

by its intervention? Was their introduction there much more than an expedient to save time by pushing the bills through the forms while the Commons were occupied with the Pacific Railway Agreement? Would the previous approbation of the Senate give any contested measure a better chance in the Lower House? A third of the Senate Report for the Session is occupied by the debate on the Pacific Railway. In that debate, a speech worthy of any assembly, and regarded by those who heard or read it as the ablest exposition of the Government case was made by Sir Alexander Campbell; but the conclusion was foregone, and the Conservative organ itself said that the Senate could act only as a court of registration. How much of the Senate debates was reported even by the journals most friendly to the institution? How much attention did the press or the public pay to its proceedings, till it ventured on an amendment to the Scott Act, which had our hearty approval, but which the nation flung under the table? It is in no revolutionary spirit that we approach this subject. In the interest of democracy itself, we wish the Conservative elements of the Constitution to be strong. But where the national will is supreme nothing can be strong without an elective basis. A body of nominees representing nobody and irresponsible will never be suffered to exercise real power. Give the Senate an elective basis of a Conservative kind, and it may become a most important institution. Unless that is done, we venture to say once more, the anchor will not hold.

--The change of leadership, or rather the revolution by which it was brought about, has, at all events, enforced a nominal deference on the part of Grit Machinists to the most sacred article of the Liberal creed. To the great edification of the public there appeared the other day in the *Globe* an editorial in favour of freedom of individual opinion within the Liberal party, ending with this paragraph: