

jourment. It is very essential that we should hear from the hon. Premier whether, in his opinion, the House should meet before the time suggested.

Hon. Mr. ABBOTT—I was about, when my hon. friend rose, to say what I thought about the motion and its amendment. I am not disposed to favour the adjournment over Monday; I should have preferred to see the adjournment until Monday at 3 o'clock, because, in point of fact, to-day is private members' day in the House of Commons, and we shall probably have some Bills on Monday from both private members and the Government. Then there is this debate, which commences this afternoon. I hope it will be over by six o'clock; but I do not know that it will be, and if we adjourn it will delay the conclusion of the debate. The amendment certainly has some reason for it, because gentlemen from Ontario would have to leave home on Sunday evening to be here in time for Monday at 3 o'clock, but they can arrive here in time for the evening session by leaving on Monday morning.

Hon. Mr. PELLETIER—Members from Quebec would have the same difficulty; they would have to leave Sunday evening to be here in time.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—These adjournments are always for the benefit and pleasure of gentlemen who live near the capital. They are not at all pleasant to members from other parts of the Dominion, who have to stay here, and if hon. gentlemen only knew how lonely we feel, how we miss their society when they go, they would not inflict us with this sort of thing too frequently.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE AIKINS DIVORCE BILL.

FIFTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DIVORCE.

Hon. Mr. GOWAN, from the Select Committee on Divorce, presented the fifth report, which was read at the Table, as follows:—

“With respect to the Bill intituled: ‘An Act for the relief of James Albert Manning Aikins,’ your committee having carefully considered all the circumstances of the case, and it having been shown in evidence before them that it will be impracticable to serve a copy of the said Bill, and notice of the second reading thereof, upon the respondent personally, recommends that service thereof may

be made by mailing the same post paid and registered, addressed to Mary Bertha Aikins, care of each of the following parties, viz: T. E. McLelan, Truro, N.S.; Gordon W. McLelan, St. Catharines, Ont.; Mrs. A. W. McLelan, Truro, N.S.; C. W. Blanchard, box 139, Laredo, Texas; and also by addressing copies thereof to the said four persons respectively.”

He said: In this case application was made to the committee, under the Rule . to be allowed to make substitutional service. The committee found that it came fairly within the terms of the rule. After personal service was made upon the respondent, she and her alleged paramour went to Mexico, and it is purposed in this application to allow service to be made upon two of her brothers, and upon her mother, and addressed to herself in Mexico, where it is supposed she is, and where one of her relatives said she might be found. I move the adoption of the report.

The motion was agreed to.

THE MEAD DIVORCE BILL.

SIXTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. GOWAN, from the Select Committee on Divorce, presented the sixth report, which was read at the Table, as follows:—

“With respect to a Bill intituled: ‘An Act for the relief of Herbert Remington Mead,’ your committee have carefully considered all the circumstances of the case, and it having been shown in evidence before them that it will be impracticable to serve a copy of the said Bill, and notice of the second reading thereof, upon the respondent personally, recommends that service thereof may be made by mailing the same post paid and registered addressed to Mrs. B. M. Morris, care of J. M. Harris, Rancher, Halbut, Montana; and to B. M., care of Dr. McFarlane, 21 Leavenworth street, Waterbury; and to the said Dr. McFarlane.”

He said: This is a case coming under the same rule as the previous one. The respondent was served personally with notice of the application. She is now living under a feigned name in the United States, and cannot be served personally with a notice of the second reading of the Bill. The committee, therefore, recommend that the same course be followed as recommended in the previous case, that there shall be a substitutional service.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I did not catch the reason given by the hon. chairman of the