

those two committees have, from time to time, been enlarged. In 1872 the two committees of Banking and Commerce and Railways and Canals embraced only twenty-four members each. Since that time some two or three members have been added, but at the time I speak of, Prince Edward Island had come in, came in about 1872, and British Columbia was in. Those two committees now number seventy. The increase is due entirely to the pressure by gentlemen who desire to be added to those committees, and so they have grown to what, in my judgment, is rather an undue and large proportion. In the arrangement on the Committee on Railways, which practically is the committee on which some hon. gentlemen desire to be named, I have, in a hasty way, just run over the proportions that are on that committee from the different parts of the Dominion. Prince Edward Island has four senators, and would be entitled in a rough way to one-twentieth. She has her proportion; she has two gentlemen on the committee. British Columbia has three senators. She is not entitled to two. Her proportion would be something over one, but she has two, so that, perhaps, she is over-represented. Manitoba having four, is entitled to one-twentieth, and there is only one senator from Manitoba on that committee. The principle that guided us in former years, although it has not been followed in the last three or four years, was that locality, rather than political colour, should be regarded by the members of that committee. I may remind my hon. friend that if I had, a few years ago, raised that question, the Liberal party would not have been represented on any committee. The Northwest Territories have two senators, and would be entitled to one member. It has one member on that committee. Nova Scotia, having ten senators, would be entitled to an eighth, perhaps a fraction over. That proportion would be five, perhaps a fraction over. It is over-represented, because it has seven. New Brunswick, having ten senators, would also be entitled to five; its representation is less than five, so that it is under-represented on the basis that I have referred to. Quebec having twenty-four senators would be entitled to something over one-third, over fourteen, perhaps not fifteen. It has only eleven. So

that it is under-represented. Ontario, with twenty-four, would be entitled to a third, say fourteen, and it has fourteen on the committee. So that, on the principle which has influenced the committee in the past, the proportions coming from different provinces would seem to be eminently fair. It is impossible to so graduate and regulate the formation of a committee as to represent each particular locality. I quite recognize the fairness of many of the observations of my hon. friend opposite, where gentlemen have been left off altogether. The principle that has guided the Committee of Selection since the formation of the Senate has been that the newer members were not given as important places on the committee as the older members, and it did seem to me that precedence by priority is the only principle which should guide, and it has been the guiding one in the past under all governments, both Liberal and Conservative. The hon. gentleman referred to one committee in particular, the Committee on Contingencies. I have found that some of my Liberal friends have been quite as extravagant as the Tories on the committee. I begged of them several times to call a halt, and if we do not call a halt we shall get into disgrace, because the extravagance of the committee has been commented on outside. The additions last year were in the neighbourhood of \$3,000, which was extremely uncalled for, I do not hesitate to say so, because officials who only work here for three months and occupy inferior positions are paid higher sums than officers in other departments of the government who are occupied till five or six in the evening, and sometimes have to come back at night, and draw less compensation than the officers in this Chamber. I have heard the voice of the hon. gentleman from Amherst (Mr. Dickey) raised against it several times. I think he left the committee in disgust. I am sorry he is not now in his place. I remember calling his attention to the condition of things at confederation, and the professions that were made then. The Senate was to be managed as a fairly prudent, economical body, and to his regret year by year the expenses of the administration of the Senate had enormously increased. I have heard other gentlemen, not confined to one political party or the other, make similar com-