

Winnipeg's case, and in a manner totally different from the overbearing style of the *Mail*:

"Montreal merchants would not it is said, like that the merchants of Winnipeg should have such routes from Montreal to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg to Calgary as, together, would be equal to the through rates from Montreal to Calgary. We do not see that they would have any reason or right to object. The cost of the extra carting back and forth at Winnipeg, re-packing, reshipment and so forth, would be a natural and sufficient advantage to Montrealers.

It is refreshing to read from an eastern journal such an honest acknowledgment of the rights of Winnipeg or any other portion of the Northwest, and we suppose the *Witness* is sufficiently independent of either Government or C.P.R., or the statement would not have appeared in its columns. On the other hand, the *Mail*, which is owned body and boots, (we were going to say "soul," but it never had one) by the present Dominion Government, is prepared to uphold the dishonesty and rascality of the C.P.R. discriminations, and from its tone we may judge how the attempts of Manitoba to break up railway monopoly will fare at the hands of our Ottawa rulers. It may be, that after being once more snubbed at Ottawa, and our interests and rights again trampled on to suit the aims of a small knot of speculative railway magnates, some of our gushing political partizans may begin to see how little consideration their requests receive from those to whom they pin their political faith. At least they might sit down and ponder over the incentives they have to political enthusiasm.

An Irishman once said that the only way to touch the feelings of his donkey was with the end of a club, and we believe the only way of making a Government learn where it blundered is to desert it when it wants support. With an election looming in the distance this course can be followed, if it is found necessary. The press of the Government already foreshadows that we must still be held in the grasp of railway monopoly, and suffer all the evils of discrimination. Perhaps all this is merely a little bluster put forth as a feeler, and we hope it is. If, however, it indicates aright, we hope that Manitobans when the time comes will be prepared to place their own present personal interests before the political prejudices they may have received from their fathers, or formed in an eastern home, when there

interests were the opposite of what they now are.

NOT WITHOUT A STRUGGLE.

From recent utterances of the Government press of Eastern Canada, together with what may be surmised from the remarks of conservative politicians and officials, it would appear that there is still no disposition, on the part of the Dominion Government to yield to the just demands of this province in the matter of the disallowance question. It would further appear that the statements made by Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, when discussing the resolution granting a loan to the C.P.R. Co., during the Parliamentary session of 1884, were the merest political buncombe. The hope held out to the people of Manitoba and the Northwest by the hon. gentleman, on the occasion referred to, that after the completion of the north shore portion of the C.P.R. the policy of disallowance would be discontinued, at least so far as this province is concerned, has now been thoroughly dissipated. It is becoming more clearly discernible day by day to the people of this country that they must fight for every just demand which they may make upon the Government who rule them in the interest of monopoly and eastern selfishness. Relief from railway monopoly will not come as an exception to the rule. If we are to have railway competition, and consequently no more disallowance, we can only have it when we make up our minds to no longer take no for an answer, and the sooner we come to this conclusion and prepare for the struggle the sooner will the result desired be attained.

The most important article bearing on the subject of disallowance of Manitoba railway charters, of recent date, appeared in a late issue of the *Montreal Gazette*. If this article were from the pen of a salaried editorial writer, simply giving the personal views of the writer, it might be passed over with merely a reference. But such is not the case. The article in question is given double weight by the fact that it has appeared in the organ of the Hon. Thos. White, Minister of the Interior. Even this might be looked upon without seriousness, were it not known that it was written by the Hon. Minister himself, and telegraphed from Ottawa to his paper. This being the case, it may be taken as an index to the intentions of the Government on the disallowance question. The article was undoubtedly

prompted by the notice given in the House by Mr. Blake, that he would move for the presentation of an address to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that the act passed by the Legislature of Manitoba, incorporating the Manitoba Central Railway Co., be not disallowed. It is regarded at Ottawa as foreshadowing the intentions of the Government to continue the disallowance policy in the interests of the C.P.R. monopoly, and as settling the fate of Mr. Blake's motion. Mr. White, in his article in the *Gazette*, has already shown how much dependence may be placed upon the utterances he made when here last fall, at which time he promised strict justice to the Northwest, and even hinted that it would not be necessary to further continue the policy of disallowance. It remains to be seen whether the Government will also show itself as utterly disregarding of its promises made through the Minister of Railways, that after the completion of the Lake Superior section of the C.P.R. the policy of disallowance would not be acted upon.

A careful review of the lengthy *Gazette* article would consume more space than we have at our disposal. Mr. White first refers to Sir Charles Tupper's speech in 1884 as "recognizing officially that the C.P.R. contract does not require the disallowance of Provincial charters" and that "the necessity of protecting the company will gradually disappear." After having thus perverted Sir Charles Tupper's positive statement, he goes on at length to endeavor to prove that the necessity for such protection still exists, and that it will take "time and capital" to overcome the necessity for disallowance. The C.P.R. Company falls in for a liberal share of flattery, but there is nothing about justice to the Northwest. That part of the article referring to the recent action of the Winnipeg Board of Trade in regard to freight discrimination is worthy of notice. Mr. White says: "It would be manifestly unjust for the company to make concessions to the trade of Winnipeg," and that "nowhere on the continent is such a principle in practice." And yet the wholesalers and shippers of Montreal have been clamoring for just exactly this principle, and have made demands upon the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial Railways exactly similar to the claims put forth by Winnipeg merchants. In this they have been supported by Mr. White's paper, in common with the press of that city, which has sent forth a loud wail of the injustice done Montreal. Mr. White evidently believes that what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander, and no doubt he will be able to reconcile the matter as easily as he does Sir Charles's speech, or his own statements "that there is nothing to prevent Manitoba now granting a charter to the boundary," and that "Parliament cannot take away those rights" from her.