

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I cannot see any reason for it. We are simply following the rule which prevailed in other years. However, I have no objections to let it stand.

The motion was allowed to stand.

#### THE PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT moved that the following senators be appointed to the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament :—

The Hon. Messrs. Bernier, Carling, Sir John, K.C.M.G., Cochrane, Dever, Dobson, Ellis, Ferguson, Fiset, King, Macdonald (P. E. I.), MacKeen, Mackay (Alma), Merner, O'Donohoe, Pelletier, Sir Alphonse, K.C.M.G., Primrose, Reid, Shehyn, Templeman, Wark, Watson.—21.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—When this report was made yesterday it seemed to me, from the reading of it, that the composition of those committees was not fair to members of this House. For that reason, I objected to the adoption of the report yesterday. I find, on looking over the list of the standing committees, that I was right in my contention at that time. The distribution of the members on the several committees, to my mind, is certainly very unfair. With the experience I have had here and elsewhere, I have always found that the government, or the special committee striking the standing committees, have always considered the relative strength of the several parties. I find, in looking over this list, that that principle has been entirely ignored in this case. True, there are several committees, such as the one we are discussing now, where the political proclivities of their members can have very little effect. On the Printing Committee the other chamber has a large majority and could swamp the vote of the Senate. Consequently, the membership of the Printing Committee is of no political consequence, so far as this House is concerned. I find that on that committee there are eleven Liberals and ten Conservatives, where it will have little effect. Further on, I find on committees which deal with questions more or less of a political character, the minority of this House certainly have not fair representation. Take, for instance, the Committee on Railways. That is a very important committee—in fact, the most important committee in this House, as it is in the House of Commons. On that committee the party representing the government in this Chamber should have a fair

representation, and, in proportion to its numbers, should have forty per cent of the representation at least. I find on the Railway Committee the Liberals have twelve and the Conservatives twenty-eight. They should be sixteen to twenty-four, if we follow the rule which prevails in the House of Commons. In all cases in the House of Commons, the minority, no matter what political party they belong to, have a fair representation, according to their proportion in the representation of the House. I find the same thing prevails in all the committees. Take, for instance, the Internal Economy and Contingent Accounts Committee: the Liberals ought to have ten on that committee, the majority fifteen. I find, however, they have six, as against nineteen Conservatives, certainly a very unfair proportion. As I said yesterday, last session a large number of absentees were left on the committee. I see that this session, the Committee of Selection have substituted others for those who are not here, but in case the absentees come, they are to resume their places. In every instance, it increases the voting power on one side. Yesterday we were told that the committee did not see fit to drop the names of members who have been on the committee for a long time; notwithstanding that, I find those changes have been made, and were reported yesterday. I have all due respect for the old members of the Senate. They have had a longer experience than I have had; at the same time, so far as responsibility is concerned, new members have the same responsibility in this House as the older members who have been here for years. I find active business men in this Senate are entirely ignored. Some are on one committee, some on two, while the older members are on as many as five committees. I have looked over the list, and I find there are five members of the Senate who are entirely ignored—who are not on any committee at all. In that five are included some of the most enterprising business men of Canada. I find that eight members of the Senate are on only one committee; thirty-two on two committees; twenty-five on three committees; seven on four committees, and three on five committees. I do not think any person will say that I was wrong in my contention yesterday and to-day, that the committee should revise their work, and make a very much