

deed, if there are any exceptions about it, if there are any special reasons attached to it at all they are in the direction of refusing this special legislation, assuming that the parliament of Canada was in earnest when it passed this general legislation of 1903 and 1904. I therefore think that if you want to give force and effect to the general law you cannot at all times, here and there and every other moment, be making exceptions to that general law.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Could the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmer-son) inform me if the statement made by my hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Pringle) is correct that the Canadian Pacific Railway has not a separate company for its line running through the state of Maine? I understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway must have a separate company. At the time of the construction of the road through the state of Maine I am aware it had to have a separate company and I think that the hon. gentlemen is entirely wrong in his statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. They have.

Mr. MACDONALD. The proposition contained in this Bill is of an exceptional character. The proposition which this House crystallized into legislation last year requiring a majority of the directors of the companies which had received subsidies from the government of Canada to be British subjects was in line with the whole history of legislation in regard to the rights of aliens in the British empire. In Canada—more particularly in the province of Ontario—we have departed from the general principle which is recognized in England as one of the fundamental principles of the common law and we have extended to aliens various privileges in regard to real estate and otherwise which are not to be found in England or in other portions of the empire. The other provinces of the Dominion have not gone as far as the province of Ontario in this respect, but when we come to consider whether or not our lines of transportation should be under the control of a board of directors, the majority of whom are British subjects, I say we come to a situation in which this House should stand by the general principle of the legislation adopted a year ago. While I listened to the eloquent words of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) I am bound to say that his logic did not commend itself to me. It is true that we have a great country and that we are realizing to-day, perhaps, more than ever before the possibilities of Canada. This is true notwithstanding the fact that we are turning aside from the realization of those possibilities and taking up our time with the consideration of questions which will not conduce to the prosperity of this country. It is true that we occupy more time with such questions than we should, but if we realize, as I believe we all, on both sides of this House, do, the importance of our future, we must also be impressed with the importance

Mr. EMMERSON.

of keeping all the important elements which are going to make our future greatness within the control of the Canadian people. It is all very well to talk about American enterprise and American capital coming into this country to develop it and open it up. Why are they coming? They are coming because those who are behind them want to get everything that Canada has to give them and because they want to make money out of Canadian possibilities. Canadian legislatures and parliaments should not be anxious to relax a wise rule of the common law by extending to aliens any more rights in this country than they should possess consistent with the principle which have always governed our legislation in this and the mother country. I submit that this House a year ago, after full deliberation, having settled upon a line of policy in regard to that question, no case has been made out here to-night to warrant us in this particular instance in departing from the sound principle which we recognized a year ago.

Mr. SPROULE. We may very reasonably ask what object parliament had in view in passing the law. It was to get more effective control over the railways. We required not only more effective control over the railways into which the state had not put any money, but it was doubly necessary that we should have control over railways into which the state had put money. This is one of the roads of which the state paid a share of the cost and if there is any road in the country that the state ought to have a proper control over it is the road which the state helps to build. That is the case in this instance. My hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Pringle) says that this is an exceptional case. What is exceptional about it? Nothing at all. These people came and got a charter, as soon as they got the charter they wanted government aid and the government gave them aid and assisted in building the railway. There is nothing exceptional in the situation from what we can find all over the country. We have companies that are standing on exactly the same footing and in the same relationship to Canada and we have made this law apply to the whole of them. If it applied to other companies under similar circumstances what justification is there for saying that it shall not apply to this one? My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) rather amused me. He said you might as well give it to them because it is so easy to get over the law. If it is so easy to get over the law why should we give it to them? If they can get over the law without any trouble there is no object in making the exception which they ask. Therefore, I say that is an argument in favour of retaining the law as it is.

So long as we are not able to control our railways better than we have controlled them in the past, we should respect the provisions of this Act. The Canada Southern is in a similar position to the Ottawa