

House to secure his wishes in this regard, when we have asked him that he should not press the bill at the present time, and I ask the House whether it is proper to consider this bill at the present time when it is altogether inconsistent with a government measure that is before the other House, having received its second reading, and is now under consideration in Committee of the Whole. The least my hon. friend could do under these circumstances is to permit this bill to stand until the government measure comes before us, and if this House should then see proper to reject the measure of the government, my hon. friend could with propriety press his bill; but I say it would be a most unprecedented procedure for my hon. friend to persist in pushing forward this bill and committing the Senate in advance of an important measure coming before it, to a principle in direct conflict with the provisions of that measure. I think hon. gentlemen who may differ from us in this House will at all events extend to us that fairness which ought to be extended by this chamber, that is supposed to be a non-political body, which we are entitled to expect under the circumstances.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—I was under the impression, when this was pointed out, that it was through a clerical error, or some mistake, that this bill was put down on the Orders of the Day for the 21st March. Now, it would appear, from the remarks of the hon. leader of the House, that the matter was done designedly, that the government were not prepared—

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—I do not say that the hon. gentleman says that it was done designedly. But his remarks would lead one to believe that it was done designedly. Although this bill is shown to have been marked for second reading to-day, the hon. leader of the House asks to have it postponed because the government is not ready to go on with it, on account of a bill in the other House.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—What had that to do with the clerical error? Will the hon. gentleman say that, because I wish to have this bill postponed, on account of the government having a bill in the other chamber, that therefore we have altered the minutes?

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—No, but the hon. gent'eman wants to take advantage of the fact that there is a clerical error. Here is this bill set down for second reading to-day. Why should not the hon. gentleman allow it to be read the second time to-morrow and refer it to committee? It will not interfere with the bill in the other House. I cannot see why the government in this House should try to take advantage of what is apparently a mistake.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—There can be no possible harm in allowing it to be set down for a second reading to-morrow, and if the hon. gentleman can show that it conflicts with the other bill, the House can consider that. For my own part, I do not altogether understand that it does conflict with the government measure.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I would point out to the House that the same error has arisen in regard to the following Orders of the Day, the bills fixed for Thursday. They are put down for the 24th March, 1898, and upon reference to page 92 of the minutes hon. gentlemen will observe that those bills were to be read the second time Thursday next. Instead of that, the Orders of the Day indicate that they will not be read until a week from next Thursday. It seems to me a glaring error of this kind should be rectified immediately by this House. There should not be the slightest hesitation in correcting an error of this kind, and no advantage should be sought to be taken of it. If there is merit in the objection raised by hon. friend the leader of the House why this bill should not be read the second time to-day, then deal with it upon its merits, but do not take advantage of a clerical error which has arisen, doubtless, through an oversight of one of the officers of the House, or seek to strangle a bill of an important character which is receiving considerable public attention, and which should be dealt with at an early date. I do not object to my hon. friend having all time he thinks he would be entitled to for a proper consideration of the bill. It is only an ordinary bill. But notwithstanding the fact, at the request of my hon. friend, I should be very pleased that the time should be enlarged so that he can give proper consideration to it, but I disagree with him most emphatically in regard to the postponement of this bill until the government