

same, and with that will come the nationalization of the cable system of the land telegraph system, and of some of the great steamship lines that connect one portion of the empire with the others. Now, as an evidence of the growth of the sentiment in favour of public ownership, consider what is taking place throughout the world to-day. Municipal ownership is one of the growing questions of the day. The idea of municipal ownership is being extended in a practical way in Europe and it has been begun in this country. There are several instances of it in Canada; and if you study the question as it is in Ontario to-day, you will find that what the people are talking of is the best means of bringing about the public ownership of the great franchises in connection with cities. The people are down on the monopolies, and they are trying in some way to get away from them, and the only way they can do it is by public ownership. The great argument in favour of public ownership of city franchises by the cities—and it applies also to the ownership by the country at large of the railways is that the problem before the men who have charge of the administration of one of these great franchises, when it is under public ownership, is how to supply the product whatever it may be, at the cheapest rate to the greatest number of people; but when the franchise is administered by a corporation, the problem is: How can we make the largest dividend on the greatest amount of inflated stock? That is the superiority of public ownership over private and corporation ownership. Every city that has gone into public ownership has succeeded; and the people of the cities of the United States and of the cities of Canada are, almost with one accord, in favour of this reform. When the next election is held in this country, I venture to predict now, there will be no issue but this question of the public ownership of these great corporations, the railways. We are talking of petty questions to-day. We must not forget that we are in a new century, and that there are newer and greater questions before us. The last century is gone, and gone with it are the questions that were identified with it. In this new century there is no question before the people of such magnitude and of such importance as the growth of the corporations and the necessity of getting rid of them in some way. And the only way to get rid of them, apparently, is by public ownership. If that is the case and if that is to be the issue, it is time that the people of this country were being educated on that question. It is time that the question was raised and the alarm given. It is very well for the Prime Minister to tell us that when the horse is stolen he will see to it that the door is locked. But that will not do. We must try in some way to take steps now to prevent the railways we have from passing into the hands of the great railway corporations of

Mr. MACLEAN.

the United States. For, if we allow them to go, I contend that when that transfer has taken place, Canada's future as a nation will have gone, and the people of the United States will own this country. Now, hon. gentlemen on the other side, and especially the Prime Minister, as I said, express no alarm at this American invasion. Perhaps we should not expect anything more from the right hon. the Premier. Perhaps the party of commercial union, having failed in their former effort, will quietly assist in the new American invasion, the result of which can only be that the Americans will practically come into possession of this country. It may be that the old commercial union movement may seek to realize itself in this way. The Americans are becoming more powerful in this country. Industry after industry is passing into their hands, and out of the control of the people of this country. It is time that we did something to try to prevent it.

Now, I would like for a moment, having dealt with the question of public ownership and the growth of corporations, to refer to one or two things that have come up in the debate this afternoon, before I touch another point. If there is one thing that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) who moved the address, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bland), who seconded it, boasted of, it was the great prosperity that prevails in this country. The Prime Minister took his cue from them. And, in some way, all these gentlemen identified this prosperous state of the country with the advent to power of the Liberal party. To that, I have just one answer to make, and it is in the form of a question. If Canada has been prosperous since the Liberal party came into power is it not because the Liberals failed to put into force the policy they declared for when out of office? They were to wipe the national policy off the face of the earth, they were to give us free trade as it is in England. Did they do either of these things? No; they adopted the national policy, and when they adopted it, the people at once saw that the country was not to be overturned, that the Liberals would not do what they had threatened to do. Thus, there was, at last, a united people in favour of the national policy and in favour of the development of the country. That is why the country is prosperous to-day. It is because you did not do what you said you would do, it is because you did not carry out the threats you made, it is because you adopted the national policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, which I am defending to-day.

Now, I wish for a moment to direct the attention of the House to the relations between Canada and the empire. The Prime Minister this afternoon referred to the sending of the last contingent in a way that was not satisfactory to me, and that I do not think will be satisfactory to the people of this country. All the justification he had for it was to say that he had allowed