

to his seat. It would be a great hardship for him to be deprived of the privilege of taking his seat until the arrival of the return.

MR. MACKENZIE : Who sends the telegraphic certificate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The returning officer.

MR. MACKENZIE : But it must be from the Judge who had the recount.

MR. MOUSSEAU : There was no recount held.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : Not demanded.

MR. MOUSSEAU said that at the same time the telegram was received by Mr. Pope, another telegram to the same effect was sent to the member himself.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not suppose any member of the House would desire for a moment to keep any person out of his seat who was legitimately entitled to it ; but the question they had to consider was that the time within which a recount could be demanded only expired the day previous, and was it not possible that a recount might have been demanded ?

MR. MOUSSEAU : No. If a recount had been demanded the proclamation would not have been made.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was some case wherein they declined to accept a telegraphic certificate. He could not remember for the moment what case it was ; probably hon. gentlemen opposite would remember.

MR. KIRKPATRICK : It was in Manitoba.

MR. MACKENZIE said that might be so. He did not remember. He had no personal objection himself whatever to the elected member being introduced into the House, except that they might be going beyond their usual custom of requiring the ordinary certificate of the returning

officer. His impression was that, on a former occasion, the hon. gentleman opposite called the attention of the House to the danger of accepting a telegram which might be sent by any one. That was the only difficulty. They had no absolute certificate identifying the sender of the telegram as the proper party to send such a message.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was the difficulty, and he thought he remembered having called the attention of the House to that on the occasion of the election of his hon. friend Mr. Langevin. In this case they would take one step further than they were usually in the habit of doing. Usually they had been in the habit of accepting the return of the returning officer, and entering at the same time upon the journals of the House that it should not be made a precedent. This would be going one step farther, and saying that the return could be sent over the wires as well as in an envelope. The reason why his hon. friend made this application was that the gentleman, of whose election there was no doubt, would be subjected to considerable hardship by being excluded from taking his seat until the certificate could arrive, in the due course of a long winter's journey. He thought the hon. gentleman might be allowed to take his seat, and an entry made upon the journals of the House that it should not be made a precedent.

MR. MILLS said there was another difficulty to be regarded. It was necessary for a new member to preserve a duplicate of the certificate to the Clerk of the House for the purpose of identity, before he could be sworn in. He did not think the Clerk could swear the hon. gentleman until he had produced such certificate. He did not think the House could do anything in the matter. There was a difference between recognising the election of a member known to the House, and the recognition of one who was elected for the first time.

MR. MOUSSEAU said he had made a mistake about the time within which a recount could be demanded. It was not five days, it was four days, so that the period had expired on Monday. As to