

Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba had a better than 50 per cent attendance record but seldom intervened in the debate. (See Table 4). In the sixties the pattern changed somewhat. The most regular attenders came from New Brunswick, Ontario and again British Columbia. Newfoundlanders were not regular members of the committee and very seldom participated even when they did attend. The most active participants came from Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. (See Table 8). Because of the work of two new members, Newfoundland fared much better in the seventies and eighties and its views were heard much more often than those from the other maritime provinces. (See Table 13). Quebecers generally showed little interest in the committee and they have more recently been joined by their Ontario colleagues. Members from Alberta and British Columbia continue to be the leading spokespersons on the committee. The British Columbia record, comprising members from both of the opposition parties, is quite exceptional and not confined to just the hearings on the Columbia River Basin which they naturally dominated in the fifties and sixties. Since 1972 they have occupied 17 per cent of the positions on the committee, though they have only 9 per cent of the House members. Their attendance is better by far than those from any other province. They have asked 32 per cent of the questions and every fourth intervention has come from their ranks. The members themselves account for this extraordinary performance in terms of their more expansive outlook. According to them, while Ontario and Quebec have a more inward looking vested interest, those on the west coast have always had to look outward or down south for their markets. Their view, and that of the prairie members generally, has been more internationalist. This is a perceived phenomena which the statistics and record supports but is worthy of further investigation. Also worth investigating is why the maritimers participated so infrequently in Law of the Sea discussions.

While the statistics offered in this paper present some interesting trends, they do not answer the fundamental questions of why individual members do or do not attend or participate. Before 1983