

law is perfectly clear on this subject. I see hon. gentlemen sitting in the House to-day who, we have been informed, have been approached and promised offices under the Crown, and have agreed to accept those offices. In the face of events of this sort it is important that this House should meet from day to day. The liberties of the people, as well as the rights of the Prime Minister, are attacked in what is being done. This House has important duties to discharge, and if the House sits every day at the usual-hour it will be in a position to undertake the discharge of those duties if opportunity occurs. Under these circumstances I trust the leader of the House will not press his motion for an adjournment until Tuesday next.

Mr. WELDON. I hope the hon. gentleman now leading the Government will press the motion for adjournment, for the reason that the Prime Minister, who is responsible for the request made to the House, has declared that in his judgment it is necessary to ask for an adjournment over Friday, Saturday and Monday to enable him to reform the Administration. What possible good to any one, what possible protection to the public, what possible regard for public safety makes it necessary for hon. members to come here on Friday and again on Monday to meet and adjourn. I cannot understand. Time will be wasted. What we now desire is, that the crisis should be brought to an end at the earliest possible moment; and if the hands of the First Minister, who is now employed in the duty of reconstructing the Cabinet, would be more free and his attention be less distracted by the House adjourning two or three days—it being admitted that we are willing to give the hon. gentleman as many days as are asked, if the House meets from day to day—I see no good reason why the Minister who leads the House should consent to the request made by the leader of the Opposition. I think the adoption of the motion before the House would lead to the more rapid conclusion of the crisis, which all good Canadians must heartily desire.

Mr. EDGAR. With respect to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that no harm can happen by giving the Premier four days' delay, instead of the House meeting to-morrow, I would ask the hon. gentleman if any harm can arise by meeting to-morrow. The rules of the House say that the House shall do so under all ordinary circumstances. The members are all here; they have come to the capital to try and transact some business, or get some information for the country at all events, and not merely to knock their heels together around the hotels for four days. The balance of convenience is altogether against the contention of the hon. gentleman. If the leader of the House should come down at three o'clock to-mor-

row and state that no progress has been made, we want to know it, and the country wants to know it. On the other hand, if he is then able to say, as we all hope he will be able to say, that progress is being made, that satisfactory progress is being made, then the meeting of the House will stand over till Monday, and the Premier can go on with his work of reconstruction. Does the meeting of the House for a quarter of an hour to-morrow or for half an hour on Monday delay the Prime Minister in filling up vacancies in the Cabinet? Not one whit. It will accelerate the work; it will cause him to do his duty more rapidly and will hurry him up in discharging the duty of filling the Cabinet positions. I think the leader of the House should consider this matter, and not endeavour to take away the undoubted constitutional right of Parliament, that when a Ministry is being reconstructed or formed in the face of Parliament, members shall have the right to ask explanations as to the progress made from the representatives of the Government at the meeting of the House from day to day.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope the leader of the House will not press his motion. This Parliament is the Parliament that governs this country and not the Committee that we call the Government, which is a Committee of this Parliament. The reason I urge on my hon. friend who is leading the House not to press his motion is this: I must emphasize my opinion and enter my protest against the tendency that is noticeable in parliamentary life in Canada for Parliament to efface itself before the Government of the day. Any man who has observed the course of parliamentary institutions in this country for any length of time, and who has sat in the House for seven or eight years, as I have done, must have seen this—and it would be the same if parties crossed the floor, I have no doubt, it seems to be in the air and to belong to the country, and the sooner it is got rid of the better—that there is a constant tendency on the part of members of the dominant party to voluntarily efface themselves before the Government of the day. And we see a correlative impatience on the part of the Government of the day with the least assertion of the rights of Parliament on the part of their supporters. This Parliament is the Parliament concerned with the Government of Canada to-day, and we have a right, and it is our duty as well as our right, to know from day to day what progress is being made under the unhappy circumstances with which we are now face to face. And I say, Sir, that I am now not speaking more in the interests of parliamentary institutions, than—addressing my hon. friends who are around me—than in the interests of the Conservative party itself. If a proper regard had been had by the members of the Conservative party to their own