

is now smarting and has smarted, owing chiefly to the action of the United States Senate, are pretty good judges of what I might call the duller side of the question. The English statesmen, some of whose opinions I shall presently refer to, have taken the bright side of the question, but we in Canada have experienced, in our own persons and properties, the darker side of the question and that leads me to a conclusion adverse to that which has been expressed elsewhere. Above all things do we not want, in a body of this sort, whether nominated or elected, men free from such strong party bias that they are ready to prefer patriotism to party? I say that is a thing which the most devoted party man in this House cannot contravene. He may, for the sake of his political friends, maintain that it is his duty to support them in all their measures, but I think I could point, if the order of the House would permit me, to individuals in the Senate who are prepared to put patriotism before party, and it is a body acting upon that principle which, I think if a change is made at all, we ought to seek to pave the way for. The Senate of the United States, as I suppose every member of this House knows, is elected by the State Legislatures, and probably it is that circumstance which has presented itself strongly to the mind of my hon. friend who has introduced the subject to-day; but we find that, owing to the regulations of that body, a two-thirds majority in a body elected for six years and returning to their constituents after that time, are very likely to find themselves in antagonism to the Executive. Now, how often has this occurred in the experience of almost every hon. gentleman surrounding me here? It has occurred in the case of President Cleveland. We know that he had not a majority in the Senate, and that body rejected a well matured treaty negotiated by the Ministers of the President and by gentlemen appointed for that purpose by Great Britain and Canada. It was a treaty at all events that some parties thought was fair and reasonable, and I think we may infer that it was a reasonable treaty, because we find the extreme opposition on both sides opposed to it, each claiming that it was a surrender of its country's rights. When I find that opinion expressed by the strong opposition in both countries, I come to the con-

clusion that it was a very fair treaty. When the President's policy was thrown out by a two-thirds majority of the Senate we find that body ready to accept the *modus vivendi* with Canada. That is a strong combination of circumstances in a body represented to be the most enlightened in the world. If I had no other grounds to form my judgment upon than this single fact which forms part of the history of Canada to-day, I would say that that cannot be a wise Legislature which acts in so partizan a spirit. It may be said, and I think it is quite proper to point to it, that the United States Senate, when first formed, was a very different sort of body from what it is now. In the first place, there were only thirteen States, and, each sending two members, there were only twenty-six Senators; but there are now seventy-six members of the Senate and in course of time it may be still further enlarged until it reaches nearly 100. A small body such as the Senate was in the days of Washington and the earlier Presidents was far more competent to discharge the duties imposed upon it than a larger body. In the first place, the twenty-six members were no doubt choice men and it is much more easy to conduct business partly legislative, partly executive and partly diplomatic in a body consisting of twenty-six men than it is in a body of seventy-six men. Secrecy can be much more easily preserved and more public attention attaches to the decisions of such a body. At all events that is the opinion of one of the most independent Englishmen that have written on the subject, Mr. Bryce. For that reason, I cannot attach a great deal of importance to those who say that any change made in this body should be based upon the model of the United States Senate. As to whether a second Chamber is necessary, I think there can be very little doubt. We have heard the opinions of a great many experienced men on that point. It may be worth while to mention a few of them. It has been discussed of late in the House of Lords. That body, becoming aware of its rather peculiar position with regard to the people and with regard to the other House of Parliament, has seriously considered, on several occasions of late, the expediency of altering its constitution. A couple of years ago Lord Roseberry brought the subject before the House, speaking at considerable