

the committees, on which he was a very active and intelligent member, leaving him only upon the Private Bills Committee. Why was that done? Of course the hon. gentlemen who manipulated—I do not desire to use the term offensively—these committees may explain. The Hon. Mr. Baker is upon three committees. Mr. Bélique was introduced into this House at the opening of the session. I have no doubt of his ability, from his remarks, and that he will make a very intelligent and useful member of the Senate, but I find in his case a departure from the principle laid down by the hon. Secretary of State, that the new members were to be put upon the least important committees. This gentleman has been put upon four committees, while Mr. Baird, an old member, is upon only one. Then Mr. Berrier is on three committees, Mr. Bolduc on three, Mr. Deboucherville on two, myself upon two—I may say, however, that is at my own request. Sir John Carling, who has had about forty-five years' experience, more than half the time in official life, is left on the Printing and Standing Orders Committee only. Mr. Carmichael is left on one. Mr. Casgrain of De Lanaudière, I find, must have been considered a very important personage in this Senate, although not a very old one. He has been placed on four committees, three of them among the most important committees in the House, while my hon. friend of the same name from Windsor, who has been in the Senate some fifteen years, and has been constant in his attendance on committees, is reduced to one. I have no doubt the younger branch of the family is of much more importance if the older one will excuse me for making the statement, but why the principle as laid down by the Secretary of State should be so grossly departed from, I do not understand. Perhaps the older branch of the family (I do not mean to be disrespectful) has a much better idea of the manner in which this country should be governed than the younger one. As he is more conservatively inclined he has been reduced to one committee, while the younger member of the family, the advanced liberal of the day, has been given the honour of being appointed to four.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton)—It is all in the family.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—It may be all in the family, but it is not a family compact. That is quite evident, because while they may agree in good fellowship, one thinks one way, and the other the other way, and I would say to those gentlemen who were so solicitous of the honour of the older members, I think the hon. gentleman from Windsor should not have been forgotten, however, he may have differed from his young relative politically, or degraded to one committee while a younger member of the family is placed on four. I find Hon. Mr. Clemow is on three. I suppose that is as much as he cares for. I have no doubt that it was at his own solicitation that Senator Cox was left on only one committee. I do not think he cares much for committee work. He is on the Committee of Banking in which he has no slight interest, and is satisfied to be left there. Then, we have Mr. Cochrane, a gentleman who has been in the Senate and in public life between twenty-eight and thirty years. He made a special request that his name should be left on the Committee on Railways and Canals, and if I were permitted to repeat the proceedings of the committee, I might say that I tried to get him there, but could not. He has been reduced from the position he held ever since he has been in the Senate, except for one year, to the Committee on Printing. Senator Dandurand's modesty would not allow him to usurp many committees. He was one of the principal men—I think I am correct—with the new member of the cabinet without portfolio (Hon. Mr. Templeman)—who manipulated these committees, because, when the committee met he said: 'You can have so many on the committees.' In order to free himself from the responsibility of erasing any older names from the committees, he has confined himself to one, so we cannot accuse him of being a monopolist at any rate. Then, what has Mr. Dechene done to bring down the vengeance of his political friends? He is left off all the committees. From what little I know of the hon. gentleman, I think he would make a very good committee man. In the House of Commons, where he occupied a very prominent position, he was a useful member, and I have no doubt he would be equally useful here. It may be possible, since the hon. gentleman has reached the Upper House, he is becoming a