

tion of any railway south of the Canadian Pacific Railway with certain exceptions for the term of twenty years.

The Dominion Parliament might agree to refuse to "authorize" the construction of such railways for a thousand years, but that would not affect Manitoba's rights. Railways chartered by provincial legislatures are not "authorized" by the Dominion Parliament, and never were since the passing of the British North America Act. There would be no sense, then, in the construction it is sought to place upon the monopoly clause. What it meant was that the Dominion Parliament would not "authorize" such railways in the territories over which it, and it alone, exercised control. The latter part of the monopoly clause, namely, the provision that "in the establishment of any new Province in the North-West Territories, provision shall be made for continuing such prohibition," plainly reveals the knowledge that the erection even of a portion of the North-West Territories into a province would *eo ipso* take it out from under the yoke of monopoly, and place it in a position to build as many competing railways to the boundary as it might desire. It was expressly provided, in accordance with this, that the territory taken from the North-West, and added to Manitoba, should be subject to the monopoly clause. If it was necessary to enact that upon the erection of any portion of the already monopoly-ridden territories into a province, express provision should be made in order to continue its subjection to monopoly; why was it not necessary to make a similar express provision in relation to Manitoba, which was already an autonomous province? How is it possible to argue, then, that the monopoly was intended to apply to old Manitoba?

I might quote the speeches of Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Thomas White, in the Dominion Parliament, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was up for ratification in February, 1881; the speech of Sir Charles Tupper in 1884, on the application for the \$30,000,000 loan; Hon. Thomas White's remarks to the Junior Conservatives of Winnipeg last March, and the assurance of the Minister of Justice to the Winnipeg Board of Trade in May last; but your contributor states that he does not care what the ministers said, but merely for the actual requirements of the law, and to the public the quotations from ministerial speeches on the Canadian Pacific Railway contract are sufficiently trite. It suffices to say that in all of them we have been assured again and again that neither the British North America Act nor the Canadian Pacific Railway Contract required monopoly in old Manitoba. The Red River Valley Railway Act was disallowed simply to carry out the trade policy of the Government, and not for the so-called reasons which your contributor has assigned.

WINNIPEG.

F. C. W.