

his life a Conservative in politics. I will read this extract:

In passing it might not be too much out of place to observe that whatever the government may grant in the way of provincial autonomy, I trust it will retain control of the lands. I do not think it would be in the interest of this country to have those affairs administered by the provincial authorities. From the very nature of the industries in Western Assiniboia, there exists very strong companies, and those would wield too great an influence to the detriment of individual interests.

My correspondent is to-day, as a sort of side issue, engaged in a small way in ranching, and he is a small land holder in the west. He appears to think that if the provincial government had control of the public lands, the large ranching corporations and land companies which have what, in common parlance, is called too great a pull, or too great an influence with the local provincial governments, and that their influence would bring about regulations that would be in the interest of the large rancher and the large land holder rather than in the interest of the smaller farmer and smaller rancher.

MR. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend object to giving the name?

MR. MILLER. MR. J. W. Brown, of Medicine Hat. Now, Sir, as to the educational clause of the Bill. Not being a member of the legal profession, I do not count myself competent to discuss this matter from the constitutional or legal standpoint, nor will I attempt to do so. I am perfectly content to leave that discussion to those who are lawyers and to those who have a superior knowledge and a greater experience along those lines. But, Sir, after reading the newspapers of both political parties, after reading letters I have received, after listening to many speeches delivered in this House, many of them from legal gentlemen on both sides, and after having personally conversed with members of the legal profession, I feel inclined to say with Sheridan: 'Egad, I think the interpreter is the harder to be understood of the two.' It does appear to me that the most our best constitutional lawyers and authorities will be able to do in this matter will be, in learned legal phraseology, to build up contrary arguments, to quote antagonistic authorities and to express opinions diametrically opposed. It seems to me, Sir, that whatever course this parliament may adopt in this matter, litigation may possibly follow. But it does not by any means follow that litigation must ensue, or that it will ensue if the parties more immediately concerned, and more vitally interested are fairly well satisfied with what may be the action of parliament. If, Sir, there is some degree of difficulty on the part of the legal gentlemen in settling what may be the position from a legal standpoint it will

not be the first time that lawyers have failed to agree as to the meaning of a statute. But, Sir, it would surely appear to be the duty of this parliament at least to endeavour to do that which is right in law and in equity, that which will bring about and be attended with the most happy results, and the best results, not temporarily, not in the interest of my political party, but in the permanent interest of this country and particularly in the interests of Saskatchewan and Alberta. That there should be a difference of opinion in this House and in this country concerning a question of so great importance as to what may be equitably right, as well as to what may be legally right, need not be any cause for wonderment or astonishment. Many men have many minds, and a discussion of even the most trifling things that occupy our attention, either in a committee of the House, invariably provoke discussion and elicit differences of opinion and yet those opinions however much they may differ are usually discussed without heat, asperity or bitterness, and we ought to try to approach this matter in a manner just as calm, just as judicial, just as judicious. Surely, Sir, it is not the duty of any member of this House, to whichever party he may belong, upon which ever side of the House he may sit, whether upon a front-bench or a box, whether he be an old member or a new in discussing this question to make any appeal for any mere party advantage to any passion of race or creed, and in the name of a religion that teaches peace on earth and good will toward men, to endeavour to stir up and arouse discord, animosity and strife. Sir, I will not say who is responsible in this House for stirring up passions and kindling the flames of religious discord in this country. But, Sir, I will say that when members on the Conservative side of the House say that the speeches in this House that have been calculated to stir up strife and kindle passion have come from the Reform side of the House, I admire them for two things, that is to say for their simplicity and for their courage. I will not say that every Conservative member who has spoken has made that kind of a speech, for I do not think that would be right or true. I will go further and say that I think a large majority, the greater number of citizens, Conservative and Reform throughout the length and breadth of Canada, will deprecate and be sorry for some of the speeches that have come from the Conservative members in this House on this occasion. I will not make any particular reference, but I leave to the people who heard the speeches and who will read the speeches to say whether or not the speeches of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) were delivered with any other intention than to inflame and kindle passion. I think the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Bor-