

depositors by pressing the matter unduly if it were likely to have that effect. The government feels that in the course it has taken it has gone as far as it would be prudent to go if relief is to be given immediately. I may say with respect to the bringing in of an estimate, that while there appears to be precedent in the British parliament for bringing in a bill to replace a bill that has not attained the object that was aimed at, there does not seem to be any precedent for bringing down an estimate to attain the object of a bill which had been previously introduced. It is quite possible that it is wholly within the competence of the Commons to do that; on the other hand I understand that a doubt has been raised with respect to the matter, and it might be raised in this instance. I might further mention that were the government to bring in a further measure of relief by way of an estimate, in view of the stand which the Senate has taken on this matter there is no guarantee that the Senate itself would accept it; they might reject it if brought in as an extra supplementary estimate—that is, assuming that such estimate were to pass the Commons. We feel we have pressed this matter as far as we can without jeopardizing the relief to those who will receive relief—and they constitute about eighty per cent of the depositors—under the bill as amended.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Prime Minister say what is the value of those words, "straitened circumstances"? The words preceding are to the effect that those who show need arising from the loss may be given consideration. What is the value of saying "straitened circumstances" as well? I cannot see that it changes the meaning at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The bill as amended by the Senate, as I recall it, permitted the granting of relief up to the extent of \$500, that is, to those whose deposits amounted to \$500 or less. But the amendment as now drafted permits others who have larger amounts to appeal before the Exchequer court, I think, and intimate that their circumstances are such as to render it necessary that they receive aid. In other words they would be in straitened circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no; the Prime Minister has not the effect of the history of the thing at all, if he has done justice to himself in that answer. The bill as amended by the Senate provided first of all that need should be the basis upon which anybody could get

any money, but in order to save the investigation of every single case it said that need should be presumed if the deposits were \$500 or under. The effect of the whole thing was that need had to be shown; it was presumed in the case of deposits of \$500 or under, but it had to be shown in the case of deposits of larger amounts than \$500. Now, the conference, following the rejection by this House of the Senate amendments, added the words "straitened circumstances" after "need". I do not know the difference between a man in need and a man in straitened circumstances. I do not think the amendment meant anything.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would point out to my right hon. friend that the amendment originally proposed was "special need," and the substitution has been "special need or in straitened circumstances."

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the difference?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think probably it gives a little more in the way of latitude to the commissioner in granting relief.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot see it. It may be the fine mind of the president of the Exchequer court can, but I cannot see it makes a bit of difference at all.

The next question is this: The Senate, I believe, has undertaken to abandon the preamble. There was no preamble in the bill that passed the Commons, but I have been looking up the records, and I find there is a preamble in the resolution the government introduced. The government, when the Senate put this preamble in, said they had no authority to assert what was in the preamble, but I have looked the matter up and see that the preamble the Senate put in is just the preamble the government had in the resolution. So what is the use of having the preamble struck out?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was not in the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was in the resolution preceding the bill which the government introduced.

Mr. VIEN: Not the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is like the difference between "special need" and "straitened circumstances."

Mr. VIEN: It is more than that. There is the question of moral claim. This is totally different.