

a member. It must also be said that in many other sessions it will operate to his disadvantage. In the case of a session lasting eight or nine weeks, under the law as we propose to amend it, every member must have at least fifty days of attendance in order to receive his full sessional indemnity. If not he receives only \$25 for each day of attendance. Under the old law if the session lasted more than fifty days, and the member was present for three-quarters of the sitting days, he received his full indemnity. We did not find this to be absolutely just and right, owing to the fact that the entire membership cannot receive its indemnity unless the session extends over a period of fifty days, and we considered that like under the old act, the individual member should be treated the same as the entire House. This amendment would certainly not relieve a member from any hardship in earning his sessional indemnity and in many instances, it would necessitate a longer attendance than that which is necessary under the present law.

May I be allowed to repeat that the finding of the committee in all these respects was absolutely unanimous. I submit the report to the House in the firm hope that it will be adopted with equal unanimity. When concurred in, this report will not be binding upon the government but I feel sure the government will be directed by the unanimous voice of the House, and that as requested by the committee the required legislation will be introduced during the present session to correct and do away with the anomalies and inconsistencies to which I have briefly referred.

Mr. SHAW: What were the reasons given in parliament for the legislation which it is now proposed to amend?

Mr. BOIVIN: I have before me the debates of the House of Commons of June 28, 1920, when the amending bill was introduced by Sir Robert Borden. That was one of the last sittings of the session, and no detailed reasons for all the amendments were then given, except that the sessional indemnity was being increased from \$2,500 to \$4,000 and that it was desired to make the rules concerning the attendance of members in the House more rigid than they had been under the then existing act. This intention is carried out by the amending legislation now proposed. Under the old law, the attendance of a member and the length of session necessary to enable him to receive the full indemnity was only thirty days; that has been extended to fifty days. Under the old law the absence allowed a member was fifteen days; that has been maintained in spite of the fact that

sessions are now much longer. Under the old law the penalty for every day of non-attendance was only \$15; that has been increased to \$25.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Just a word as the seconder of the motion. It has always been the rule in this House not to oppose the unanimous report made by a committee to the House. I hope that in connection with the present report, no departure will be made by the government from this very commendable custom.

Mr. LOGAN: I would point out that there is another anomaly that has not been rectified. If a member is ill and confined to hospital in Ottawa, he may come in on the last day of the session and draw his full indemnity of \$4,000, whereas if he is so unfortunate, as I was, to be confined to a hospital in Montreal, he is penalized, as I understand I am, to the extent of something over \$1,000.

Mr. GAUVREAU: No.

Mr. LOGAN: Yes, because I was not in hospital in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. LEWIS: It seems to me there is another anomaly. If a member from the West goes home because of illness in his family, it takes him fifteen days to get there and back. If the House sits only fifty-five days, under the new rule that member will lose his right to get the full sessional indemnity. Moreover, the House has to be forced to sit sixty-five days before any member who has taken fifteen days leave of absence can get in his full time. I do not know that it is wise always to force the House to sit sixty-five days if the business to be transacted does not call for it.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 223, to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914.

He said: This bill provides that the annual fee for salmon canneries shall be \$20 a year. It is to follow the recommendation of the committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Instead of what?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Instead of \$500; but they are paying in addition to that a fee for every case of 48 one-pound cans.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.