

HON. MR. MILLER—I should like to know whether the leader of the House considers it proper that a report on a petition for divorce should be adopted without the ordinary formality of allowing it to stand over for a day in order that members may have an opportunity of examining it. The House should know what it is doing.

HON. MR. LACOSTE—The report has been read at the Table, and it merely states that all the formalities required under our rules have been complied with. This is merely a preliminary report, and I am under the impression that it has been usual, in this House, to adopt such reports when they are presented, unless an objection is raised by some member. If the hon. member objects to the adoption of this report now, it must stand until Monday.

HON. MR. MILLER—I do not object to the motion. I wished to elicit the view of the leader of the House on the question.

HON. MR. VIDAL—This is merely a preliminary report, stating that certain requirements of the House have been complied with. It does not deal at all with the merits of the case. It is simply doing what has hitherto been done, in former Sessions, at the bar of the House. I see no reason, under the circumstances, for delaying the adoption of the report.

HON. MR. MILLER—The report relates to very important matters in connection with the case before us. While I do not question the correctness of the report in any particular, still I think it was only proper that the attention of the House should be called to it, in order that we may know what we are really asked to concur in. The report having been read, I have no objection to its adoption, and I do not care if the same course be followed in all such cases; but let us understand clearly what we are doing.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (H) "An Act for the relief of Christiana Filman Glover." (Mr. Sanford.)

Bill (G) "An Act for the relief of Hugh Forbes Keefer." (Mr. Clemow.)

Bill (I) "An Act for the relief of David Philip Clapp." (Mr. Clemow.)

Bill (K) "An Act respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto." (Mr. McKindsey.)

Bill (J) "An Act respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company." (Mr. Clemow.)

THE WALKER DIVORCE CASE.

HON. MR. DICKEY, from the Select Committee on Divorce, presented their report on the petition of Emily Walker for a divorce.

HON. MR. SANFORD moved the adoption of the report.

HON. MR. MILLER—This is clearly a different case from the others. This report recommends that the petitioner be allowed to withdraw her petition and substitute a new petition. So important a step should not be taken without some explanation in justification of the course. I presume the leader of the House will not allow such a report to be adopted without due notice. I shall object to the adoption of the report to-day, because I desire to know why such a recommendation is made to the House.

HON. MR. SANFORD moved that the report be taken into consideration on Monday next.

HON. MR. ALMON—How will we know more about this report on Monday next than we know now?

HON. MR. MILLER—I presume that the gentleman who makes the motion, or the chairman of the committee, will be prepared to explain to the House why such a course was taken.

HON. MR. DICKEY—An appeal has been made to me to ascertain why this recommendation was made. The petition is irregular. One of the requirements of our rules is wholly absent—that is to say, there was no negating of any collusion or any connivance; that was the only ground on which we objected to the petition at the moment. That, I apprehend, is the information that my hon. friend requires. All the notices had been given, and if within thirty days the petitioner should bring in a proper petition it would go to the committee, and the House would