

more of the heritage of the people is being handed over to the companies and no relief is afforded to the taxpayers. It is discouraging to a Canadian. Just think that this session, we are actually going to give the Grand Trunk easier conditions, under which eventually we will give them the railroad and we are to get nothing in return. What are the farmers of Ontario to get for the \$150,000,000 in the way of facilities for transportation. No effort has been made to give them an Atlantic seaport with cheaper rates for their cattle and produce. Nationalize the Grand Trunk, consolidate it with the Intercolonial Railway, make two or three ports in the maritime provinces, take advantage of the splendid terminals and shunting yards of the Grand Trunk, and I venture to say that transportation rates in Canada will come down 33 per cent and perhaps 50 per cent and the government will have conferred a benefit on the whole people. But instead of that, what are we doing? Why, Sir, this session of parliament has apparently been called for nothing else than to reiterate the vote giving \$150,000,000 of the money of the people to the Grand Trunk. It is a serious proposition; it is a question the people of Ontario have spoken on at the by-elections. They do not like the Grand Trunk proposition, they do not like it because it does nothing for them; they do not like it because after spending their money on it we are to hand over the railroad to a private corporation. The right hon. gentleman may say it is a grand project; that it is the great object of his life, that it is opening up the back country, but I might remind him that there are people who live in the front country, that these are the people who want relief, and that they cannot get relief from the Grand Trunk Railway. There is another thing I have not heard mentioned in the House or out of it, and the statement of the right hon. gentleman with regard to our treaty making power, brings it to my mind. I go a long way with him on that question, but let me ask him why he did not insert a provision in his bill compelling the Grand Trunk Pacific to have its headquarters in Canada. The feature of the Canadian Pacific Railway was that it was a national scheme, with its management and its directors in Canada. But what happened in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific. After the contract had been signed, sealed and delivered by the Parliament of Canada, it had to be sent to the other side of the Atlantic for ratification by the Grand Trunk Company. The Grand Trunk Company repudiated the contract which was made by the Canadian parliament. That never should have happened. I trust that before the Bill goes through, the headquarters of the Grand Trunk will be fixed in Canada, so that we may know with whom we are dealing and so that the parliament of Canada may not in future be subject to

Mr. MACLEAN.

the humiliation of having its decrees repudiated. It is not a satisfactory thing that the parliament of Canada should have its will subject to the ratification of Rivers-Wilson in London, instead of having the controlling body of the railroad here in Canada, so that we may deal with them as ordinary business sense would dictate.

I shall not refer to the Newfoundland question, but I wish to mention a matter in connection with the Hudson's Bay which I brought to the attention of parliament last session. After the confession the right hon. gentleman has made in regard to treaty making powers and as to how we have been ignored in the old land, I believe it is high time that we should take some steps to maintain our territorial integrity in the Hudson Bay country. Whatever the government may do in that direction I shall be only too glad to endorse it, and in view of the aggressive and outspoken neighbours we have south of the line, we must be up and doing, as we may have to make a fight to hold our own territory.

The right hon. gentleman told us that it was not the custom in a speech from the Throne to refer to the tariff. His memory is short, because in 1897 the speech from the Throne contained this paragraph:—

A measure will be submitted to you for the revision of the tariff which it is believed will provide the necessary revenue, and having due regard to the industrial interests will make our fiscal system more satisfactory to the masses of the people.

Are we then to take it for granted, that if there is no mention of tariff revision in the speech from the Throne, there will be no relief granted to the people of this country this session? Sir, the people of Canada demand more protection. They are not satisfied with what they have, and if Canada is prosperous to-day, it is because the Liberal party did not do what they said they would do when they sat in opposition. They then said that they would wipe the national policy off the face of the earth. They did not do so and to-day we have a united Canada in favour of a national policy for building up our own industries. The Liberal opposition antagonized the industries of this country; capitalists were afraid to invest; Canadian workmen were not sure of employment, but when the Liberals came to power they decided to uphold the national policy in a way, and they have since upheld it in a way. To-day we have a united Canada in favour of the national policy, and as I believe, in favour of a much more national policy than we ever had before. Let me remind the right hon. gentleman, that the United States is a difficult country to deal with in regard to trade matters. It is true they have been brought to a sense of their proper position by the threat of retaliation made by the Prime Minister of England. That has had a very great effect in promoting the idea of reciprocal trade among the