger than was given to the Liberal opposition which sat in this chamber before.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman is a living example of that partisanship.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I desire to protest on behalf of Quebec, and wish to have it noted, that this motion is carried on division.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

## AN ADJOURNMENT.

### NOTICE OF MOTION.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Several members have spoken to me about an adjournment, and I should like to be guided by the feeling of the House. Some hon. gentlemen desire a longer adjournment than others. My own idea was to adjourn to-morrow after the committees have been organized, and meet again two weeks from Tuesday next.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—That is long enough.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Perhaps the House will accept this as a notice, and we can take the sense of the House to-morrow when the motion is made.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—If we adjourn to-morrow it will necessitate the meeting of the committee to-morrow to strike the committees of the House, and we would have to adopt the reports to-morrow or the matter would have to remain over until after the adjournment?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes.

## INTRODUCTION OF GOVERNMENT MEASURES IN THE SENATE.

### INQUIRY.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Might I ask the hon. Secretary of State whether it is proposed to ignore the Senate altogether in the introduction of any government measures, or are we to be here just as recording scribes.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—As in the past.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I deny that most emphatically. The hon. gentleman is very apt to interject expressions and insinuations which are not correct. When I had the honour of sitting on that side of the House I introduced some of the most important measures that were presented to parliament, many of which I could refer to. Those constant imputations thrown across the floor of the House are uncalled for, particularly when they are not correct. I think I am not out of place in inquiring whether it is proposed to introduce important measures in the Senate.