

will be produced as soon as possible in response to this address.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (C) "An Act for the relief of Adam Russworm." (Mr. Merner.)

Bill (F) "An Act further to amend the Act respecting Trade Marks and Industrial Designs." (Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (E) "An Act respecting the settlement of accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and between the said Provinces." (Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (A) "An Act for the settlement of certain questions between the Governments of Canada and Ontario respecting Indian Lands." (Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (B) "An Act to amend "The Bills of Exchange Act, 1890." (Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (19). "An Act respecting the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company." (Mr. McCallum.)

Bill (17) "An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company." (Mr. MacInnes, Burlington.)

Bill (22) "An Act respecting the Lake Temiscamingue Colonization Railway Company." (Mr. MacInnes, Burlington.)

Bill (D) "An Act to amend cap. 91 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intitled: "An Act respecting the protection of Navigable Waters." (Mr. Clemow.)

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved that the Senate do now adjourn.

HON. MR. POWER—Before the House adjourns, I wish to call attention to an omission in the minutes of the proceedings of our last sitting. Several petitions were presented just before the House adjourned, and they are not mentioned in the minutes of proceedings. I think the leader of the House rather set the example of irregularity in presenting them just before the adjournment of the House, and the Clerk, I presume, did not get the petitions down on his notes.

HON. MR. CLELOW—I presented a great many petitions at the last sitting of the House, but I find in the minutes of proceedings that very few are reported as having been presented by me, though I presented some thirty or forty.

HON. MR. MILLER—This is a very serious matter. I presented a number of petitions myself, and I do not know whether they are included or not. Unless they appear in the Journals hereafter the gentlemen who sent these petitions will think they were not attended to at all.

HON. MR. CLELOW—The omission ought to be remedied in some way, as people will be anxious to ascertain whether their petitions were presented, when they find no record of them in the Journals.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, June 1st, 1891.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PETITIONS FOR DIVORCES.

MOTION.

HON. MR. GOWAN, from the Select Committee on Divorce, presented their third report, recommending that the time for presenting petitions for divorce be extended until the 1st of July next. He moved the adoption of the report. He said: In consequence of the long adjournment, two or three cases that are nearly ripe could not come up unless we adopt this report, and in view of possible contingencies it was thought advisable to extend the time. I hope that in a day or two all the petitions will be in.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I think it is a very unusual proceeding. The rules of this House have been invariably construed strictly in dealing with all matters relating to divorce. I think my hon. friend is proposing a latitude that this House will consider very unreasonable when he asks us to extend the time until next July for allowing petitions to be presented. It is an intimation to the world—to Canada at least—that this House is prepared at all times to consider petitions for divorce, and to give latitude to such cases wholly un-