

measure comes up from the other House. Will hon. gentlemen consider how ridiculous it would be for me to postpone it till after the Teslin Lake Bill comes in before the House, a bill which is as monopolistic as it could be. Upon the face of that bill, no rights shall lie with parliament for the next five years to pass any such bill as the one now before us. My hon. friend must think my simplicity is extremely childlike if I should consent for one moment to postpone this bill until the passage of the measure which he has in view, by which it would be postponed for at least five years. Does my hon. friend wish me to wait until the Teslin Lake Bill is passed, and then bring this bill down? Surely he is trifling with the House.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Does my hon. friend think this House should commit itself to this bill in opposition to the bill of the government?

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I have no hesitation in answering my hon. friend in the affirmative, that I most decidedly think so, and I can further point out to my hon. friend, that he need not be disappointed, when the time arrives, if this House should pursue that course in regard to the bill the second reading of which I have moved. I do not think the House will approve of the government measure, so far as the monopolistic features of it are concerned, namely, preventing all application to parliament for the incorporation of companies to open up that country by railway enterprise. I regret that my knowledge of parliamentary practice is not so extensive as that of many hon. gentlemen before me, but this bill is down for second reading to-day.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—No, it is not.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I say positively that it is. The notice of last Thursday shows that this bill is on for second reading to-day. I refer hon. gentlemen to the bottom of page 92 of our minutes. I point out to the House the fact, which is quite obvious, that the mistake is a clerical one, but I see no objection to permitting this bill to stand until to-morrow if hon. gentlemen desire it. I move that this bill be read a second time unless my hon. friends desire to have it stand until to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—As a matter of courtesy to the hon. leader of the House, it

seems to me that it is not sound policy on the part of the hon. member from Calgary to press this motion at the present moment. I have no doubt he is anxious to see this bill passed, but it has to go to the Lower House for its passage, and if he takes the government by the throat in the Senate, the government may take his bill by the throat in the House of Commons. Now I am anxious to see this bill passed, I am anxious to see no monopoly in railways in that territory, in pressing this bill to-day in opposition to the declared will of the government, the hon. gentleman is taking the best means in his power to strangle the bill and place it rather as a political motion than as an evidence of his desire to secure the passing of the measure.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—As a matter of courtesy it would be well for my hon. friend to put down the bill for a second reading for another day. Members of the House, I presume, are not prepared to give a vote upon it to-day. I have not read the bill myself yet, and it is probable that many other members of the House are in the same position looking forward to the second reading not taking place before the 21st of this month.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—My hon. friend does not suggest that it should stand until after the Teslin Lake Bill is before us.

Hon. Mr. MILLER—No, I do not suggest any limit to the postponement, nor do I suggest what my hon. friend should do, I leave it to himself to name the day—some future day. With regard to the course pursued by my hon. friend being unprecedented, I have no doubt the language of the Minister of Justice would be strictly applicable to the proceedings of the House of Commons. It is an unprecedented thing in the House of Commons for any private member to urge a bill which would interfere with a government measure emanating in that House. The government must be in the majority always in the other House, and is able, of course, to enforce respect for its wishes if any member should have the boldness to differ from them, and therefore it would be manifestly absurd to take such a course in the House of Commons in opposition to the government as my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Lougheed) proposes to take in this House in reference to this bill; but I am not sure that it is unpreced-