

hon. gentleman read the concluding portion of a speech made by his former leader, then Minister of Justice, in the case of the Cox Divorce Bill. I did not read that part of Sir Alexander Campbell's speech, for this reason: On one day (I think Friday) Sir Alexander Campbell called the attention of the hon. gentleman from Alma division to the fact that the notice was short, and on the second day, when he made the speech, the latter part of which the hon. gentleman has quoted, he dealt solely with the question of notice, and having expressed a strong opinion that owing to the fact that the notice was not sufficient the petition should not be proceeded with, he went on to give these additional reasons; but the portion of Sir Alexander's speech which I quoted dealt solely with the question of notice. The hon. gentleman has met the difficulty by expressing his willingness to let the report be referred back to the committee and wait until the notice has matured. I move that the Bill be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOW—I regret that the hon. gentleman from Halifax should continue his opposition to this Bill, seeing that although a slight irregularity has taken place, it is not of a character to affect the general principle. The notice has been published six months in the *Canada Gazette*, and the only party interested has been personally served. I cannot understand why any further delay should occur. If this report is referred back, no further step can be taken for the next fourteen or fifteen days, and that may imperil the passage of the Bill. We know that irregularities occur frequently in these matters—that often the time of a private Bill is extended—and if we raise these little technical difficulties on every occasion I do not know where we will end. I hope the hon. gentleman will give way and let the Bill take its course. If he does not, of course I do not intend to divide the House on the subject. I know that he is right technically, and if I could see any injury that could be occasioned by the adoption of this report now, I should not ask for it. Possibly we will have a very short session, and by delaying the Bill we may deprive this unfortunate man of the relief that he seeks from the Senate.

Hon. Mr. BELLEROSE—If this Bill were in the public interest a case might be made

out for setting aside the rules, but I understand that a majority of the Senate, though in favour of divorce, is inclined to discourage these Bills. Now, if we are not to encourage divorce Bills, we must demand in all cases that our rules be strictly complied with, and I think, therefore, that this Bill should be referred back to the committee.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I should be glad to do anything I could to oblige the hon. gentleman from Rideau division. There is no member of this House that I would rather oblige, but seeing that my objection is based altogether on the action taken by the hon. gentleman who was his leader in this House for many years, a high legal authority, he could not expect me to depart from that good example, even at his request.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 4.20 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, March 24th, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

AN ADJOURNMENT.

MOTION.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY moved—

That when the House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 29th inst., at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—My hon. friend should give us some reasons for this adjournment. I see in the other House they have decided to adjourn over until Monday, and the same might be done here. The hon. gentleman's proposal seems unreasonable. We have been in session for a month now, and we should have some work before us to do. I move in amendment that when the House adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until 8 o'clock on Monday evening.

Hon. Mr. VIDAL—It has been an invariable and, I think, a proper custom in this Senate, before agreeing to an adjournment beyond the ordinary routine, to know from the leader of the House whether the public business would be at all injured by the ad-