man holding a seat in both parliaments would be actuated by local feelings in administering the affairs of the General Government. The Bill did not affect members who held seats in both Houses at the present time, but when a seat became vacant in this Legislature by death or otherwise then this law was applicable to those seats. He hoped the time would come when the whole Dominion would be divided into Electoral districts, and that instead of sending single representatives from single counties several counties would be formed into one district, and then a man would require to have some ability to secure his election.

Sir J. A. Macdonald agreed with his honourable friend, Mr. Chamberlin, in his objections to this measure. The course adopted by the Parliament of England was that the constitution must be upheld until an evil is shown to exist; otherwise they would have philosophers and theorists continually making imaginary improvements upon the Constitution. They should legislate for the welfare and development of the country instead of occupying the time of the House discussing probable improvements in theory. In answer to the Speech from the Throne, they promise to give the constitution a full, fair and impartial trial; and now they try to alter it before there was a chance of knowing by experience whether the alteration would be an improvement or not. The Imperial Government had no thought of excluding by any provisions of the Act parties from sitting in both Legislatures. He was rather surprised that a member of the Liberal party should begin his career by circumscribing the liberty of the people. He found the Conservatives just as ready, and sometimes more ready, to trust the people than the Liberal party. He was willing to trust the people to choose for themselves. This matter must be considered not only as a privilege of the candidate, but as a privilege of the people. It was an old theory of the British Constitution, that if a person was elected a member of Parliament, he was obliged to perform the duties imposed upon him, otherwise he was liable to a fine. There was a case of this kind almost in our day. Robt. Southey was elected against his will, and he was obliged to write a letter to the Speaker, saying that he had not the necessary qualification, otherwise he would have been compelled to serve. Another objection to this measure was, that it was introduced in a wrong tribunal; it was the duty of every public man to give his assistance when called upon to the Chief Legislature; and it was for the Local Legislature to say whether he, having a seat here, could spare time for the smaller body.

Mr. Mackenzie said the Minister of Justice in arguing against the Bill had attempted to make two points—first that the Constitution would be infringed, and 2nd that the liberties of the people would be abridged by its provisions. But, in addition to these, he followed up the argument of the member for Missisquoi that we should always wait till an evil comes before providing a remedy. If he had carried out that principle to its legitimate conclusion, he should not have made provision for the threatened attack of cholera.

Mr. Chamberlin—Did not cholera exist before any provisions were taken against it?

Mr. Mackenzie—Yes; but it did not exist in this country, where the honourable gentleman thought it necessary to take precautionary measures before the evil appeared. In like manner, we had a Bill now before the House providing for a possible invasion by Fenians. Why not wait till the Fenians came? The honourable gentleman took strong grounds that the constitution should not be meddled with until some evil had developed itself which required a radical cure. Did he think the elective principle in the Upper House worked so badly that we were under a necessity of reverting to the nominative principle?

Sir John A. Macdonald—In that case, we were a constituent assembly forming a constitution.

Mr. Mackenzie said he could not admit that the self-appointed delegates who met at Quebec were a constituent assembly to form a constitution. For his own part, he thought one House was sufficient, but if we were to have two he preferred a nominated to an elected Upper House. He knew, however, that the bulk of the people were in favour of the elective principle and why did the honourable gentleman revert to the nominating principle while he had been accustomed to assert that the elective principle had been found to work well? And why as regarded Upper Canada did he do away with the Upper House altogether while two houses were allowed to Lower Canada? Was not this a meddling with the Constitution on theoretical grounds, the very thing which he now condemned? But he denied that if this Bill should become law to-morrow, it would be any infringement on the constitution. It was quite unworthy of the honourable gentlemen to argue that a