

of the Minister of Justice, and the right honourable leader on this side (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) is likely able to obtain the opinion of our Parliamentary Counsel. But what about the other members? It is probably true that some of us who are lawyers are very humble members of our profession, but we too have ideas about legal points that arise in connection with bills, and we should be only too pleased to have a chance of reading any opinions given by Parliamentary Counsel. We should like a chance to ponder them for a few minutes, at least, to see if they agree with our own views. In this particular instance the only information I have had is that given this morning in a newspaper article setting out the reasons why the other House disagreed with the Senate amendments.

Those who were fellow members of the special committee appointed by the Senate to consider this Bill know that I objected strenuously to the proposed amendments. I am not in favour of them, and I am not in favour of the Bill. Our Parliamentary Counsel expressed the opinion that the Bill was entirely *ultra vires*. That defect was not cured by the Senate's amendments; the Bill was just as *ultra vires* after those amendments were made as before. The reasons sent over from the House of Commons, which I presume come from the Department of Justice, support my view that the measure is absolutely *ultra vires*. I do not at all agree with the amendment—

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: With which amendment?

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE: I do not agree with the Senate's third amendment, and I am opposed to the Bill itself. And I do not agree with the reasons given by the House of Commons; I would challenge them in any court.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Honourable senators, the right honourable gentleman opposite (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) has discussed the reasons stated in another place for disagreeing with the amendments proposed here.

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE: Would the honourable gentleman kindly pardon me? I should like an answer to the question I asked of the honourable leader (Hon. Mr. Dandurand).

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: What is the question?

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE: Are we likely to adjourn to-day, or not until to-morrow? If we are going to adjourn to-day, I should like to speak on this matter. But if we are to sit to-morrow, I want to adjourn the debate.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: As the adjournment situation is very uncertain, I would suggest that my honourable friend speak now.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I would make a motion, in a moment or two—

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Perhaps it would be better to allow the honourable member from Ponteix (Hon. Mr. Marcotte) to speak first.

Hon. Mr. MARCOTTE: No; I prefer my honourable friend from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) to speak now. In the meantime, I shall have a few minutes more to study the matter.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: The right honourable gentleman opposite (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) has recited the objections stated in another place to the amendments which we made to this Bill 99. I do not know whether I am too touchy or not, but in my judgment the intelligence of members of the Senate has been insulted by a statement made by the honourable gentleman who in that other place took exception to our amendment. Let me read—

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I doubt if my honourable friend can cross swords in this Chamber with an honourable member of another place.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Possibly I have not got it right, but I will undertake to cross swords at any time with any Canadian who undertakes to tell me something that I know to be absolute nonsense.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My honourable friend need simply cite the statement and answer it.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: After quoting the eighth and last objection made to our amendment, the distinguished gentleman who was handling this matter in another place said:

Those are the reasons I would suggest why the House, at this stage of the session, should not accept the Senate amendment. I have left out of account any consideration of any practical matters which may or may not be of great importance. The ones that occur to me are the inconvenience and expense to the Crown of acting in these garnishee proceedings, as well as the doubt as to need for any further remedies to creditors of civil servants, or, in other words, the whole question of the adequacy of present remedies.

Unquestionably that is not a true statement of fact. The honourable gentleman must have known, as everyone here knows, that present remedies were insufficient or Bill 99 would not have come to us for the purpose of making possible the collection from 1,400 Dominion civil servants in Manitoba of a tax imposed