result of which they had now before the House. That judgment properly authenticated was, he maintained, all that they required to govern their Parliamentary action.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the certificate of the SPEAKER, or of the Clerk of the House, accompanying the proceedings of the House, would only mean that it was certified that the copies were true copies. So in this case Chief Justice WOOD certified that the papers now before the House were the papers connected with this case, and being so certified they must be held by the House to be true copies. But as the SPEAKER's or the Clerk's certificate would go no further than to certify that the copies were true copies, so Chief Justice WOOD's certificate went no further than to certify that the documents were true copies of the papers that appeared in the court in Manitoba. It did not in any way give a character to these documents. They must stand upon their own merits. If defective they must fall: if sufficient they would be maintained. Yet the hon. gentleman said that for Parliamentary purposes these must be held to be correct, and a member of this House must be expelled on them whether correct or not. It was said he could go to the Court of Appeal of it was incorrect, but suppose the appeal should be successful what satisfaction would it be to be told "You ought to have sat for four years." In the case in which Lord DENMAN and the Court of Queen's Bench decided against the jurisdiction of Parliament, Sir ROBERT PEEL rose in his place and appealed to Parliament against the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas. He said no matter how the law might have been construed, the House of Commons could not be denuded of its jurisdiction; and that was a case in which the lawyers in the House of Commons did not say that the Court of Common Pleas was wrong. In this case, the House was asked to declare a seat vacant on a document that was rotten, on its face; that was not worth the paper it was written on. There was no legal man in the House who would venture to say that the judgment of outlawry, as declared in these documents, would be sustained where British law existed, yet the House was told that for Parliamentary purpose this rotten, illegal paper must be accepted as correct. The House should take the honest, straightforward course which the hon. gentlemen opposite voted last year, and ought to vote this year—to say that the man who was a fugitive from justice and expelled for that reason, was still a fugitive from justice and should be expelled again.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE was surprised that the hon. gentleman should use such vehement language as to call the judgment of a court a rotten document. It was not respectful to the court or to this House. The mere fact that the hon. gentleman characterized these documents as rotten did not make them so. The sentence of outlawry was equal to conviction of crime, and that having been pronounced. the House was not to go behind the record, but simply to accept the judgment of the court and act accordingly. The right hon. gentleman seemed to be extremely anxious that this man should be expelled from the House; the hon. members for Bagot and Terrebonne wished that he should not, but they were all working most harmoniously in order to obtain a common ground upon which they could vote. A great blunder had been made in framing this motion, and he was anxious to see how the hon. gentleman to whom he had alluded would vote on it. They were all exceedingly anxious to put members on the Government side of the House in an awkward position, but they would not accomplish their object. The motion before the House was based upon the procedure of the English House of Commons, and no one would venture to say that Lord JOHN RUSSELL was not quite as good an authority as the hon. member for Kingston. He defied the hon. gentleman to find a single instance where the House of Commons had ever gone behind a verdict of a court to criticise it. The verdict of the court in the SMITH O'BRIEN case was sent down to the Commons from the House of Lords. It might have been competent for any member of the House of Commons to raise an objection to that judgment and state that the House of Lords and the Court of Appeal were wrong, but no one thought of such a thing, and it had been left to a Parliamentarian in Canada to impugn the judgment of a court and characterize it in such strong language.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD pointed to the case of Mr. JOHN MITCHELL, in which