

place. Now, the hon. gentleman must recollect that quite a large proportion of the members of this House are gentlemen who come from a very long distance. They cannot go home, they have got to remain here until Tuesday. I am speaking solely on the question of convenience which the hon. gentleman has advanced as one which ought to weigh the House in taking a course absolutely opposed to all former precedents. If I understand the hon. gentleman aright, the proposition laid down was this, that we were passing through a condition of affairs for which it was difficult to find a precedent. We acknowledge that, but there is no difficulty in our adopting the constitutional course, which I think I am right in saying has been almost invariable, that while a government is in process of construction and the House of Commons is sitting, adjournment should take place *de die in diem*. That is an almost absolute rule, and I think hon. gentlemen will find it exceedingly difficult to quote a precedent the other way. Now, we stand in that position, and the hon. gentleman advances the proposition that the adjournment is for the convenience of members. I challenge that proposition; I say it is not; I say it is distinctly for their inconvenience and disadvantage; and when you are asking us to violate a constitutional rule which has been most rigidly adhered to in Great Britain and her colonies, and to adopt a new, and I venture to say, a bad precedent, and when there is no other argument in support of it than the one which the hon. gentleman suggested, that it is for the convenience of members, I respectfully submit to him that it is not. I would urge upon him that since the leader of the Opposition has expressed his earnest desire to give every reasonable latitude to the Government in undertaking, in the peculiar circumstances in which they find themselves, to re-form the Government at the request of His Excellency, and while we are willing to do everything in our power reasonably to further those views, still the hon. gentleman ought not to ask us to join in setting a precedent which in itself is bad, and which will be quoted hereafter and have a bad effect on future occasions. The convenience of members is against it, parliamentary procedure is against it, the precedents are against it, and there is nothing I can see in favour of it at all. We can meet to-morrow, and the hon. gentleman, if he has made any progress then, can inform us; and the House will then be in a position, if called upon, to give advice to His Excellency from day to day. That is one of the rights of which this House is possessed, a right which we can exercise to-day, or can exercise to-morrow, that is, tendering respectfully to His Excellency any advice the House may see fit, or may be in a position to give. I am inclined to think that, if it were not for the message which has been read to-day, the

House might have done that. The House will not, under the circumstances, do it now; but I say that to ask the House to adjourn for four or five days, when it will not be in a position to give the advice which it ought to give, if called for, is a course to which I hope the hon. gentleman will not press the House to accede, and one which, if he does press the House to accede to, the House will refuse to do so.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I may be allowed one word in explanation—when I spoke of the convenience of members, I viewed it in this manner. First, most of the members leave town on Friday and return on Monday, and when I spoke of the convenience of members I thought that we were reducing the delay from the time which was mentioned in my motion that is now on the Order paper, to Tuesday instead of ten days, the delay which I originally asked for. Now, that is one of the reasons why I think that the delay we ask for now is the shortest possible delay that will meet the case. The hon. gentleman knows very well that we do not sit on Saturday, so that it is really only a delay of two sittings we ask for, in order to give the Premier an opportunity of re-forming his Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. For my part I do not quite understand the anxiety of the Government to obtain a delay or an adjournment of the House until next Tuesday. Speaking for myself, and echoing in that respect what has fallen from the opposite side of the House, I think the House is quite willing to give every indulgence and every facility to the Government in their difficult task, and in the very difficult position in which they have been placed. Then why should we depart from the well established constitutional rule? This is the great council of the nation. We are here to advise His Excellency, if necessary, and why we should be sent about our business in order that the Government may be filled up, or that the Government may fill up the vacant portfolios, is, under the circumstances, what I am unable to understand. I am quite free to admit that there are no precedents; and I quite agree with what has fallen from the hon. gentleman who is leading the House, that no precedent for the position can be found. We have a Government *de jure*; we have a Government, as I understand, *de facto*; and the only question that occurs to me is whether we will have a quorum of the House of Commons when we meet next Tuesday, if members are taken from the House to fill positions at the rate that has been going on for the last forty-eight hours. We have, therefore, a Government both *de jure* and *de facto*; and it is to be remembered that this is not a ministerial crisis in the ordinary sense, it is not the case of the resignation of a Minister, or the resignation of a Prime Minister,