

KNIGHTLY EXPECTATIONS AND REBUKES.

Sir George Stephens the "baronet bold" but certainly not diplomatic, in his threatening telegram to Mr. Norquay last spring condescended to call the business men of this province irresponsible speculators and shysters, for the sole reason that they demanded the rights of the province, and freedom from railway monopoly, which he and his associates in the C.P.R. still insist upon holding, for purposes of gain to themselves. Evidently Sir George meant this as a rebuke to those who dared to oppose his pet scheme, and it may be that some people were astonished that the "baronet bold" but not diplomatic should have manifest his mighty displeasure in language smelling so strongly of Billingsgate.

But Sir George gave some hint at his expectations and desires regarding those irresponsible speculators and shysters, when he stated that they would be better employed in plowing the prairie lands around them and raising crops, than in agitating for freedom from railway monopoly. Sir George's knightly expectations were therefore, that only in the shafts of a plow should the Manitoba settler be allowed to live.

But Sir George Stephen is not the only titled gentleman who has made known his expectations regarding Manitoba, and administered rebukes to those who differed with him regarding the administration of its affairs. Sir Charles Tupper has made his name notorious in this respect, and every true friend of the province can remember the rebuke he administered to Mr. Watson member for Marquette, when that gentleman demanded from the Dominion House the freedom of his province from railway monopoly as a condition of the Government guarantee of \$22,500,000 then asked by the company.

But Sir Charles, like Sir George, has expressed expectations regarding Manitoba. Yes he has gone him one more, for he has expressed in the Dominion House his disappointment at the non-fulfilment of his expectations, and on the strength of this disappointment he based his further support of railway monopoly. His expectations regarding the progress of the province had been so far from realized, that he felt justified in refusing to allow the abolition of that monopoly, although three years previously he had as a member of the Government and on behalf of the C.P.R. Company, promised that long ere now the monopoly should cease.

Now we shall bid good bye to knightly rebukes and study knightly expectations. Had those of Sir George been fulfilled and all Manitoba turned farmers, where would we now be? And had those of Sir Charles been realized, let us ask the same question and ponder carefully over it.

Manitoba has a population of a little over 100,000, and less than 30,000 of these are adult males. Government service, Dominion and local, reduces the number of adult males at farming, business, speculation and shyshtering, if Sir George must have it, to less than 25,000. That the number is so small is due entirely to the policy of railway monopoly forced upon the province. The progress made by this 25,000 people is, that from one crop they are able to supply themselves with bread and export over 12,000,000 bushels of grain, or about 500 bushels per capita of their number. But the facts in the case are that only about 10,000 of our adult male population are engaged in farming, and that is a larger proportion than can be shown in the population of any other part of this continent. These 10,000 farmers have, therefore, produced enough grain for the population of their own province, and have on the average, supplied, or are only waiting to supply 1,200 bushels each for export purposes. To bring the matter down short, this province with 100,000, of a population, less than 30,000 adult males, and not more than 10,000 farmers has produced in one year bread enough to supply two-thirds of the entire population of Canada, and it is less than seven years since the province was in a position to export one car of grain. With these facts before us we ask Sir Charles Tupper what progress he really expected from the people of Manitoba? and at the same time we may ask Sir George Stephen a plain old "rule of three" question, namely, if 10,000 farmers produce so much grain in one year, that the efforts of his road to carry it to market are about as successful as the mythical old woman, trying to bale the ocean dry with a pitch fork, how would he succeed with the products of 25,000 farmers to haul? Yet Sir George in his rebukes assumes that we should all be farmers here. Sir George will probably give it up, and if he will give up advising and rebuking our citizens at the same time he will act wisely. As for the disappointment of Sir Charles, his expressions were only one of those subterfuges to excuse an act of perfidy, in the use of which no one is more skilled than the fishbone knight.

COMMERCIAL UNION IN SAINT PAUL.

At a meeting of the Saint Paul Chamber of Commerce last week, at which the question of Commercial Union with Cana-

da was discussed, the proceedings were such as might convince any Canadian friend of free trade of the utter selfishness, which has prompted every overture from the United States in the direction of Commercial Union or reciprocity with this Dominion.

Mr. Daniel R. Noyes the convener of the committee of the St. Paul Chamber, who has had the Reciprocity question in his care for a year or so is undoubtedly one of the very few men of mercantile prominence in his own city, who believes that Commercial Union between Canada and the United States is a step in the direction of free trade, although it is impossible for us to see on what grounds he reasons out the connection. At the meeting referred to however, he had the misfortune (for Commercial Union we mean) to drop a few words to that effect, and immediately a storm of opposition was showered at him and his project. Protected interests were by far to powerful in the Saint Paul chamber to allow the endorsement of anything that had a taint of free trade. Commercial Union and even political union were freely advanced by some speakers, but not upon any grounds that would admit of a possibility of free trade, although it is questionable if six men in the meeting could by any course of reasoning show, where a link between Commercial Union and free trade could be formed.

There is no use trying to evade the fact, that in the United States the movement for Commercial Union with Canada is being pushed in order to check the tendency of the present Washington Administration to legislate in the direction of reduced tariff. If the United States manufacturers could secure Canada as a new field, in which they would be protected from outside competition, they would have temporary relief from the state of industrial over-production, to which tariff-bolstering has brought matters there. The relief would only be temporary, for Canada's market is limited, and Canadian manufacturers would have to be bought or crowded out to secure even this temporary relief. It would be relief, however, and would aid greatly in averting the proposed tariff reductions they so much fear, but under present circumstances are powerless to prevent. But the very thought of free trade makes such advocates of Commercial Union hunt for their protective shelter in a hurry.

In Winnipeg in the near future the citizens may be called upon to pronounce upon this question of Commercial Union, as Senator Butterworth and Mr. Erastus Wiman have been invited by the Winnipeg Board of Trade to visit the city and explain their ideas of union. We hope when our citizens come to consider the question with the intention of recording a decision, they will show that they too can frame their opinions upon selfish grounds, and that the selfish interests of this country will be the weight which will turn the balance.