

get very far if we amended the Bill in the way indicated by my right honourable friend, for the Government has authorized the Minister of Finance to declare that the proposed change in the law is a matter that could not be taken up at this time. I leave it at that. My right honourable friend is free to move, if he so desires, that a committee be formed for the purpose of amending this Bill in the sense he indicates, but I cannot accept the responsibility of so moving.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Honourable senators, would it be possible to refer this Bill to our Railway Committee? I noticed in the Press that an honourable member of another place complained bitterly of an attack on civil servants of this country. There is no such attack. If a man works for the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian National or any other large corporation and does not pay his bills, his wages can be garnisheed. A large number of people in Winnipeg are employed on the railways, but I doubt if there are more than two or three garnishments against railway workers there in a month. They all know they are not protected; so they make their payments.

I have no grudge at all against civil servants, but I strongly protest because people employed by the Crown—including senators, if you will—are not required to pay their debts to the extent of their ability. I come from the very place where the row over this thing started, the city of Winnipeg, and it started on account of the two per cent wage tax in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: They like a fight out there.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I admit we are a fighting people.

I suggest that in all fairness this Bill should be referred to the Committee on Railways. Most of the members of that committee are not on the Banking and Commerce Committee, which is busy with the Unemployment Insurance Bill. We shall be here for a couple of days more, in any event, and in that time the Railway Committee could hear representatives of the Civil Service. Even if the committee reported the Bill just as it is, something would have been gained by that reference. I am persuaded that 95 per cent of the civil servants of the country pay their debts on the nail. I move that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbours.

Hon. Mr. COTE: Honourable senators, I am not a member of that committee, and there is one thing I should like to point out

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

here. If the principle of the Bill is to be adopted, as it now is, there should be, I think, an amendment to provide against a contingency, which I shall explain. The Bill sets no limit to the proportion of a debt that the Minister may deduct from the weekly or monthly wages or salary of a civil servant. Suppose in a certain case the debt was \$100. If that were deducted in one sum from a civil servant's monthly salary, it might leave very little for him to live on until he got his next cheque. In every province of Canada, although garnishment of wages and salaries is allowed by statute or by rules of the court, a limitation is placed on the amount that can be taken from a man's weekly or monthly wages. I think that in Quebec, under the Lacombe law, up to fifteen per cent of the weekly or monthly wages can be garnisheed, but I am speaking only from memory. I know that in Ontario there is a definite limit to the amount that can be garnisheed. If we do change the law to remove the present immunity of civil servants from garnishment, it would be very unfair that any of them should be liable to a large deduction from salary in any one month, and I think an amendment should be inserted to provide against that contingency.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That could come before the committee.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I hardly think the Railway Committee would be the proper one to which such a Bill should be sent. I thought we had a Legislation Committee, but I do not see it referred to in the list. However, there is a Civil Service Administration Committee, and the measure could perhaps be examined by it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Who are on it?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I move that Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred to a special committee, to be appointed by the honourable leader of the House (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) and the right honourable leader on the other side (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen), for the purpose of considering the Bill with a view to strengthening it.

The amendment was agreed to.

TREACHERY BILL

THIRD READING

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND moved the third reading of Bill 73, an Act respecting Treachery.

He said: Last night we discussed this Bill, and, in case my right honourable friend