

the Bill of 1935. Then agriculture faced a more promising time. Now, I think, the universal judgment of the House is that it faces a blacker time. We depend upon exports, but no other section of our people depends upon exports so vitally as do the people engaged in agriculture. Where shall we be if our wheat exports cease, if the absorbing power of the world disappears, if—which God forbid—the British market for our bacon is cut off? There is danger at least of a severe contraction of the farmer's market in this Dominion. At this moment we come along and add to his burden in a very important way by a scheme of social reform.

All these subjects should be considered by the committee, and considered very carefully. I do not think the country generally is in a hurry for this measure. I know my communications have been varied. I have had some in favour of the Bill, but I have had two or three against it for every one in its favour. With other members probably the proportion would be different. But there is no appeal that is universal or anything like unanimous for its immediate passing. I beg of the Government—I know it intends to submit the Bill to committee—that it invite and thoroughly review submissions to that committee by earnest, conscientious men, whether they appeared before us in 1935 or not, and whether they were before the Commons Committee recently or were not. I know all will be given a courteous hearing at the hands of our committee. I suggest that we do not hurry our consideration of this Bill merely because we are hot and are eager to be at home. As respects not only the fate of the Bill, itself, but also the various phases which I have sought to expound, and those which others will think of, let us approach the decision not in any party spirit—I know we shall not—but as citizens entrusted with a grave duty, and as parliamentarians who have at heart the honour of the body to which they belong.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

#### REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I move, seconded by the Right Hon. Mr. Graham, that this Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

In making this motion I would point out to honourable senators, for perhaps the hundredth time, that those who are not members of the Banking and Commerce Committee should feel as much at home in the committee as those who sit around the table,

because all may participate in the discussions and put questions.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLACK: May I ask the leader of the Government if it is possible to get a larger room for the committee? The one in which we regularly meet is small and the ventilation is not good. If all who want to hear the evidence are to attend, I would suggest there should be a bigger room.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I do not know what we can obtain, but I shall make an effort to meet the wishes of my honourable friend.

Hon. Mr. BLACK: Honourable senators, I am informed that the representatives of three different organizations are already either here or on their way here, and desire to be heard on this Unemployment Insurance Bill. If that is the case, as I am assured it is, we might make some progress by sitting to-night.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I give my assent to that idea.

#### DEBTS DUE TO THE CROWN BILL

##### MOTION FOR THIRD READING—BILL REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Hon. RAOUL DANDURAND moved the third reading of Bill 99, an Act to amend an Act respecting debts due to the Crown.

He said: Honourable senators will remember that we had this Bill before us last week. I need not refer to the discussion we had on the Bill, which asks for authorization to collect from Dominion employees residing in Manitoba amounts due by them to the province.

Two or three questions arose. The question of the constitutionality of the Bill was one which brought an opinion from our Law Clerk and another from Mr. Fraser Elliott, Commissioner of Income Tax. Another question raised was as to the possibility of the Government allowing creditors to garnish Dominion employees for their debts. This question was referred to the Minister, from whom I have the following statement:

The Government has given consideration to the suggestion made in the Senate that the exemption from garnishee proceedings enjoyed by civil servants be removed. The removal of this exemption could not be effected by alteration of the Bill, which has passed the House of Commons and is now before the Senate. A new Bill would be required.

The abolition of a long established principle, such as the one that the Crown is not answerable to a garnishee summons, should not be taken without further consideration than is possible at this stage of the session. It is, I think, admitted that the situation which the