

THE STRIKING COMMITTEE.

MOTION.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yesterday I gave notice of a motion to move to-morrow the appointment of the Striking Committee. Strictly speaking, the notice could not be entertained until to-morrow. I presume there will be no objection to my presenting it to the House now on the understanding that the committee will not meet before to-morrow morning. I therefore move :—

That, pursuant to rule 79, the following Senators be appointed a Committee of Selection to nominate the Senators to serve on the several Standing Committees during the present session, namely :—The Honourable Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Honourable Messieurs Templeman, Ferguson, Dandurand, Miller, Watson, Lougheed, Jones, and the mover, and to report with all convenient speed the names of the Senators so nominated.

I am informed that one of the members, Mr. Jones, will be away and by arrangement I should like to substitute the name of Mr. Gibson.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Could not the Hon. Sir Alphonse Pelletier be placed on the committee in place of myself? He has had more experience in the Senate and knows more about the work.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Then I will substitute the name of the Hon. Sir Alphonse Pelletier for that Mr. Dandurand.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Before the motion is carried, I should like to enter my protest against the suggested formation of this committee. Last year, when a similar motion was presented to this House, I called the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that the province of Quebec was not duly represented on that Striking Committee, and I think it is still now the most striking feature of the Striking Committee. If hon. gentlemen remember well, the previous year the Hon. Mr. Bolduc was on the committee, and his name was stricken out last year, and I asked the hon. minister about it. I said :—

Hon. Mr. Bolduc's name is stricken out. Why? Could the hon. Secretary of State tell us why?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I really could not.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I said :—

He cannot say. Has he any reason to strike out Hon. Mr. Bolduc's name?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—None whatever.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—That is just the answer given last year by Hon. Mr. Scott, 'none whatever,' and I asked 'why'? Then Hon. Mr. Scott replied, 'because I claim one for ourselves.' Then I asked :—

Why strike out one from the province of Quebec?

Then Mr. Scott—well, the reporter omitted the word 'candidly'—said :

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I never thought of it.

The province of Quebec is here represented by twenty-four members, so is the province of Ontario, and the three maritime provinces together are represented by twenty-four members, and the provinces from the west have the nine remaining members. I think the province of Quebec is entitled to have on that committee the same number as the province of Ontario or the three maritime provinces put together. Why give three members to Ontario and only one to Quebec? I suppose the Hon. Secretary of State will say again 'I never thought of it.'

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hear, hear, exactly.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—He should think of those things. He is the leader of the government in this House and he ought to give fair play to every province represented in this chamber. I ask him to-day if he will seriously take up the matter and do justice to the province of Quebec. I do not see why our province is represented by only one member on that select committee, while Ontario has three members.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—What three has Ontario?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The Hon. Secretary of State, the Hon. Mr. Gibson and the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell.

Hon. Mr. LANDERKIN—You do not want to strike him out?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—No, and I do not want to strike anybody out, but I want the province of Quebec to be fairly represented, as a matter of right, on that committee. That is what I ask the hon. leader of the government in this House to do in fairness to our province. If the resolution passes as it is now, I shall object to it and ask that it be declared carried on a division, as a protest against the manner in which the province of Quebec is treated.