

enough to enable those members who live at some distance from the Capital to go to their homes and return again, and I would suggest that instead of adjourning until Monday next it would be better to adjourn until the 19th instant.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—In order to avoid any technical objection on Wednesday, would it not be better for my hon. friend to give notice of a motion for a longer adjournment? I do not make this motion with any desire to press it on the House or to use the influence of the Government to carry it. I want to elicit the opinion of the House, and if the hon. gentleman will name a later day the whole question will come up on Wednesday, and if a longer adjournment is desired the House will so determine.

HON. MR. MILLER—I am opposed to any adjournment. We are called here at a late season of the year, and with the understanding that we should have the business of the country placed before us as speedily as possible. But if we are to meet from day to day and merely hear the Chaplain read the prayers and then separate, and if it would be a convenience to members to get to their homes for a few days, I am not disposed to throw any obstacle in the way. My object in rising just now was to suggest the course proposed by the leader of the House, if any hon. member desires a longer adjournment than the one that has been proposed.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—I think the adjournment should be from Wednesday next until Tuesday, the 19th inst., at 8:30 p.m. Such an adjournment would not interfere with the public business, and we need not have any further adjournment.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Although the discussion is quite irregular, I wish to express my objection to any adjournment. It will have the effect of protracting the business of the House. Certainly it will interfere with the progress of the divorce bills; they will be delayed in their preliminary stages if we adjourn now. I have always been opposed to those adjournments. I believe that by remaining here we accelerate the progress of business. The Government know that we are here

ready to attend to their measures, when they bring them to us. It is not in the public interest or in the interest of good legislation that we should have so many adjournments as are applied for every session.

HON. MR. VIDAL—We are making a mistake in permitting discussions to arise on questions which are not before the House. It is quite out of order to debate a question on a notice of motion. The intention of giving notice is to enable members to consider questions before debating them.

HON. MR. McCLELAN—I do not think there is any irregularity in the discussion; the leader of the House wished to elicit the views of members. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for St. John, that if we are to have an adjournment at all it should be long enough to enable those who live at a distance from the Capital to visit their homes. I have no objection to the adjournment on the understanding, as stated by the hon. member from Alma, that when we return we remain here until the public business is finished.

HON. MR. DEVER gave notice that he will on Wednesday next move that when the House adjourns it stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 20th instant, at 8:30 p.m.

#### SENATOR ALEXANDER'S SEAT.

##### MOTION.

THE SPEAKER read a communication from the Clerk setting forth that the Hon. George Alexander had for two Sessions been absent from his place in the House.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved that the report of the Clerk be referred to the Committee appointed to consider the Orders and Customs of this House and the Privileges of Parliament, the Committee to meet at a quarter to three in the Senate Chamber to-morrow.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I do not remember at this moment the course adopted on a former occasion—

HON. MR. ABBOTT—It is the same.