posed adjournment is granted they can. I understand that the Budget is to be brought down to-morrow, and that the debate thereon is likely to occupy several days, when no business will be brought up to this House. Short adjournments are of no value to members who do not live within a reasonable distance; but if the adjournment proposed in my motion is considered too long, it might be reduced to the 9th of April.

HON. MR. MCINNES (B. C.)—Better make it a week longer, so that British Columbia members can go home.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I am taken by surprise in this matter. I understood from my hon. friends that they had withdrawn this motion for to-day, and had made it for to-morrow, and I see another motion to the same effect on the Order Paper for to-morrow. I think my hon. friend had better withdraw his motion. It is not in the interest of the public or in the interest of legislation that these adjournments should take place. When we come to look at the number of Bills of great importance, such as the Banking Bill, Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange Bill, and other important Bills that are to come before this House, I do not think it is advisable that we should have such a long adjournment. If we do adjourn, it should be simply over the Easter holidays, the same as the House of Commons. They will probably meet every day except one next week. In consequence of those repeated applications for adjournments, the business of this House is not in a satisfactory position. They are generally brought up for discussion by gentlemen who do not take an active interest in the business of the House. There is no necessity for adjourning beyond Tuesday. The banks are open on other days, business is going on, and men are at work in the streets and in their shops, yet the Senate is asked, for some particular purpose, to adjourn for several days. Yesterday the Senate did not meet, though the pages and messengers were on hand; the Senators alone were absent.

HON. MR. ROBITAILLE — Yesterday was a statutory holidy.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—If my hon. friend wished to say his prayers on that day there was no reason why he should not do so; but even that hon. gentleman I found about the House, as well as others, though it was a day supposed to be set apart for prayers. I do not know that there is anything obligatory that we should do no work on that day.

HON. MR. ROBITAILLE—It is a statutory holiday.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—There are several important Bills before the committee of which I am chairman—the Divorce Committee—that we cannot go on with, and if this long adjournment takes place the effect may be that justice will not be done. I think we had better alter the rules of our House and the constitution of the Senate, and provide that all those days that hon. gentlemen take as holidays should not be taken at the expense of the public. We are called here to do important business, and we should stay and attend to it. If the adjourned days were called absent days, and were taken from the indemnity of members, there would not be so many adjournments asked for. I say in all earnestness that it is not in our interests to adjourn; because, after an adjournment, whether long or short, we come here rushed with business, and instead of discussing the public measures before us in a deliberate way, they will be put through in a manner not creditable to this House. I contend that we had better adjourn the Senate altogether and amend the constitution, if we are to bring upon ourselves, by our own conduct, the adverse criticism of the public. I do hope the leader of the House, having the responsibility on his shoulders of seeing that the business of the Senate is prosecuted effectively, will, in the interest of legislation, and in the public interest, oppose prolonged holidays as being detrimental to the best interests of the country. We had an adjournment in the early part of the Session for ten days. Then we had another adjournment of ten days.

AN HON. GENTLEMAN—No; only a week.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Well, say a week; yet, here we are asked again for another adjournment of two weeks. I was going to say I wonder that my hon. friend has the audacity to rise in the House and propose such a motion as this. The Bills