

early remembrances, and when, in maturer years, he thinks he has grown tired of Mendelssohn in the rage for modern chromatic vagaries, he is still apt, after periods of silence, to be stirred to his inmost depths by the well-known sounds when awoke by a fine performance, and he finds that he is not yet so modernised as to despise the musical forms he once appreciated.

Poets ignore artistic facts and possibilities even more than novelists, although possibly poetic license may be taken in this case as some excuse. Still, one cannot help feeling that there could be no reason why the individual who was practising on an organ with the key-board out of order ("noisy keys") in Miss Proctor's poem should, immediately on discovering an unusually effective chord, have forgotten it and been unable to play it again. Perhaps his poetic mind was wanting in the mathematical qualities necessary to a good musician. Another funny man is the professor in Frances Ridley Havergal's well-known poem. This musician had a refractory pupil whom he induced, after much exercise of poetic and persuasive eloquence, to learn the so-called "Moonlight Sonata" instead of a set of waltzes. His artistic exertions were rewarded years afterwards by meeting this same pupil in society, and hearing her play the sonata with such feeling and insight as to disclose even to him a deeper meaning than he had previously discovered in it. As this is perhaps of all sonatas the most hackneyed, a musician fails to be touched by this poem, for his mind begins to speculate on the artistic and social status of this professor who was so slow of apprehension as to require in middle age one of his own pupils to reveal to him the emotional possibilities of the "Sonata quasi Fantasia." Possibly he was one of the noble army of "cheap teachers," to protect itself against whom the musical profession occasionally forms associations, but who nevertheless live and thrive under the sympathetic protection of an appreciative and economical public. Yet another instance of poetic aberration is a poem in which the duet in Mendelssohn's "Lieder ohne Worte" is compared with the well-known picture of the Huguenot lovers, the maiden being supposed to plead musically with her lover, endeavouring to detain and thereby save him. This poetic conceit loses all its point from the fact that the pleading voice in the piece is the man's, the soprano melody being of a calmer nature. Had the poet treated it as a love song, the man pleading, the woman denying, and finally both agreeing as they unite in the same air in octaves, some successful poetic use might have been made of it, but, as usual, the writer starts with a preconceived idea to which the poor art must accommodate itself. Music, being beyond all others the emotional art, should be left unfettered, and whilst to a poetic mind it undoubtedly does present definite images, it may be, within certain limits, very differently interpreted by different minds.

Music without words cannot state an argument or describe a material object, but it can rouse any kind of emotion, and by the emotional effect suggest a material cause, thus calling up a world of material images; but to confine it to any one of these images is to rob it of that vagueness of suggestion which is its chief glory and characteristic.

J. W. F. HARRISON.

THE C. P. R. CONTRACT AND MONOPOLY.

IN a former article, believing that the words of the Minister of Justice had silenced those who had so loudly claimed that the C. P. R. contract necessitated Disallowance in old Manitoba, I discussed monopoly enforced by Disallowance as a policy merely, and not as the result of any obligation by which the people of Canada might be bound. Since then Sir George Stephen has issued his address to the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and has created no little surprise by contending not only that the monopoly clause applies to old Manitoba, but also that, from the first, it was understood to affect it; and that, in 1880, "the province hailed the signing of the contract with satisfaction, and hardly a voice was raised in objection to the so-called monopoly clause." Nearly all the Government organs are repeating these assertions, and it is being widely represented that, as Manitoba swallowed the monopoly clause without complaint in 1880, she is estopped from raising her voice against it now. Of course this contention is not a just one. If the monopoly clause is unconstitutional as well as oppressive, no former act on the part of the old province could be used to muzzle her now, nor would any one outside of the interested parties and the partisan organs urge such a thing. As a matter of fact, however, the signing of the contract was not greeted by Manitoba with so much satisfaction as Sir George and the organs allege; and the statement that "hardly a voice was raised in objection to the so-called monopoly clause" is diametrically opposed to the facts. A little history on this point may not be out of place. On the 11th December, 1880, Sir John Macdonald presented the contract to the House of Commons, and a short summary of its contents, omitting any reference to the monopoly

clause, was telegraphed to the Manitoba papers. On the 15th of the same month the full text of the agreement was published in the Winnipeg press. The 14th clause provided that the Company might build branches "from any point or points within the territory of the Dominion," and the 15th or monopoly clause read as follows:—

"For twenty years from the date hereof no line of railway shall be authorised by the *Dominion Parliament* to be constructed south of the C. P. R. from any point at or near the U. P. R., except such line shall run south-west or west of south-west, or within fifteen miles of latitude 49. And in the establishment of any *new province* in the Northwest Territories provision shall be made for continuing such prohibition, etc."

