

that probably I was mistaken in supposing that he could get over the three-quarters clause, but that seems to be prevented by this exception in subsection 2 of section 35.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL: As a rule, this House does not sit on either Saturday or Monday. Do those days count as adjournments or not?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But my honourable friend, I think, must qualify that answer. He told us that subsection 2 of section 35 would prevent a member of Parliament from taking advantage of those days of adjournment if he had not previously put in an appearance.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is all right. The intention of this is to prevent an abuse which has been complained of—the practice of members absenting themselves for a certain time during the session, and then appearing before the close and claiming all the days over which the Senate adjourned in previous months. I would draw the attention of my honourable friend to a phraseology which works out unjustly. In order to obtain the advantage of the adjournment say over the week-end, from Saturday to Monday, a member will need to be present on the day preceding the adjournment. So that it will work in this way: for instance, a member of this Chamber may be absent on the Tuesday, the Wednesday, and the Thursday, and those days will be deducted from his fifty days if the session is long enough. But if he attends on the Friday he will be entitled to count in his favour the Saturday and the Monday, whereas if absent on the Friday he will not be entitled to claim the Saturday and Monday as attendance days for the making of the 75 per cent. I do not quite understand why that word “immediately” is there, because if a man be absent on Friday, although he has been here all week, he would lose the advantage of that attendance, while another member may be absent the whole of the week, but be here on the Friday and gain those days.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: But will my honourable friend go back to new section 33, where he will see that the phrase “three-fourths of the days” is ap-

Hon. Mr. POWER.

plied only to those days on which the House sits.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Then what is the good of it?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It does not sit on week-ends.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But what do those attendance days mean?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It probably might be reasoned that it would affect you in regard to the 50 days.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: The term “50 days” has no bearing on this.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The period of 50 days has been replaced by the terms “three-fourths of the days upon which the House sits.”

Hon. Mr. WILLOUGHBY: I think there is one case that should be remedied—the case of distant members. If we have an adjournment of three or four days or a week, and those members must be here on the day preceding the adjournment, a member living in British Columbia, for instance, if he wished to go home, would have to spend the whole time on the train. That is a serious handicap to members living at a distance, and I point it out in order that it may be remedied.

Hon. Mr. BOYER: What is the object of having a man living within ten miles of the city of Ottawa? Suppose a member from Montreal breaks his leg in Ottawa, and is carried home to where he lives?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It is conditional. It would probably admit of a man remaining in Hull during the period of his illness.

Subsection 2 of new section 35 was agreed to.

New sections 37, 38 and 39 were agreed to.

Section 6 was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We may have some consolation in passing this Act, that at the end of next session we will know how it works.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes; there may be a difference of opinion even then.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But before the Bill goes out of Committee I would strongly urge the leader of the Government to see if, after consulting with the