

tion, appointed to nominate the senators to serve on the several standing committees for the present session.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Is that the usual way to adopt that report—en bloc, or each committee?

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—En bloc.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—The whole of it?

The SPEAKER—Yes, that has been the practice since I have been here.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS—While I have no objection to the report of the committee, I rise to offer a suggestion. Since I have been in this House I notice that there has been quite a bit of friction about the appointment of the striking committees. I do not wish to make any motion with reference to the report of this committee. It has been moved by the leader of the House and adopted; but I think the better plan to appoint a proper striking committee would be, to name one representative from each of the nine provinces on that committee. That would give nine members. I find some provinces are left out, and some provinces have two representatives. The committees are very important, and there are important questions coming before the committee. It is a committee that practically decides all matters coming before them. The House seldom rejects the report of a committee. Questions come up affecting the welfare of the provinces, and I think that each province should be properly represented on the different committees. I find on going through the committees as they have been struck by the present striking committee, that some of the provinces have a large representation on a committee, while other provinces have no representation at all. Take the committee on Standing Orders, which is the gateway through which all legislation affecting the railways and affecting the western part of this country particularly enters this House. Saskatchewan is left without representation on that committee. I do not think that is fair. There should be a proper distribution

Hon. Mr. GIBSON.

of the members on the different committees. The proper way to arrive at it would be to have a striking committee composed of one member from each province. I am giving this as a notice of motion for next year. If the suggestion is not adopted, I will then move it as an amendment.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I will take note of the suggestion of my hon. friend. Possibly it may be found expedient that we should enlarge the size of that committee a little, but we can discuss it later on.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I wish to call the attention of the House to an anomaly in the construction or make up of this committee. I heard the hon. ex-leader of this House state that the Liberals have always stood for representation by population. We to-day in this House stand sixty-one to twenty-six according to political division, and I find that on the Striking Committee the 26 have as much to say as the 61; that is they are four to five. That is an anomaly that should not be allowed to exist any longer. I have been in consultation with some hon. members of this House and they quite agree with me, and I take occasion to call the attention of the House to the fact that the administration of the House should be manipulated by the majority and not the minority. As the hon. gentleman from Saskatchewan has just stated, the legislation of this country is largely in the hands of our committees. We know that, and why should the minority have as much right to dictate who shall be on the committee as the majority? I am not making any formal objection to the present construction of the committee. It is too late to do so. If I had been here when the committee was struck I would have called the attention of the hon. leader of the government in this House to the fact; but it is too late now, and like my hon. friend from Saskatchewan, I call the attention of the hon. senators to this matter. It is not that I am against any of the hon. members on the committee, but surely if we are going to stand by our principles we should have representation by population.