On the 16th of the month Thomas Scott, Tory Member for Winnipeg, telegraphed to Sir John Macdonald, asking what were the real powers of the C. P. R. under clause 14, and on the 18th he received the following reply:—"The Canadian Pacific Railway will have the power to build branch lines anywhere." On the 20th of the month Mr. Hay, Member for St. Clements in the Manitoba Legislature, gave notice of the following resolution, that—

"An address be presented to the Governor-General in Council, praying that the terms with the syndicate may not be entered into, inasmuch as the said terms will be found unacceptable to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, more particularly with respect to part of clause 11, and clauses 14, 15, and 16."

On the 21st he moved it, and, in speaking to his motion, he said:—

"He believed that, if the Dominion Government had announced their intention respecting this railway last summer or early this fall, not only would Manitoba have offered the strongest objections, but the Dominion at large would have done so. The terms offered to the syndicate would create one of the most gigantic monopolies ever brought into existence by any Government, and one which would be a lasting disgrace to this country."

At the request of Mr. Norquay—then as now Premier—the motion was postponed in order that more time should be given the members to consider the question fully. On the 22nd a meeting was held in the Winnipeg Court House, and a resolution referring to the published agreement and Sir John's telegram, and concluding as follows, was passed:—

"That for the present the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate should have given to them power to build only the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that any other line or branch line shall be built by the syndicate or other company only after their obtaining power from time to time from the Parliament of Canada to build such line or branch; and that the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall not be allowed to approach within fifteen miles of the international boundary line; and that Parliament should not abandon its right of authorising the construction of railways in any direction by other companies."

On the afternoon of the same day, in the temporary absence of Mr. Hay, A. W. Ross, then Member for Springfield in the Local Legislature, re-introduced Mr. Hay's motion for an address to the Governor-General in Council, protesting against the monopoly clause, and clauses 14 and 16. As Mr. A. W. Ross has since become one of the most reliable voters on the side of the monopoly in the House of Commons, his utterances on that occasion may be of interest now:—

"The universal charter power [he said] proposed to be given this company would be one most detrimental to the Northwest. (Hear, hear.) Under it the C. P. R. syndicate could build roads wherever they saw fit, and bar all others out most effectually. (Hear, hear.) By running trial lines anywhere they might hold the field against all comers and prevent the incorporators of any other scheme from going on with their work. The monopoly given them in this way, and the mischief they could work by its use, will be patent to every hon. Member. (Cheers.) The Southwestern Railway, for instance, which is so valuable to this city and a large and important section of the country. The building of that road could be very readily retarded, if not prevented altogether. All the syndicate would need would be to say, 'We have resolved on running a line to the Pembina Mountains—in the same direction as yours,' and by merely holding out this threat a powerful corporation such as this syndicate might deter this company or any other from going on with a line, and no capitalists would advance money on such security. (Hear, hear.) There is no question in my mind but that this is one of the most pernicious provisions in the contemplated contract (cheers), and it meets the most determined opposition from the people of this Province. (Cheers.) Some of the provisions restricting the building of other lines in certain directions were also highly objectionable. Unless there is an intention to create a huge monopoly here, undoubtedly other companies should be permitted to build roads for the benefit of the public on as favourable terms as the syndicate."

At the urgent request of Mr. Norquay Mr. Ross withdrew his resolution, and in its place the Premier introduced substantially the same resolution which had been passed by the meeting of citizens during the afternoon, and it was adopted by the Legislature. The two resolutions differ in that the former asked that the contract be not entered into, while the latter demands that it should be modified in certain particulars, one of