

Toronto has moved to leave out certain words in order to insert other words. I furthermore believe the amendment to be relevant to the question before the House. It is admitted by the hon. member who calls for the ruling of the Chair that an amendment can be made to a special motion for an adjournment, but he says it must be to shorten, and not to extend the time. I see no rule of this House which, in my opinion, would justify me in coming to that conclusion, and I find no such distinction in the works on parliamentary practice. Accordingly, I am of opinion and I rule that the sub-amendment is in order.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—My hon. friend from Belleville contends that this adjournment could be made to the 26th instant without interfering with the legislation. It is virtually an adjournment until the 27th, because we are to meet in the evening of the 26th, simply to show ourselves. None of us would feel disposed for legislation after a long journey. Therefore, we are virtually asked, shortly after the opening of the session, to adjourn for a month. My hon. friend from Toronto has not supported his motion by any argument justifying him in asking for such an adjournment. We were told last session by the leader that a large number of private Bills would be introduced in the Senate this year. My hon. friend no doubt has not the disposal of such matters; he has not the control of private Bill legislation, but I believe he has a number of measures to introduce in the Senate now, if the House should continue sitting. We were promised, at the opening of the session in the other branch, that the public business would be immediately brought down. That promise has been fulfilled. In the other House a large amount of Government legislation has been already introduced. On Tuesday next the House goes into Committee of Supply. Several private Bills have been introduced. The Government have brought in a Bill for extending the *modus vivendi*, giving the Americans a certain right in our inshore fisheries. That is a measure of very great importance, and one which should receive most careful consideration. Then we have the codification of the criminal laws and a Bill for the exercise of Admiralty jurisdiction. We have also a measure to give over to the Local Legislatures the

right to the foreshore, a matter of very great importance. There is also a measure with regard to the administration of justice, and there are other matters requiring careful and continuous attention. Will any one tell me that if we adjourn for nearly a month it will not interfere with the progress of legislation? Many of the Bills to which I have referred must pass the lower House before the end of this proposed adjournment. If we remain here we can make ourselves familiar with the proceedings in the other House, and mature our minds on the important questions to come before us, so that we can discuss them intelligently. Will my hon. friend from Toronto tell me that we are going to run over the whole of Canada for a month, and when we come back here be in a position to legislate as efficiently as if we remained at our posts?

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—I wish to correct my hon. friend: it is only twenty days.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is virtually a month lost, because we have yet done nothing, except to pass the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. There are private Bills to be introduced in the Senate, and, I believe, Government measures also, and the leader of the Senate has not taken upon himself to assure us that the adjournment proposed by my hon. friend from Toronto will not interfere with the public business.

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—I submit that by his silence the leader of the House has acquiesced in this adjournment. If the public business required our presence here within the time specified in my amendment he would have said so.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The leader of the House has given notice of a motion for an adjournment over to-morrow, and he has not proposed to change it. I have no doubt he will stand by his own view. If he had thought the adjournment should be longer he would have supported the amendment of my hon. friend. There is a large amount of divorce business to come before us, and work for the committees—enough business to be attended to if we remain here to look after it. I have