

them as they treat us. This is a vicious principle that is being introduced by this legislation. The international complications that arise in the world to-day largely arise out of the administration of foreign capital in a country by a board of directors outside of that country, and there is nothing President Roosevelt takes so much interest in as backing up boards of directors living in his own country and exploiting some foreign country with their capital. He says he is the big policeman of this continent to compel all the governments in North America to carry out their commercial obligations and to respect the rights of United States corporations having interests in these countries. If you pass this legislation you are forming the ground work of international complications; you are opening the door for the administration of Canadian railways by a small executive committee sitting in New York and you are giving that power to the great Vanderbilt interests who will extend it and extend it until they take over all our railways. It is not good national policy, and it is not in line with the statement made by the Minister of Railways in this House last week. I am where I was last week, but he has changed his view. He now tells us that Canada has no national policy in maintaining in her own hands the control of the railways in this country. True, the Canadian Pacific Railway has an executive of three, but that executive is in the city of Montreal, and the proposition now before us is that this Ottawa-New York line shall be administered by an executive of three sitting in the city of New York.

Mr. EMMERSON. Selected by a board, the majority of whom are British subjects.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And the majority of whom are elected by one man in New York.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I agree with the member for East York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as to affirming the principle of Canada for the Canadians, but it does seem to me that the strongest blow you can strike at this principle is to try to apply it in defiance of common sense. I suppose there is nothing more generally admitted in this country than that what every part of Canada wants is as much foreign capital as we can possibly induce to come here, and it is just a question whether or not we in this House are doing anything to assist the investment of foreign capital if we throw as many obstacles as possible in the way of foreigners investing their money in Canada. I feel very strongly that anything we may do to make it more objectionable from the standpoint of an outsider to invest his money in Canada, is doing just so much to retard the progress of this country. There is another consideration that strikes me. Looking at the matter practically, while I am very glad to see the majority

of the board, Canadians, and while I would be very glad to see this committee of three, Canadians, I do not feel that practically it makes one iota of difference whether you have them Canadians or not. If the Americans are bound to purchase this railway, and if we pass a law that all the directors or a committee of three must of necessity be Canadians, we will have dummy Canadians, men who are merely placed there to do what they are ordered to do by those who own the road, and in such a case it seems to me the latter end of that railroad would be worse than the first. When my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) inquires as to whether or not the Railway Commission would have still more authority over this railroad in case the committee of three were all Canadians, it seems to me the Railway Commission has this advantage; that in case this railroad comes before the commission the railway is in the position of a litigant in court. If the litigant lives on the other side of the line and he has a case in a Canadian court I do not think his opponent need be worried as to whether or not he will call his witnesses, for the Railway Commission will have perfect power to proceed whether any witnesses are called on behalf of the railway company or not. I think we can give credit to these Americans for sufficient common sense to rest assured that if a question arises before the Railway Commission they will protect their own interests by calling all the witnesses they think necessary, and if they do not so much the worse for themselves and so much the better for the people of this country, because then judgment would be given in favour of those who are attacking the railway.

Mr. LENNOX. I am very sorry that I may be open to the insinuation that I am not capable of exercising ordinary common sense.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We get that insinuation often now.

Mr. LENNOX. Even in view of the possibility of being open to that imputation I will venture to do my own thinking. I ventured to express my view on this matter briefly the other day, and it is of such importance that I feel justified in restating that view. I had not the pleasure of hearing the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) to-day, but I infer from something which has been said since I came into the Chamber that he had put the matter in a somewhat different light.

Mr. HAGGART. He has not spoken to-day.

Mr. LENNOX. Then probably he has done so by his silence. This is not a question as to what we shall do generally, but, it is a question as to what we shall do in a case where we have invested the money