

diately only a few persons, is of real importance in its relation to grave principles. And if we have gone into details it was with the object of inducing a public body not to proceed with an act of injustice, which is no small matter.

Fortunately the Senate has not yet sanctioned the Report of its last Committee, but adjourned the consideration of it to the 16th of March. We have reason to believe that it will hesitate to adopt a proceeding so faulty in principle, so miserably parsimonious, and so ill becoming its dignity. A great majority of the Senators do not desire to displace any body, but a number of the Senators from Ontario are of a different opinion.

It is to be regretted that men who formed a part of the former Legislative Council should, in the new Senate, be so oblivious to the moral responsibilities that belong to them as the representatives of the old order of things. It ill becomes them to be unmindful of certain obligations, especially when they consider how the Queen has acted by them in similar matters. Their chief title to the high dignity which She has conferred upon them is in short the same "*acquired right*" that they dispute to their former old employés.*

To sum up briefly, the Senate, for all the reasons that we have indicated, ought in justice to confirm the old employés in their offices and salaries, or, if it comes to the conclusion that it is its duty to displace some, it should indemnify them or even pension them. And if it is necessary to accomplish that—to revoke its first decision—then why not revoke it?

"I felt it was unjust" said the Honorable Mr. Miller, at the sitting of The House on the 12th of December last, "and I foresaw the consequences. To-day I think myself no longer bound by that decision though I did not oppose it when it passed."

Other good words were spoken on that occasion, we give them below, and certainly nothing finer could fall from the mouth of an honest man.

Mr. Seymour and some others having reproached Mr. Letellier de St. Just with resisting the execution of a reform which had been approved by him three years before:—

"It is true, replied he, that I voted for the report of 1864, but that was on condition that it should only take effect in the future—that is to say—on the demise of the present Office Holders, but if you will maintain that I have been inconsistent, be it so! I prefer to be thought illogical rather than inhuman."

And here, Gentlemen, is the true solution of the question: it is better to be illogical than inhuman.

* Hon. Mr. CURRIE—I would ask why, in the first selection, the choice of the Crown is restricted to the members of this Chamber, when probably others out of it could be found whose presence here would be of more advantage to the public?

Hon. Sir E. P. TACHÉ—I do not know what advantage would be derived if the Crown had the right of making selections from all over the country. If that had been proposed, *I think many honorable gentlemen would have found fault with it.* (Hear, hear.) It was due to courtesy that the members of this House should not be overlooked, and not only that, but *there were acquired rights which had to be respected.*—*Debates on Confederation of B. N. A. Provinces, 1865.*