

say, and the House adjourns for a fortnight, he is entitled to count every one of the days of adjournment as a day of attendance—as a sitting day. As I say, this would have a tendency, it seems to me, to open the doors to an abuse that we are trying to guard against.

Hon. Mr. McLENNAN: Section 35 says:

Except for calculating the number of days he attended a sitting of the House for the purposes of section 33—

Section 33 states the condition on which the member shall be entitled to the full indemnity:

—each day during the session on which there has been no sitting of such House. . . shall be reckoned as a day of attendance.

This cannot affect the days included in the three-quarters, but only the lesser number of days. If you attend three-quarters of the sitting days you get the whole indemnity; otherwise the allowance is \$25 a day, and if the days of absence are to count, the member must have attended on the day previous to the adjournment.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable gentlemen, I confess that until this moment I had not completely read the Bill, I have been going through it clause by clause and am becoming somewhat nonplussed. Coming to the subsection regarding illness, subsection 2 of section 35, I find that only half of it refers to illness, and the latter part seems to extend to the general question of attendance.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: As I understand it, before a member is entitled to draw either the sessional indemnity or daily allowance he must have made an attendance. A member must have attended before he can take advantage of an adjournment. That is to say, if there be an adjournment of the House, the member must have attended the sitting on the day before. If this House adjourned say for three weeks, after meeting a fortnight, and if during the fortnight the member did not appear in his place, he is not counted as having been in attendance until after the expiration of that adjournment and he would not be entitled to his indemnity. Of course, if he was ill that would be a different question.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: It would be as if he were absent all the time?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes, precisely.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: The first question is: is this clause supposed to apply only to cases of illness?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: No, no.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Or does it apply generally?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: It deals with two classes of cases.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: It applies generally. The next question is: are days of adjournment to be counted as sitting days?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes, if the member was in his place before the adjournment. He need not remain here during the adjournment, but he must have been here before the adjournment to be entitled to the allowance.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: What provision has been made for monthly payment? I do not see anything in the Bill.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: As I understand, the provision in the old Act still remains.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Then a member would receive the same—\$10 per day?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: That has been increased to \$25.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: But there is nothing here amending the Act with regard to that.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I think so.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: I could not find it.

Hon. Mr. POWER: I find that I was perhaps a little in error in what I said about this clause a few minutes ago. Beginning on line 17 it reads:

—and, except for calculating the number of days he attended a sitting of the House for the purposes of section 33, each day during the session on which there has been no sitting of such House, in consequence of its having adjourned over such day shall be reckoned as a day of attendance at such session for every member who was in attendance at a sitting of the House on the day immediately before such adjournment.

Now I find that section 33 says that a member shall not be entitled to the sessional allowance if he does not attend the sitting of the House of which he is a member on at least three-quarters of the days upon which such House sits. I think