

a short-sighted policy, and reverts a considerable portion of the blame back upon their own shoulders. But now that the matter has been taken up, retailers surely cannot consider it unreasonable, if wholesalers should make some inquiries in regard to the insurance carried, before advancing large amounts of goods. All merchants should look upon the insurance premiums as a necessary portion of their unavoidable expenditure, just as they would upon rent, fire and light, taxes, wages, advertising, or any other unavoidable expenditure, without which it is impossible to do business. Because premium rates are high, it should not be neglected any more than any of the other cause of expenditure mentioned, in fact should be the very first thing secured in commencing business or increasing stock. The merchant who cannot afford to pay his insurance premium, cannot afford to do business, and had better vacate the field immediately.

THE "MAIL" AND DISALLOWANCE.

The Toronto *Mail's* opposition to the disallowance of Railway charters in Manitoba, has stirred up some little discussion in Eastern papers regarding this most momentous question to the people of this province. The argument is advanced, in opposition to the *Mail*, that were free trade in railways granted to Manitoba, the merchants and manufacturers of Ontario would lose a portion of the trade of the Northwest, which would be reverted from them to the advantage of the Americans. It is also urged that the monopoly clause is a part of the contract with the Canadian Pacific, and that to abrogate it would be a breach of faith. With regard to the loss of trade, the *Mail* argues, that if Eastern merchants and manufacturers cannot hold Northwestern markets with the aid of the existing protective tariff, it would be owing to the dearness of their goods, and that this is a question which the Manitoba settler could not be expected to concern himself about. THE COMMERCIAL has contended heretofore that Eastern manufacturers would not be the losers by the abolition of railway monopoly in this province, and in this respect the *Mail* adopts pretty much the same line of argument as has frequently been set forth in these columns. It is contended, and with show of good reason, that the abolition of monopoly would have the opposite effect from what it is generally supposed it would, in curtailing inter-

provincial trade between Manitoba and the older provinces, and that on the contrary, Eastern manufacturers would derive advantages from the opening up of the country to free railway communication with the United States to the south. Railway competition would cheapen transportation rates, thereby lessening the cost of goods to the consumer here. Such competition and reduction in freight rates would further increase the value of grain, produce, etc., and all exports from the country. Thus in each case, the purchasing power of the people would be increased, to the advantage of manufacturers exporting their goods to this province. Then, as the *Mail* points out, "our endeavor should be to make the country not less attractive, but more attractive than Dakota, Minnesota, etc." What is chiefly wanted to make the Northwest valuable to home manufacturers, both east and west, is population. Shutting up the country from railway connection and competition with the outside world, is the very thing which will not bring population, and would seem to have been designed with the view of driving settlers to the adjoining states. On the other hand, the policy of free trade in railways would aid in the settlement of the country, and would, in turn, result in a proportionate increase in the consumption of goods—all to the advantage of the manufacturers.

In regard to the statement that the monopoly clause is part of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the *Mail* agrees with its eastern contemporaries, but thinks that the promise of Sir Charles Tupper to the effect that monopoly would be abandoned on the completion of the C.P.Ry., should be carried out. The *Mail* says: "The agitation now going on against monopoly is nothing more than an attempt to induce the administration to carry out its pledge. As a matter of fact no one ever thought the monopoly could be kept alive for twenty years." On this last point the *Mail* is at variance with public feeling here, and fails to comprehend the real point of view from which Manitobans contend against disallowance. It has always been stoutly contended here, that the monopoly clause in the agreement with the C.P.Ry. Co. was not binding upon this province, but only applied to the unorganized territory west of the boundary of Manitoba. In support of this contention, we have the declaration of Sir John Macdonald himself, made in the House during the debate on the C. P.

Ry. Bill, and before the adoption of the same. When asked "what about Manitoba," Sir John replied to the effect that "we have not the power to check Manitoba." The promise made by Sir Charles Tupper, that the disallowance policy of the Dominion Government in regard to Manitoba railway charters would be discontinued on the completion of the C.P. Ry., was hailed here with delight as a vision of coming freedom from monopoly. The subsequent refusal of the Government to carry out the promise made by the ex-Minister of Railways, has produced a corresponding feeling of gloom and want of confidence in our rulers. But though this promise of Sir Charles' has frequently been referred to as a secondary reason why the Dominion Government should cease disallowing the railway acts passed by the Manitoba Legislature; yet Manitobans have never based any particular claims upon it. It is freely admitted that the Federal Government is at liberty to exercise its Royal prerogative in disallowing any act of the provincial legislatures, but that the Government has the power to establish a monopoly of the nature of the C.P.Ry. in any of the organized provinces, it is not for a moment conceded. In fact, members of the Government have admitted that Manitoba railway charters have been disallowed, not on account of any obligations to the C.P. Ry. Co., under the agreement with that corporation, but solely as a matter of expediency in the interests of the Dominion. Manitobans do not base their claims against disallowance upon the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, but upon the rights of the province to equality with the other provinces of the Dominion, under the British North America Act. It has never been admitted that the C.P. Ry. Co. has a right to claim the disallowance of railway charters granted by the Manitoba Legislature, for the purpose of building railways to the United States boundary, within the limits of the old province of Manitoba; nor has it been admitted that the Federal Government has the power to grant a monopoly of railway privileges within any province of Canada, without the consent of that province. If the C.P. Ry. Co. enjoyed the monopoly in this province which is claimed by some it does, why was it necessary to introduce a clause, granting the monopoly privileges in the territory which was added to the province to the west of the old boundary?