

Mr. TISDALE. I think if it is necessary to make out an exceptional case, one has been made out here. It has been shown that the proprietorship of this railroad is exclusively American and as far as I am individually concerned—and I am only expressing my own sentiments—I was not in accord with the change in the Railway Act, because I believe that in this country, which is one of the greatest countries in the world, our one weakness in times past—and we are not beyond that condition of weakness yet—is the need of capital to develop our immense area, our great resources and the magnificent possibilities of our splendid country. Why should we not allow people of another country to come in with capital when in my opinion we can sufficiently clothe them under the system of international law that exists to control their own property which we allow them to acquire in this country, I think that at present and for many years to come, notwithstanding the magnificent development we are making, that one of the things of which we should be most careful, is the inducement of capital to come in here, to protect the capital when it does come in and to give those whom we allow to become interested in enterprises, especially in large enterprises in this country, a cordial welcome and control of what they are permitted to acquire. The time has not yet come, even in the mother-country, great as it is, thickly settled as it is, developed as it is, that they have found it necessary to enact laws of this sort to protect the interests of the country as against the capital of those whom they invite to enter that country. Therefore as I said my individual opinion was that it was a mistake to change the Railway Act even to the extent that we did, for as I understand the international law of all civilized countries, when people acquired property under the law of a country in which they invest their capital under the comity of nations, they do it with the full knowledge that in so investing they are subject to the laws of the country in which the investment is made. I think in a commercial transaction that is a sufficient protection. Under the circumstances that have been developed here I feel it is my duty to explain why I view this matter as I do and to justify the vote I propose to give in support of this Bill. I say that I invite American capital, I invite European capital. I believe the majority of the people of this country if they understood this question would agree with me that the capital of all nations should be induced to come to Canada. We want to control, we must pass the laws, we must regulate the actions of every one who comes into this country, and must see that the laws shall be obeyed by them, but we wish to have them here because so great are our national resources, so wide is this wonderful country as yet undeveloped, so confident am I of the institu-

Mr. LENNOX.

tions of this country and of British institutions anywhere, that the people, especially those from the neighbouring country to the south who come in here, when they realize the justice and the fairness of our laws, when they have once become interested will become more deeply interested. On that line I want to say on a larger question although not pertinent to the matter at issue, that some people are questioning the wisdom of immigration from the United States, fearful that the voices of those coming in here and settling the vast millions of acres of undeveloped and unsettled lands that we have in our wonderful Northwest may be a menace to British institutions.

I want to say that from personal knowledge of those who come here having tried the institutions of the Northwest and other parts of the United States, when they perceive the equality upon which the poor man stands with the rich man, the prompt and impartial administration of our laws, I am satisfied that we cannot possibly get a better class of men to pioneer our Northwest than those from the United States. None will sooner become British subjects. They realize the great superiority of our administration of justice, the real equality of all men under our laws, and no men will support our institutions more heartily. Why then should we be afraid of them? Are we Canadians so afraid of the competition of men of that sort that we will not allow them to acquire property? We have set them an example, we allow any alien to acquire and hold real estate if he pays for it, and real estate is the most sacred of all property. We can place restrictions on them without compelling them to become British subjects. They have to obey our laws, and that is sufficient protection for us. If my views had prevailed we would not have changed the Railway Act as we did. But we are asked here to make an exceptional case. Why, even in the old state of New York they are benighted enough—and I use the expression advisedly in an international sense—in the great state of New York they won't allow a British subject to hold any land. It is a mistake, many people there are opposed to it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if they allow British subjects to hold mortgages on property in New York?

Mr. TISDALE. They do indirectly, but they do not allow them to hold land. They allow them to hold mortgages because mortgages do not vest the land. But in most parts of the United States they have a better state law. Mind you, that is a state regulation, not a federal regulation, and they allow aliens all through the undeveloped portions of the United States to hold lands, to buy lands and to hold them, to my knowledge. Those who want development, those who invite capital, those who want settlers, remove the restrictions, showing that even in their