

law Mr. Sullivan could not be paid the sum of \$152, and that is the reason, I presume, why the Government are now asking Parliament to grant it. Generally speaking, I think it is important that the law should be observed; but in my long experience in Parliament I have known some instances—not very many, it is true, and therefore the evil cannot be quite so great as hon. members have depicted it to be—in which members who have been absent from their duties through illness have had voted to them by Parliament the balance of their indemnity which had been deducted from them. I know nothing of the special circumstances connected with this case; but I assume them to be what the hon. Postmaster General has stated, that Mr. Sullivan, having been taken ill in Ottawa, would have been entitled to his pay if he had remained here; but finding it more convenient to go to his home, he remained away during nineteen sitting days of the session, and application was made by some person on his behalf that he should be recouped this sum of money. I say that very few cases have occurred during my time in Parliament, and therefore this case, which involves a small sum of money, is not likely to give rise to any abuse.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the Speaker has given the best reason why this vote should not pass. The hon. gentleman tells us that according to law this hon. gentleman is not entitled to this money. If you consider that the circumstances are such as entitle him to receive this money, then, I say, alter the law, and put us all on an even footing. But it is most invidious and highly improper, in my opinion, to ask the House to vote money in these individual cases contrary to the law. The law lays down that a man is entitled to indemnity under certain circumstances, and not otherwise, and it is exceedingly invidious to ask us to vote money when the facts are not and cannot be before us.

Mr. SPEAKER. One instance that occurred in recent years was that of the late hon. member for East Hastings, Mr. Burdett, who was voted the full amount of his indemnity because of his illness.

Mr. FRASER. After he died?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, not after he died. He was absent during the greater part of the session of 1891, and my impression is that the cheque was sent to him before the session was over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) We may have done wrong before and set a bad precedent, but there is no reason why we should follow it. The amount may be small, but I decline to discuss either the amount or the gentleman in question. It is the principle involved that I am dealing with, and if you adopt a new principle now, you cannot, in justice, ignore

Mr. SPEAKER.

any other similar case that occurs. If I am detained at my home in Charlottetown for a similar reason, I can demand my indemnity. In this way you make the indemnity a perfect burlesque. What is the principle of the indemnity? It is this: We grant it because while a member is in Ottawa he has to incur expenses that he would not incur at home; but here you are setting a precedent the result of which must necessarily result in similar demands on behalf of other members of the House and the Senate, who may be detained at home because they do not feel very well. How are we to decide how well or how ill a man may be? We cannot ascertain the fact: we have simply to accept the statement of somebody who says he has been informed, just as the Postmaster General states in this case that he has been informed. I think we are adopting a thoroughly evil principle.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Livingston) had his leg broken while on his way to Ottawa, which necessitated his being confined to his house for several weeks, and the Government refused to recognize his claim to indemnity for that time. In that case, the fact did not depend on the opinion of the Postmaster General or any one else; it was well known; and I would like to know from the Government how they can reconcile their granting the one claim and refusing the other.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before expressing an opinion as to how I could reconcile the two cases, I would like to know the facts. I am not aware that the indemnity was ever refused to the hon. member whose name my hon. friend has just mentioned. I am not sure whether he applied for the indemnity, but if the hon. gentleman was laid up from a serious accident and applied for the indemnity, I see no reason why it should not be granted to him as well as to Dr. Sullivan. I was going to suggest to the hon. gentleman that to save time, we should allow the item to stand until the Minister of Finance, who happens to be away to-night, but who is very seldom absent from his place, is present to give the details.

To meet the expenses for promoting the dairy interests of Canada by placing fresh made creamery butter on the British market without deterioration, for securing recognition of its quality, in that market ..... \$3,000

Mr. McMILLAN. There was a resolution passed by the Select Committee on Agriculture and Colonization last session. I seconded that resolution, and have been blamed for being one of the causes of the Government purchasing butter and exporting it to the old country. It is true that I did second the resolution, which was as follows:—

Moved by Mr. McLennan, seconded by Mr. McMillan, "That this Committee are of opinion