

THE BYSTANDER.

MARCH, 1881.

THE opponents of the Pacific Railway Agreement cannot seriously have looked with hope to the action of the Governor-General or the Senate. Had the charge of corruption against the Minister of Railways repeatedly made by the leading organ of the Opposition press been brought forward by the Opposition leaders in Parliament, it would undoubtedly have been the duty of the Governor-General to withhold his signature from the charter pending the investigation, and, in case of conviction, to dismiss the Minister. A Governor-General is responsible for the enforcement of the Privy Councillor's oath. But the charge has been allowed to fall to the ground, and on no other pretext could His Excellency have interfered. There was no deadlock, no doubt about the decision of Parliament, no feature in the situation which rendered necessary or warrantable an appeal on the part of the Crown from the national representatives to the nation.

The Senate might, indeed, have been expected, if it had any capacity for usefulness at all, to be useful on an occasion like this, when the matter in hand was not one of party politics, but one of business, with which the veterans of the commercial world were particularly qualified to deal. Yet, who has looked to it for any sort of help or guidance? How many have read its debates? The weakness of its title to a costly existence could hardly have been shown in a more striking way. In discussing the Reform of the Senate, too little attention is paid to the simple question