

this large sum of \$2,500 to use it. I cannot see that the House is committed to this vote on the argument presented by the Minister of Justice. The Government assumed the responsibility of contracting a debt, and the House has a perfect right to say now whether it shall vote this money or not. We are at liberty to criticise this ballot and the payment for it. In my opinion it is an absurd invention and there is no genius at all displayed in it.

To pay the Hon. Mr. Sullivan the amount  
absence through illness in the session of  
1894 ..... \$152

Mr. McMULLEN. I question the propriety of introducing this system. This I presume is to enable Senator Sullivan to receive pay while he was at home, and if you commence to do this in one case you will have to extend it to others, and after a while you will have one-half the Senators remaining at home.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But they will have to be sick.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, they may be sick, and they will claim their pay on the same grounds as Senator Sullivan claims it. The Senators should be made to comply with the Act, and if they are not able to, we should not pay them.

Mr. DENISON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is quite correct about this item. For instance, Sir David McPherson is now away in Europe for the benefit of his health, and if this is a proper vote Sir David might very well claim for the whole session, less the days he has missed. I think it is a bad precedent.

Mr. FRASER. I do not think that we should begin this system.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We began it long ago.

Mr. FRASER. There is the case of the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) who is suffering from rheumatism and has had to go home. Should he not be paid as well as Senator Sullivan.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We have done it several times for members of Parliament.

Mr. FRASER. We have done it but seldom. There is an absurd rule that if a man happens to be within a certain number of miles from Ottawa and should be sick, he gets his indemnity, but if he has to go home to be nursed he cannot be paid. That is absurd on the face of it. This, in my opinion, should be done only in very special cases, and only in such cases, as that a Senator or a member of Parliament might feel very much in need of the money. I do not think that this should be a general rule. If a member is returned to Parliament, or if a man is appointed to the Senate, he must expect to be sick, and he must accept the

condition as a matter of course. However, there might be one thing said in favour of granting this money, and that is, that the Government is treating the country very well so far as the Senate is concerned; because it has not filled ten vacancies, and so it has saved \$10,000 a year and travelling expenses. Yet there is another view perhaps. Perhaps this money should be voted to active Senators who do the work of the sick Senators and of those who are not appointed. I have the very highest respect for the Senator in question, and I am not speaking because it happens to be that hon. gentleman, but I think we should have a general rule about this matter. I venture to say that there were a number of members and Senators sick last year, and who if this principle is maintained, should be paid their indemnity. There should be no invidious distinctions made in this matter.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The case of Senator Sullivan is one that I think would come under the head of a special case. The hon. gentleman took so seriously ill in Ottawa, that I understand his life was despaired of, and he had to be sent back to his family. Had he remained in Ottawa without that care and attention which he received at home, this vote would probably not have caused any discussion in the House. On more than one occasion this rule has been applied to members of Parliament and also to Senators, and under the circumstances, I can see no reason why the item should not be voted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you should add to the item "the said Senator having got sick through staying at Ottawa."

Mr. McMULLEN. If you introduce this system you will find that a great many Senators and members of Parliament, after they come to Ottawa, will get sick, and be obliged to return to the tender care of their families. The result will be that claim after claim of this kind will be made. Now, I would like to ask the Government on what principle they will decline to acknowledge a claim on the part of Senator Macpherson, who is obliged to be in the south of France for the benefit of his health. And there may be many other cases of the same kind. By making the grant, the Government are only inserting the thin edge of the wedge, which is going to bring a general demand from senators who will return to the bosom of their families instead of remaining here the whole session. I maintain that the law regulating the attendance of members and senators should not be violated, or else it should be amended in the direction my hon. friend suggests, so that all may be treated alike.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope I may be pardoned if I say a word or two in reference to this matter. The law is not being violated, as the hon. gentleman suggests. Under the