

always opposed these adjournments. They are simply intimations to the country that we consider ourselves a useless body. We are here to look after the public business, and we should attend to it, regardless of our own personal interests. If any hon. member wishes to go home he can do so: there is no necessity to adjourn the Senate for the convenience of private members. I contend seriously and strenuously that it is not in the interest of good legislation to adjourn for such a length of time. I therefore ask the House to vote down the proposition to adjourn for a month.

HON. MR. SMITH—It is exactly twelve working days.

HON. MR. READ—I am surprised to hear the hon. member from Lunenburg tell us that twenty days are a month. It is an indication of the value of his arguments.

HON. MR. VIDAL—We should have a statement from the leader of the House as to the effect which the proposed adjournment is likely to have on the public business. If he will give us information on that point it will enable us to determine what adjournment is desirable. If there was any danger that the public business would suffer or be retarded by an adjournment none of us would desire it, but we know very well that there is ample time for a considerable adjournment at the beginning of the session, and we can still keep up with the legislation from the other House. We have had such adjournments every session, and we have never found that the public business has been delayed or injured by them. I am inclined to support the adjournment proposed by the hon. member from St. John, but before making up my mind on the subject I wish to hear what the leader of the House has to say with regard to the business that is likely to come before us, and whether that business will be injuriously affected by an adjournment till the 26th instead of the 20th instant.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—With reference to the business which is likely to come before the House I cannot speak with any degree of positiveness; but I can say that there are several Bills now ready, of which a considerable proportion will be intro-

duced in the Senate, and may be introduced early in the coming week. There is that work, which undoubtedly we might do during the period which would be covered by this adjournment. There are also the divorce Bills, in which the first stage ought to be taken, in order to give ample time for the taking of evidence and the discussion of the matters involved in them before the prorogation of Parliament, which I hope will not be at too distant a date. The difference between the time which these two adjournments would give us, in order to do this and other business which may originate in this House incidentally—business of which there is always more or less some—the time which we will lose by the adjournment proposed by the hon. member from Toronto would be eleven sitting days. The time which we would lose by the adjournment proposed by the hon. member from St. John would be eight sitting days: there is a difference of three days between the two periods of adjournment. Now that I have told hon. gentlemen what we shall probably have before us in the course of these eleven days, they know as well as I do how far we should be retarded or impeded in the due performance of our legislative duties by the loss of this time. It would certainly retard us in our work; but I cannot say whether, after the expiry of that period, we could not regain the loss of time. I think it is probable we could, and I do not say that the result of it would be any serious injury to the business of the session, because in reality this adjournment is not so great as the adjournments of last session, and no greater than many of our adjournments have been.

HON. MR. MILLER—Which adjournment before the recess do you allude to?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Even the longest would not be so great as the one we had last year. Of course, we had a very long session last year; I hope this session will not be so long. I have stated the facts, and it is for the House to say whether they can regain the time we are likely to lose in the probably shorter period after the termination of this adjournment that we shall have to regain it in. I must say, for myself, that I am in favour of the adjournment proposed by the hon. member from St. John. I do not think that it