

distance from Ottawa it is obvious that an adjournment of two or three days would be of no value. Consequently the practice has grown up of making an extended adjournment at Easter, and making it long enough to enable those who reside at some distance to visit their homes. My own opinion of this adjournment would be to make it from Friday evening to Tuesday evening, but I see plainly that there is a strong sentiment in the House in favor of extending the holiday at both ends—that is, to allow the adjournment to commence on Thursday evening and extend it to ten days. The reason that is given for this is that hon. members who leave here on Thursday evening can reach their homes in the lower Provinces and in the North-West and Manitoba for Sunday. In like manner they can leave their homes on Monday and reach here by Wednesday night. I recognize a great deal of force in that, although my own opinion would be to adjourn from Friday night till Tuesday night. However, if the House is disposed to take the extra days, I would be disposed to yield to it; but I should like to know what the views of hon. members are.

THE SPEAKER—The question is on the amendment to the motion of Mr. Perley.

HON. MR. DICKEY—I rise merely to express my regret that my hon. friend, with his usual good nature as leader of the House, has so far yielded his own opinion as to give us an opportunity of consenting to an adjournment which I consider is too long. I think that the position which the hon. leader of the House took in the first instance was a proper one, and I regret very much that he has yielded to the pressure to consent that the House may adjourn for a longer term. My own experience is that the ordinary adjournment is quite sufficient, and any further adjournment is very much to be deprecated.

HON. MR. DEVER—I do not know that any hon. gentleman, if he wants to go home, should be ashamed to say so, nor that he should be ashamed to say so if he does not want to go home.

The amendment was agreed to on a division.

NORTH CANADIAN ATLANTIC RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CO.'S BILL.

REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE.

HON. MR. BOLDUC (in the absence of Mr. LACOSTE) moved the third reading of the Bill (88) "An Act to incorporate the North Canadian Atlantic Railway and Steamship Company."

HON. MR. ABBOTT—This Bill was allowed to stand over when it was last before this House, with a view to the consideration of the question whether the company should be permitted to erect a bridge across the River St. Lawrence from the Island of Orleans to the main shore. That question has been laid before my colleagues, and we think it would be impolitic to allow an obstacle of that kind to be placed to the navigation of the St. Lawrence at a point where the whole of the shipping, which visits our country passes through, and I am sorry to say that I cannot on behalf of the Government, give my consent to the Bill passing with that clause in it. In fact, to facilitate matters, it would be best for me to move, as I now do, that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended by striking out section 4 of the Bill with its sub-sections, and the 5th and 6th sections.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Are those all bridge clauses?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—They are all with reference to the bridge.

HON. MR. BOLDUC—I understand that the promoters of this bridge have agreed that the clauses referred to be stricken out, and I have no objection to the motion.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not know if I understood the leader of the House to say that it was the view of the Government that there should be no bridge built across the St. Lawrence in that locality at all. There is a projected bridge in which the Maritime Provinces are interested—that is, the bridge which is to cross at Quebec. I do not know if this expression of opinion from the leader is general, or with regard to this particular bridge. The exercise of the powers mentioned in the Bill must be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and I think it