

with the position of the Government which would take this resolution for adjournment out of the category of resolutions for adjournment, which he generally opposed, but there was something due to appearance, and something due to the regularity of their proceedings, and it would be decidedly better if his hon. friend would renew his notice for to-morrow, and then if the House decided to adjourn on Friday it would only take effect from Monday next. There was another reason against a long adjournment: they were not without business; there were committees to be organized and brought into action by the appointment of chairmen, and that action had to be submitted to the House, and there was pressing business, at all events, for one of the committees in consequence of unfortunate vacancies on the staff.

HON. MR. KAULBACH objected to the motion on the ground of want of proper notice. There was plenty to occupy the time of the House, and he did not like that the country should suppose they were in the position of having nothing to do when there was ample work to occupy their time. There was an important motion for to-morrow, notice of which had been given by his hon. friend Dr. Schultz; there was another by the same hon. gentleman for Friday respecting Experimental Farms in the North-West, and also one from his hon. friend from British Columbia which would open a wide subject for discussion as regards the defence of the Pacific coasts of Canada. These matters were all of deep importance and would require ample consideration. However, if the adjournment were required in order to provide a leader for this body he would certainly make no objection. He would not have so much objection to the motion if it had come from a member of the Government who was more likely to know what amount of business would probably come before the House in the next two weeks.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE said the reason why he had substituted the 11th May for the 10th in his motion was that members who returned to Halifax would have to leave home on Sunday in order

to reach Ottawa on Tuesday the 10th, but by adjourning to the 11th May they could leave home on Monday morning in time to reach here for the meeting of the House on the 11th.

HON. MR. SMITH said he was quite satisfied that the public business would not suffer by the proposed adjournment. He desired to add that personally it would be a relief to him as he was scarcely in a condition to remain in the House.

HON. MR. GIRARD was opposed to so long an adjournment and begged to enter his protest. During the recent election the question was discussed in many constituencies as to the necessity for the existence of this branch of the legislature, and whether the country could not dispense with the services of the Senate altogether. An adjournment for a period of three weeks so soon after the meeting of Parliament would add force to the arguments against the existence of the Senate. There was sufficient work indicated in the Speech from the Throne, and if a division was taken on the resolution he would record his vote against it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH understood that there were nine divorce cases to come before the House, and the adjournment might delay some necessary motions in connection with them. If the adjournment took place some hon. gentlemen who were to act on the committees might occupy their time to advantage in looking up the law divorce matters.

HON. MR. McINNES (B. C.) said it appeared to him that if the Government were prepared to bring down the Budget shortly after the opening of Parliament, there would be very little necessity for those adjournments. The Government could not do anything more to lower the standing and influence of the Senate than to propose, after the House had only been a few days in session, to adjourn for three weeks. They had been here for the latter part of last session, and up to the present time this session, without a responsible leader, and if, as the hon. gentleman from Toronto said,