

holidays ; but to a large number of hon. members a longer adjournment would be a convenience. Although I belong to the first category, if the business of the House is not to be interfered with by a longer adjournment, and it would be a convenience to many senators, I do not wish to press my own particular views and wishes on the subject against what I think very probably would be the views of the majority. The leader of the House has intimated that the public business would not be interfered with by the adjournment of a fortnight. If he is still of that opinion, I would not oppose the motion of the hon. member from St. John. In that case, perhaps the leader of the House would withdraw his motion, and allow that of the hon. member from St. John to carry. With regard to the amendment proposed by the hon. member from Toronto, I am certainly opposed to so long an extension, and if nobody raises the point of order I shall have to raise it myself—that the motion is not formal, in point of time. It requires a clear day's notice, which we have not had. The hon. gentleman says we could not have given notice any earlier ; but that is his misfortune.

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE—I think it is competent for me to move an amendment to the motion of my hon. friend from St. John extending the time. I move that as an amendment, without any regard to my notice, and if it should carry, then I shall ask the House to allow the notice I have given to drop off the Paper.

HON. MR. MILLER—I would ask the House to reflect for a moment on the position in which it would place itself by adopting the view of the hon. member from Toronto, that no notice of an amendment such as he has proposed is necessary in this House. We will suppose, for instance, that a motion such as that given by the leader of the House stands on the Paper, a motion to adjourn from to-day until Friday, and that a dozen members, quite satisfied with such an adjournment, and having no notice of any other motion in amendment, do not appear in their places here when it is discussed : they find that, in their absence, without notice, the House instead of being adjourned over the holiday, is adjourned for a month. Is the House, willing to put itself in such a posi-

tion ? It is inconsistent with our rules that such an amendment as that which has been suggested by the hon. gentleman from Toronto can be made without notice. It is inconsistent with common sense that it should be made. However, if the House chooses to place itself in that position, to be taken by surprise at any moment—if it chooses to adopt a precedent of that kind—I will submit to it, as others will have to do ; but I think it is an unfortunate position to take, and I ask the Speaker to rule on the point of order that there has not been sufficient notice of this amendment.

HON. MR. VIDAL—On what authority is the statement made that we have not the power to move an amendment of this kind without giving notice ? Is there any rule on the subject ? I am not an old member, but I have been some years in the House and I do not remember any such precedent. My impression is, that it is quite competent for an hon. gentleman to move an amendment without notice at all.

HON. MR. MILLER—Many things are done by consent which are not regular : for instance, if the hon. gentleman's amendment were adopted by consent it would be regular enough.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—Do I understand the hon. gentleman from Sarnia to say that it is not necessary to give notice of an amendment ?

HON. MR. VIDAL—Yes.

HON. MR. DEBOUCHERVILLE—I find in May, chapter 9, the following : "It is customary and more convenient to give notice of an amendment, but it is competent for any member to move an amendment without notice." Therefore, I do not think there is any necessity to give notice, and the hon. gentleman may move his motion as an amendment.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—The hon. gentleman from Toronto gave notice of a substantive motion : that is out of order, because the time was not sufficient. Now he withdraws from the position he took, and is putting his motion as an amendment to the amendment. I concur in the opinion of the hon. member from Richmond that it is not in order, because, instead of reduc-