

tle men opposite. I said to him: My good friend, you made a very good impression in this House, but you devoted too much of your time to standing well with your party here, and as far as I could gather there was a good cabinet timber in you; but you forgot just one thing—that you should have devoted your time in this House rather to cultivating your constituency than to promoting your standing in your own party. Had you done so, you would not have come to grief. Well, he replied, I have learned the lesson, but learned it too late.

It is fitting on an occasion of this kind to review for a moment the trend of parliamentary institutions in this country. There was a statement made in the 'Saturday Review,' an English publication, only a few weeks ago, in dealing with the conditions in England, which applies equally well to Canada. The remark was this, that parliament, and especially the House of Commons, was growing more and more into a mere electoral college for the re-election of a cabinet which was to conduct public affairs and introduce and carry any legislation that was to be carried. It is becoming more and more evident every day, I regret to say, that the House of Commons, whether in England or Canada, is becoming simply an electoral college for the purpose of choosing a cabinet to conduct the affairs of this country. If that is the case, is it not more incumbent on us to see that we choose for that cabinet men of the highest standing, men who have some grasp of the new and progressive ideas which are animating the people? But in that we have up to the present failed. We do not select the best men, but we rather select men who represent the provinces and the interests of great corporations. Parliament is becoming the instrument of great corporations rather than the instrument of the people to realize their wishes. Parliament does not represent the opinions of the people. There are new questions before the people, and the people are thinking about them; but I am sorry to say that the views of these people are not voiced in this parliament. In the United States the same condition exists. There they have great economic problems, great problems of transportation to deal with, and the men appointed to deal with them are not dealing with them in the interests of the people. Take the question of transportation. We have often discussed that question, but what have our discussions amounted to? More and more have the powers of the corporation increased, more and more have the grievances of the public increased in corresponding ratio, and yet parliament seems to be powerless to apply a remedy. Parliament pays too much attention to the interests of the corporations and not enough to the grievances of the people. I take it to be my duty in this parliament, as I considered it to be my duty in the last, to keep

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

prominent the fact that parliament is an instrument whereby the grievances of the public may be remedied, and to urge upon the government to give their attention to those grievances. There is no mention in the speech from the Throne of any intention to deal with the transportation question, yet that question is more of a grievance to-day than it ever was, and more in need of some official regulations by which the great corporations will be compelled to treat the public fairly. For fifty years we have had the Grand Trunk Railway running along the lake towns of Lake Ontario, yet the people are so disappointed that they are asking the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a rival line. Surely the Railway Commission ought to be able to do something to regulate their grievances, and give the people reasonable transportation, rather than compel them to incur the expenditure involved in maintaining a rival line. Even then the grievances will not be remedied, because there will be a merger. A great question such as that should receive more attention from this parliament, but apparently the whole attention of parliament is rather given to increasing the power of the corporations and placing the people more under their rule. Instead of freeing the people, we are giving the Grand Trunk Railway greater power, in spite of the fact that that company is exercising greater tyranny in Ontario and Quebec than it ever did before. Under the statutes of this country it is bound to carry the people from Toronto to Montreal for two cents a mile. When I put a question twice last session concerning this matter, the Minister of Justice was out of his place. There can be no doubt whatever as to the existence of the law, but that law is not enforced. We are paying immense sums for the maintenance of a Department of Justice and a Department of Railways, but it is the corporations and not the people who are benefiting by the expenditure. We are told that it is not the duty of either of these departments to remedy these wrongs, and the remedy is left to private citizens. We are referred to the Railway Commission, but the government will take no action itself. Take the telephone corporation, one of the worst monopolies which could exist, and which could be brought to book in five minutes by a letter from the government. But the government instead have done their best to strengthen that monopoly. The government could say to these gentlemen: Unless that contract between it and the big railways is repealed, we will have to step in. On Saturday night, speaking in South Ontario, I told the people that if the Hon. Mr. Dryden had been true to his constituents he would have told the Bell monopoly that if they did not remedy the grievance which existed in that constituency he and his government would repeal the legislation under which that monopoly worked in