

to sacrifice, to some extent, my private interest and my personal convenience. I protest against this adjournment, because we are imperiling the passage of important measures; and, in view of all the facts, I ask the House to hesitate before consenting to the motion.

HON. MR. READ (Quinté)—There are few members of this House who can go home as easily as I can, and very often I have supported motions for adjournments; but in this instance I think it my duty to vote against the proposal, for this reason: I am in charge of a Bill, and there are parties here watching its progress who are waiting to telegraph to Europe if it should become law, so that the enterprise may go on without delay. I was so informed this morning by one of its directors. It is only a few days since I was home. My seat has hardly got warm since my return, and we are asked to adjourn again and take another jaunt. If we are to adjourn every few days the people of the country will never know when to find us here. During the Session our place should be here. I can go home in seven hours, and I can leave my house at lunch time and get here at 8:30 p.m. the same day. So I have no personal reason for opposing the adjournment, but I think at this period of the Session it is contrary to the public interest to lose so much time.

HON. MR. LACOSTE—In answer to the hon. gentleman from Lunenburg, I think he is wrong in throwing the responsibility of this motion on the Government. Every member of the Senate has a right to make a motion of the kind if he pleases. Last year, or the year before, the hon. gentleman from Delanau dière made such a motion and it was accepted by the House. The position the Government takes is this: the question has been put to me, as representing the Government, whether this adjournment would interfere with the Government business. In reply, I say it will not. It is for the House to declare whether an adjournment would interfere with the business of the House. If it will, the motion should be rejected.

HON. MR. DEVER—I do not think anybody will find fault with the representatives of the Government in this House as matters stand at present. They are doing their duty; but there is another view of the

subject which is worthy of consideration—that the representatives of the Lower Provinces and British Columbia are unable to avail themselves of this proposed adjournment to visit their homes. They are kept here idle and under expense, and that is why we complain. It is not necessary that those who wish to observe Ash Wednesday should visit their respective homes. There are very good and commodious churches in this city, and the gentlemen who wish to put ashes on their foreheads can do it quite as well in Ottawa as anywhere else.

HON. MR. ALMON—According to my calculations, by this adjournment we will lose only $2\frac{1}{2}$ days. Saturday is not a sitting day, neither is Sunday—at least it ought not to be. Monday and Tuesday are not holidays, but Wednesday is a statutory holiday, and the House will meet on Thursday evening. I may be mixed in my arithmetic, but it seems to me that the loss of time will not exceed $2\frac{1}{2}$ days. The hon. member from Lunenburg objects to the adjournment because people will come here to see us on business, and will be disappointed when they find we are away from the Capital. Well, anybody from Lunenburg will find the hon. member here, and any one from Halifax will find me or my colleague. I am perfectly disinterested in this matter, but I think when there are only $2\frac{1}{2}$ days lost there can be no reasonable ground for opposing the motion. The leader of the Senate tells us that the adjournment will not interfere with the Government measures, and I know that the passage of private Bills will not be imperilled. I can see no objection, therefore, to the motion.

HON. MR. COCHRANE—The hon. gentleman from Lunenburg referred to me, I suppose, when he spoke of tramping on somebody's corns—at all events, he looked at me when he spoke. If so, his remarks are unjust and incorrect. When the hon. gentleman arrived here the morning before the last adjournment I heard him say: "It is mighty lucky for me that I got here before this adjournment." Why was it lucky for him? Because he would get the benefit of the adjournment; and I heard the same gentleman remark, when the adjournment was proposed: "If I had known of this I should have stayed at home with my family."