

right to accuse me of acting with disrespect for the proper dignity of the hon. leader of the House. Before the hon. senator takes me to task, he should ascertain the facts.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—I decidedly object to the House adjourning in order to give members a chance to go to the other House and listen to the speeches there. I believe that the debate in this House will be fully as interesting as the debate in the Commons. When hon. members of the other House set the example of adjourning to come in a body to this chamber to listen to our speeches, then I will be prepared to acquiesce in the present motion, which seems to me utterly unexplainable on the part of an hon. gentleman who very properly calls himself a young member in this House. As far as I am concerned, I would insist that we should know the reason why we are adjourning, and rather than that reason should go to the public we should insist upon going on with the business to day, especially as the hon. mover is ready to proceed.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—I have no objection to this motion on one condition: I think it is a very bad precedent, but I shall vote in favour of the motion if this House will order that the statement that we were going to adjourn to allow members an opportunity to hear the debate in the Commons be struck out.

Hon. Mr. POIRIER—Hear, hear.

The motion was agreed to

The Senate adjourned.

## SENATE.

*Ottawa, Tuesday, January 17, 1905.*

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

THE SEAT OF HON. RUFUS CURRY.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

The SPEAKER—I beg to inform the House that I have received from the Clerk of the Senate a report with reference to the Hon. Mr. CLORAN.

absence of the Hon. Mr. Rufus Curry, which reads as follows:—

Honourable Raoul Dandurand,  
Speaker of the Senate.

Sir,—In compliance with rule 99, I have the honour to report for the information of the Senate, that on examination of the records of the Senate, they fail to show that the Honourable Rufus Curry, a member thereof, and a senator for the province of Nova Scotia, has given his attendance in the Senate during any part of the last two consecutive sessions of the last parliament.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

SAMUEL E. ST. O. CHAPLEAU,  
Clerk of the Senate.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—My recollection—although I should like to verify it before taking any action, is that the Hon. Mr. Curry was appointed during a session of parliament and that, therefore, he will not have been absent during two consecutive sessions. It has just occurred to me at this moment, and I speak subject to correction hereafter. If that is found to be the fact, it may be worth while to consider whether he comes strictly within the rules. In the meantime I move, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Templeman, that the report of the Clerk of the Senate respecting the absence of the Hon. Mr. Rufus Curry during two consecutive sessions of parliament be referred to the committee appointed to consider the orders and customs of the House and the privileges of parliament, the committee to meet at the call of the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—As there is no urgency about this matter, why should the hon. Secretary of State not give a notice?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That is practically a notice to refer to the committee. There is no action taken on it other than to refer it to the committee.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—But no motion should be presented unless there is a notice. There is no urgency in this case, and we are going to have a committee to revise the statutes. Probably they will find that we have proceeded contrary to the rules in this very habit of disregarding the rule requiring notice.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I have no objection to let my motion stand until Thursday, but I was simply following precedents of the past.