

tions of that body. With regard to the making of treaties, I think it is a good plan for the Senate to make them. The government is formed for the benefit of the people of the United States, and the question is: does it discharge its duties well for the people it governs? I think the right of making treaties should be in the open control of a body like the Senate rather than it should be in the secret control of an irresponsible body, of the fascinations of a King or of a back stairs influence to which in some lands some time ago treaty making was subject; influences that very often disregarded entirely the public, and are not of a character which should be admitted in the making of arrangements between peoples. I know that in this country there has always been a great deal of fault finding with treaties which the mother country made with the United States as far as they affect us. We have adopted a chronic state of grumbling with regard to the treaties. We always think we are badly treated, and that the United States has got the better of the bargain, but gentlemen who follow the discussions on the other side of the line will discover as well that, on many occasions, they have viewed the matter from a different standpoint altogether, and they are by no means sure that the treaty that has been made with Great Britain, as far as Canadian interests are concerned, has been in the best interests of the United States. I refer to all this because there was an argument in these objections to the United States Senate as against the introduction of an elective system in the Senate of Canada. The senatorial system in the United States is condemned or objected to, or it is argued against, inasmuch as some gentlemen here have brought forward or suggested or favoured the idea of electing this Senate in the same way. My hon. friend from Smith's Falls had something to say, perhaps in an indirect way, about the trusts which found their way into the Senate of the United States. I do not feel called upon to discuss that very much. My hon. friend thought it was well to argue upon it, but if I were a United States critic discussing the Canadian system, I would take up the discussion which occurred in the Senate and in the committee of the Senate, as far as

Hon. Mr. ELLIS.

that could be got at, when we were passing the new rules. Of course we know differently, but it would be a fair inference from much of the discussion, that there are strong reasons why the members of the Senate of Canada should be bound by rules which prevent them advancing their own personal interest, and if I went further I would make a strong point of the fact that the chairmanship of the Banking and Commerce Committee of this Chamber is in the hands of a leading banker, the president of the Bank of Montreal. He is a leading member of the Senate, and while I do not wish to convey any wrong impression, I suggest that an unfriendly observer might say that we are open to the same criticism as the Senate of the United States. I am doing nothing more than making the observation on the point. Mr. James Hill, who made a speech in this city the other day upon the progress which he had observed in the neighbouring republic during the time he lived there, referred to the fact that twelve or thirteen states had grown up in the United States. There is no doubt whatever, that however great the Senate of the United States may have been in its earlier days, when some of the most eminent men in the nation were in it, there has been a deterioration in some of those newer states, because the Senators chosen from these states would naturally be men interested in the public works and undertakings of the state, and would come to the front on account of their ability to carry on public works rather than their purely intellectual power. That is a thing which will settle itself in time. I assume these difficulties which have arisen will disappear, and that the senators of these states will restore the old prestige in the Senate, and that they will be just as good men in their way, if they are not as good now, as the men who represent the New England, middle and older states. Then again, with regard to the assumption of power by the Senate, to which my hon. friend referred, it must always be remembered that under the United States system of government there is a check by the legal power; that the Supreme Court of the United States has a power to decide whether the Senate or whether any of the legislative bodies—whether the law-making body—improperly exercises its power, and that legal