

movement, to denounce all corporations as enemies of the public weal. Examine the newspapers of that school, and you will find in almost every issue that corporations are made the butts of their attacks and their sneers. The truth is that corporations, like all other human institutions, are a mixture of good and evil. The truth is that while they are important and render great service to the country, on the other hand they are not free of serious blemishes. The truth is also that corporations have been one of the most potent agencies of modern civilization in the creation and distribution of wealth amongst all classes of the community. It is undeniable, even the hon. member for South York who almost daily declares himself the enemy of corporations, and especially of railway corporations, cannot deny that corporate capital, corporate labour, corporate effort, will do more than could ever be accomplished by individual effort. What are corporations after all? Corporations are simply aggregations of individual forces, and it stands to reason that aggregations will always accomplish more than individual effort. It is also undeniable that whilst corporations have done a great deal of good in this way, railway corporations especially have become such enormous organizations as to constitute a possible menace to the state. It is equally undeniable that corporations cannot escape the reproach of having often been actuated by greed and of having disregarded the interests they were created to serve. If such be the situation, and I think I have correctly described it, it is clear that it is the duty of the legislator to interfere. But in what sense and to what extent is the problem. The hon. member for South York says, down with corporations, down with railway corporations, and let the state itself provide this kind of service for the public. The hon. leader of the opposition argues one way and concludes another way, and therefore abdicates into the hands of the hon. member for South York. But a person who looks at the question calmly and dispassionately must come to the conclusion that the interests which are served to-day by private enterprise are better served than they possibly could be by the state. The true remedy, I apprehend, is not to entrust railways to state management, but it is to leave them to corporations subject to the control of parliament, who will see that they properly discharge the duties they are called upon to discharge in the public interest. Sir, I do not hesitate to say for my part that if the policy of the hon. member for South York were adopted, it would be a calamity to this country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it a calamity in Germany, in Russia, in France, in Australia?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Thank God we are not coming here to take our examples from Germany, or France or Russia.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the right hon. gentleman say what he thinks of New Zealand and Australia, daughter states of the great empire which he upheld this afternoon?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think Australia and New Zealand are young experimenting communities, and they have gone further in state socialism than I care to go. For my part I believe that our system is preferable to the system which has been adopted in Australia and New Zealand. I say to my hon. friend that if you remove the incentive of ambition and emulation from public enterprises, you suppress progress, you condemn the community to stagnation and immobility.

Sir, I will give my hon. friend a concrete example taken from our own history. I will not go to Germany, I will not go to Russia, I will not go to New Zealand or to Australia; right here in Canada we find a concrete example to which I call his attention. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was at one time possible to build it as a government railway. Mr. Mackenzie had commenced to build it as a government railway, not from choice but from necessity, because private enterprise failed to come forward and offer to build it. When the government of Sir John A. Macdonald came to power he changed that policy, and determined to have a railway built by private enterprise; and so far as I remember I do not think that a single word has ever been said against that policy. There was dissent with the terms given to the company, but so far as it was a choice between government ownership and company ownership, I do not remember, speaking under correction, that a single word has ever been spoken against the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald. Now it has been built as a private enterprise, and will the hon. gentleman pretend that it would have served the country as well as a government enterprise? Why, Sir, consider what has been done by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It has in a great many instances, and in a multitude of manners, built up other enterprises as adjuncts to the railway which never would have existed if the railway had been built as a government enterprise. My hon. friend knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has covered their lines with hotels. There is a hotel in Quebec, a hotel in Montreal, a hotel in Winnipeg, a hotel in Vancouver, a hotel in the Rocky Mountains, and this system of hotels has brought thousands and hundreds of thousands of tourists who never