

of the next seven years they have a like surplus, they will almost have money enough to build the road. If they follow my advice, then at the end of that time the people and not a private corporation will own the railroad. Since the Grand Trunk refused to carry out their share of the contract, the government can conscientiously get out of that bad bargain. I would suggest that the government should continue the Intercolonial Railway away into the prairies, and then we shall have a truly national means of transportation. I believe that Sir John Macdonald promised the people of British Columbia that within ten years they would have a railway, and even if it takes this government ten years to build a transcontinental railroad they will not be any worse than Sir John. We have paid \$145,000,000 of the wealth of the people to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to assist them to build their railway. It is estimated that it did not cost them that amount of money, but whether it did or not, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company own the road, and the people of Canada have nothing to say about it. Don't let us fall into such a trap as that again. If another transcontinental railway must be built let us build it and own it ourselves, and I believe the farmers of Canada will back up any government that proposes such a policy. Let us learn from experience. When the Romans came to Britain, before the Christian era, the first thing they noticed was that the highways of the country were in a miserable state. The Romans built roads all leading to the capital of London, and these roads are in existence to-day, and are the finest highways ever constructed. I myself have travelled over these roads and I know how well they have been built. But the ancient Romans did not give these roads to private corporations to charge toll on; they dedicated them to the people for the use of the people for ever, and that is just what we should do with our railroads in Canada. And now as to the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). I do not wish to mention a man's name in this House unless he is here to reply for himself; it is cowardly to attack a man in his absence, but Mr. Blair is public property now, he is our servant, and I suppose we have the right to criticise him. Last year I was a member of the railway committee, as I expect to be this year. Mr. Blair was very regular in his attendance at that committee, and he watched over the interests of the railway, and he stood with a club over us in order to see that no injustice was done to these railways. He never uttered a syllable in that committee to the effect that he was opposed to the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. Had he been as emphatic in that committee as he was in this House, I do not believe that the Bill would ever have passed the committee. He had a powerful influence over the members of that committee—he never had much over me. Our farmers were asking in that committee certain rights

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin).

which we have been demanding for years, but Mr. Blair constantly opposed our demands. I twice introduced Bills with regard to cattle-guards and drainage, but Mr. Blair ignored these questions altogether. I lost confidence in him as a man who would do justice to us farmers and I am sure he was working in the interests of the railroads. That is enough about him. When the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill passed, he took umbrage, and refused to accept the Bill, and finally withdrew from the House, and of course I did not shed any tears.

However, it seems that he was appointed to the first place on that commission by the ministry. And, mind you, I am not one of those who think that the patriotism is all on this side of the House. I believe there are patriots on both sides—men who try to do what is right and just in every particular. But I have seen men get up in this House and sneer at others who were talking good sense, simply because they were not on their side of politics. That is not right; we want to discuss these matters on their merits. The ministry thought they had selected their best man when they appointed Mr. Blair to the chairmanship of that commission. Well, perhaps they did; but I failed to see it. I have heard him three years on the Railway Committee, and I have never yet heard him demonstrate how much it was worth to carry a ton of produce from Winnipeg to the sea-board, or what it was worth to run a railroad. I do not think he knows anything more about railroads than I do; but he has been at the head of the Railway Department, and he has had men to tell him what to do. The farmers in my section of the country are not satisfied with the appointment of Mr. Blair. Perhaps after he reads my speech he will resign.

The Alaska award is mentioned in the speech from the Throne. I suppose I have discussed the Alaska award before a larger audience than any other member of this House. I had an opportunity of addressing some 2,000 people in Rochester, and I gave them my sentiments in regard to the aggressiveness and avarice of our neighbours to the south. When I was through they were as dumb as oysters. However, I must say that the Alaska matter is perhaps better settled than to be kept open as a bone of contention between the two countries. We would rather have had the award more in our favour; but when we leave a matter to arbitration and the arbitration goes against us, if we cry like children and make a big fuss, it shows that we have not been properly brought up. Let us see that we do not get into such trouble again.

The Prime Minister is very strong in regard to the Canadian people having an opportunity to manage their own affairs and to settle all disputes between themselves and other nations by treaty. What does that mean? I would like very much to see Canada settle her own affairs. We have a pow-