

suggested on previous occasions how the committee should be formed. I am very glad that I am relieved from any such duty, and I am not, in making this suggestion, at all influenced against the *personnel* of the Committee. I merely throw out the suggestion that the Committee should be composed of gentlemen best qualified by training and experience for such work.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I am very sorry that the names that I have selected for the committee do not please the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The hon. gentleman is wrong.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I think I understand English, and I heard the hon. gentleman's remarks. The names suggested for the Committee were submitted to the Speaker. They were selected because they were good, honest, steady, level-headed men. That is why I picked them out. I submitted them to the Speaker, and he had no objection to them. It did not strike me that I should have picked out nine barristers or lawyers. No doubt some of the finest men in the country are lawyers; still I do think there are gentlemen who can understand what is going on, and can understand what a witness says, and are as able to give an opinion upon the evidence, as many lawyers. Some of the best decisions I have heard given have been given by laymen. I am very sorry that the committee named has not met with general approval. It would have been, perhaps, as well (though I hesitate to suggest in my humble way in opposition to such a great luminary as my hon. friend) to have allowed this committee to be appointed as it is named, and in future to adopt new rules for our guidance. I can assure the hon. gentlemen present that when I selected the committee I did what I believed was the best. I named about half of them myself and the others were suggested to me. I think I please the House in that selection, and next time I will see if it is in my power to please the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg.

HON. MR. POWER—I sympathise to some extent with the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg. Hon. members are aware that the church to which I belong does not approve of divorce. I think the part played by the hon. member from Lunenburg in this House is generally that of an enemy of divorce and I can readily understand that an hon. gentleman like the member from Alma, who is anxious to have his bill passed, would not care to put upon the committee anyone who would perhaps work against rather than for his bill. I think it was, perhaps, to a certain extent, with a view to counteract that natural tendency of the gentleman who had charge of the bill, that the late Minister of Justice, and the House at his suggestion, decided that the list of members of the committee was to be submitted to the member of the Government having charge of the business in this House. I can understand that the member of the Government having charge of the business of the House at present, being a member of the same church to which I belong, could not take part in divorce proceedings and my hon. friend from Alma did the best he could in submitting the names to the Speaker.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I did not know that the list had been submitted to the Speaker of the House, but I think if the Speaker had been aware of the general understanding of the House, as expressed by the Leader of the House, that barristers should be on that committee, my hon. friend would have asked that such should be the case. I am very glad to be relieved of the duty as far as I am concerned, and as regards the personnel of the committee, I have not the slightest objection to it. The promoter is supposed to have the best available persons on that committee to secure the object of the bill. My hon. friend, with the interest he has taken in this matter, is desirous that, as far as it is consistent with the merits of the case, the return shall be in favor of the petitioner.

THE SPEAKER—It is very true that my hon. friend from Alma brought the list of his proposed committee to me. I knew there was some understanding by which the names should be sub-