

## AN ADJOURNMENT.

## MOTION.

HON. MR. OGILVIE moved that when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 25th day of May, at 8 o'clock in the evening. He said that his reason for moving this adjournment was that Thursday, Saturday and Tuesday would be public holidays, and if the House did not adjourn, members would have to remain here for six days to do two days' work.

HON. MR. VIDAL thought it was exceedingly inexpedient that the House should at this period of this session be asked to adjourn for a week, within so short a time after having had a long recess, and so much work on the order paper. He would propose a compromise and would move an amendment that when the House adjourns on Friday, it do stand adjourned until Wednesday, at eight o'clock in the evening.

HON. MR. MILLER said that under any circumstances, if the motion carried, there would have to be a separate motion to have the House adjourn over until Friday. The regular way would be to adjourn the House to-day until Friday, and then to give notice of a motion to adjourn on Friday over any length of time that the House might decide.

HON. MR. VIDAL said it would be desirable to ascertain the mind of the House on this particular question should they sit on Friday or not; if the House decided that they would not sit on Friday, then there would be no necessity for making a second motion that the House adjourn until Friday.

HON. MR. OGILVIE suggested that the hon. leader of the House should say whether the public business would suffer by the proposed adjournment.

HON. MR. KAULBACH objected to the adjournment, as he did to all such adjournments, as he felt that it was the duty of members to be in their places when there was business before the House. He did not think those adjourn-

ments were in the interest of the public or in the interest of good legislation. He would not like it to go abroad that there was no work to be done, because any hon. gentleman on looking at the order paper must see that there was plenty of business before them, and that they could not get the order paper cleared by Friday night.

HON. MR. DICKEY asked whether hon. members considered that they were doing justice to themselves, whether they were doing justice to the business of the country or to the position they occupied by making those repeated adjournments merely for the purpose of enabling some hon. gentlemen to visit their homes? They were leaving their posts without leave from the country, without the approbation of the country, and they would be doing it against the innermost feeling of the very gentlemen who are asked to vote for the adjournment.

HON. MR. POWER seconded the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Sarnia. He thought if the House was as industrious as usual they could work off the business on their order paper by Friday night, and he thought it would probably be drawing the line a little too tightly to say that members should remain here on Saturday, Sunday and Tuesday for the purpose of working on Monday. He knew that the impression was getting abroad in the country that this Chamber was not of much value as a branch of the legislative machinery. He had at one time or another tried to oppose that view, but really if they were to go on a little longer as they had been going, he would not be so well able to defend it in the future as he had been in the past.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—With reference to this question of adjournment, of course, the Government are entirely in the hands of the Senate. They are all here and ready to attend to their work and propose to do what the Senate desires; but I may say with regard to the work that if it were not in deference to the opinion of hon. members who have been in this House longer than I have been, I should not consider that