

but rather make it more certain. We are not tied down to the exact words of the *Gazette*, if the words added are of no consequence, or if they tend to make more certain the notice in the *Gazette*. It seems to me these are not objections which ought to prevail in the House.

The motion was agreed to on a division, and the petition was read and received.

The Senate adjourned at 4 p.m.

### THE SENATE.

*Ottawa, Wednesday, February 11th, 1885.*

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock p.m.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

### PRIVATE BILLS.

#### TIME FOR PRESENTING EXTENDED.

HON. MR. LACOSTE, from the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, presented their fourth report, stating that in the Evans, the Terry and the Hatzfeld divorce cases the rules of the House had been complied with; also recommending that in the Cox divorce case the 72nd rule be suspended.

Also the fifth report of the Committee, recommending that the time for presenting Private Bills be extended to Thursday the 26th instant.—Adopted.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (D), "An Act for the relief of George Louis Emil Hatzfeld. (Mr. Kaulbach).

Bill (E), "An Act for the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry. (Mr. Read).

### THE COX DIVORCE CASE.

#### MOTION.

HON. MR. OGILVIE moved that the 72nd rule be dispensed with in so far as it relates to the petition of George Branford Cox, as recommended in the fourth report

of the Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It has been a well understood principle which prevails in this Chamber—at least well understood by a considerable section who are opposed to divorce—that all the rules laid down by the Senate should be scrupulously observed, and that there should be no relaxation whatever in any instance. I do not now speak of the merits of this case, or say whether it is an important relaxation or not, but I call the attention of the Senate to it, and feel that it is incumbent upon us, on the principles we have ourselves laid down, to insist that all the rules be strictly complied with. If we once open the door there is no knowing where we shall stop, and it is the first case I think—at least the first to which my attention has been called—in which a relaxation of the rules has been asked for. I for one should not be disposed to consent to it.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I am disposed to agree with the hon. gentleman that we should not consent to a relaxation of the rules in any case of this kind. I think the Committee have been induced to make this report because recommendations of the same kind have been made with reference to ordinary bills, but I have no recollection of any such recommendation having been made with regard to Bills of Divorce, and I agree with my hon. friend that the full notice required by the rules of the House should be given. I do not think it would be safe for us to proceed with a Bill of Divorce unless that full notice has been given. I would suggest to my hon. friend from Montreal that he should defer this motion until the House has had time to consider whether they will, in the case of a Divorce Bill, agree to any relaxation of their rules. If my hon. friend will postpone his motion until the day after to-morrow the members will be afforded time to consider that question.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—My only reason for asking that the rule be dispensed with in this case is that the informality has been very trifling indeed. It is simply that the notice was not published in the local paper for the full two weeks. It was

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL.