

the foreman, dash off copy, and, when told enough, he stopped short, and the last phrase was duly in its place. Like Thiers, he wished to do all; he felt offended if requested to take an assistant. It was neither celebrity nor fortune he coveted, but he had simply the passion for writing, as others have for gambling. The odor of printers' ink intoxicated him. He had nostalgia for the editorial room. And when he left the office, he commenced anathematizing his profession, suspecting that he would there "leave his bones." But he not the less brought home with him an armful of the afternoon papers, and passed his evening perusing them. Next morning he was at his post before nine o'clock, with the punctuality of a king.

Escande held the theory that a newspaper was not made for subscribers, but the latter for the journal. He would keep writing for months about a subject, and if a "constant reader" threatened to stop the paper on account of too much of the good thing, he would continue writing on the subject with greater frenzy to get rid of the heretic. Escande was as amiable as a bull dog; occasionally he had sallies of formidable fun—like Gambetta, and often he exploded like a canister of mitraille—sweeping all before it. He always wrote with his hat on his head, as tightly screwed down as if a coffin lid. He explained that his deformity was due to an attack of rheumatism when a baby, and of rickets when a boy. He never left the last word to an adversary. Escande died in full combat on the field of battle, at the age of seventy-five: "*Here reposes,*" might truly be written over his grave; for it was said he died in order to "rest." And suddenly too—so as not to lose a single hour in his daily work. Escande, like the Jacobites, might well have for motto—"Semper fidelis."

GEORGE SAND only became acquainted with Balzac in 1831, after she scored her first success with "Indiana." He was then poor, wearing himself out, like Scott, to pay off publishing debts. He received her in his "Villa," a rented summer house, in a large garden, and by candle-light, although it was noonday. Balzac, like De Quincy, had paroxysms of composition, and closing shutters, wrote several days and nights in succession. He confessed to George Sand ideas came to him more rapidly than he could pen them: he was a tree overlaid with fruit. He promised to interpret "Rabelais" for her, but the result was she ordered him off before half an hour. They became friends again, and he gave a dinner of reconciliation, when he wore his gaudy silk dressing-gown, and lit her part of the way home with a taper and a silver candlestick, his head bare. In 1844, when Balzac published his "Beatrice," the artistic and intelligent heroine therein portrayed had for model the authoress of "Indiana." He said of their respective talents: "You seek man as he ought to be; I take him as he is. Both of us are right, the two roads lead to the same end. I idealize my coarse creations, their ugliness and idiotcies; I impart to their deformities frightful and grotesque proportions. You cannot know such things. Continue to idealize the lovely, the beautiful, and the simple—that's woman's rôle." The followers of Balzac—the Zolas, Flauberts, and even Daudets, the modern novelists, are faithful to idealizing the hideous and the filthy.

ZERO.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## DISALLOWANCE IN MANITOBA.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—An editorial article in THE WEEK of 8th April on the "C. P. R. and the Monopoly Clause," is the occasion of my writing this letter. It seems to be a rooted impression among public writers and speakers that there is in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a stipulation which gives that company a monopoly of railway traffic between Manitoba and the United States for twenty years. Now, the fact is that, as far as the old Province of Manitoba is concerned, *there is no such stipulation*. For the twentieth time let it be repeated that the clause which provides that for twenty years the *Parliament of Canada* shall not charter any railway to run across the border, only applied to the North-West Territories. It could not apply to Manitoba, which had had a separate provincial existence for over ten years, any more than to Ontario. The Parliament of Canada could not legislate away the rights of any province secured by the B. N. A. Act—an Imperial Act. The Parliament of Canada *did not assume* or attempt to legislate away the rights of any province. They merely agreed that as far as *their* powers went, they would not set up any competing railways in territory still under their control. One of the rights secured to the provinces by the B. N. A. Act is the chartering of companies to build railways from any one point in the province to any other point therein. One of those points may be a point on the very border of its territory, yet the charter would be clearly within its *exclusive* legislative authority, and nothing but the arbitrary exercise of the power of disallowance vested in the Dominion Government could prevent the construction and working of the railway between such two points. Nothing can be clearer than this. It was never pointed out more clearly or emphatically than by Sir John Macdonald himself in the debate on the C. P. R. contract,

in the memorable words; "We cannot check Ontario, we cannot check Manitoba," when the Opposition objected to the clause on the ground that it was giving a monopoly. I cannot believe that when Sir John made use of that language he had the remotest intention of ever using the power of disallowance to "check" Manitoba, as he has since done. Otherwise he would have been guilty of the basest deception. I acquit him and his colleagues of any intention to deceive at that time. But that language certainly implied a promise that he would not in the future interfere to "check" Manitoba in the matter of railway competition. We all know how that implied promise has been kept. Manitoba has been "checked," and "checked" over and over again, and has received a set-back from which she has not yet recovered.

It is strange that so many of the writers in independent papers, like THE WEEK, the Montreal *Witness* and the Winnipeg *Sun*, seem to have the same erroneous impression with regard to the clause in question. The Ministers themselves have never urged that the so-called monopoly clause affects Manitoba in any way, or that it in any way pledges the country to prevent railway competition within the old Province of Manitoba. The leading Conservative newspapers, such as the *Mail* and the *Montreal Gazette*, have repeatedly pointed out the same thing. Look at the speeches of Sir Charles Tupper and Hon. Thomas White in Parliament and you will find the same thing there. Not a word of the alleged necessity of disallowance to keep faith with the C. P. R. What an absurdity then to talk of negotiating with the railway company for the abrogation of the monopoly clauses as respects the old Province of Manitoba! They have no such clause to abrogate, and I, for one, very strongly object to giving them money or anything else without a consideration. As far as regards the North-west they have a monopoly clause, but if it were abrogated to-morrow, will the North-west secure railway competition? By no means necessarily, for after you have induced the company for a great sum of money to give up their monopoly clause, are you sure that the Dominion Government, as at present constituted, will not as effectually as before prevent competition by disallowing local charters without any consideration at all, as they have done in Manitoba? Their promises and assurances in the past, in this matter, have been broken repeatedly, and

"Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes."

The Manitoba settler, from whose letter you give extracts, knows well what he is talking about. Up here in the North-West the hardy pioneer begins farming life with many advantages of soil and climate over the settler in the wooded districts of Ontario. He has not to "wrestle with stumps" for many, many years before he can put his one hundred or two hundred acres into crop. His roads are easily made. In most districts he gets all the hay he wants for the cutting. Game is abundant, the air is firm and bracing, and the skies bright. There are some drawbacks also, which no government can remove or mitigate; such as the want of trees in many parts, the intense cold of a portion of the winter, the distance from markets, the long railway haul, and the early autumn frosts which sometimes damage his wheat. The natural advantages, however, far outweigh the *natural* disadvantages. But our paternal Government at Ottawa, for purposes of its own, have put heavy artificial burdens upon the people here, in the shape of the Railway Monopoly kept up by Disallowance, and the heavy duties on imports. The effect of the former is to unnecessarily increase freight rates, and so add to the price of everything the settler has to buy, whilst diminishing the price of everything he has to sell in the same proportion. It is not necessary to show how the N. P. enhances the price of everything the settler has to buy. He is thus handicapped in both ways for the supposed benefit of the Dominion as a whole, and he is expected to be patriotic, to make the sacrifices cheerfully, and to do nothing to "embarrass poor Sir John." It appears to me to be a policy very short-sighted on the part of the Dominion.

They ought to know that Canada can never become a great and populous nation until these great prairies are filled up; and that the true way of getting people to come here and to stay, and to recommend their friends to follow, is to make the yoke easy and the burden light. They should not expect a too immediate return on their investment. The old man must give the boy a chance to grow, and develop, and not expect too much work from him until his muscles and sinews are stronger. The boy has been taunted with asking to be "spoon-fed," but if you tie up both the hands of the young giant how otherwise can he be fed?

They tell us we are ungrateful because the Dominion has given us a through railway at an enormous cost, and we should not grumble at paying our share. What are the facts? The people of Manitoba would have been better served to-day if there had been no through line built yet. In that case we would have had two or three lines connecting us with the States besides the line to Port Arthur, which would have been finished by the Government anyway, as indeed it was.

But Sir John having assured the people in the East that the entire cost of the railway would be defrayed out of the land sales, first took away all of our public lands—thus depriving us of that source of revenue enjoyed by the other Provinces—and then, in order to meet the heavy expenditure caused by his own policy, imposed a tariff that is especially burdensome to the people here. Add to that the burden of this Railway Monopoly gratuitously imposed by Disallowance, and it is wonderful how Manitoba prospers at all. But she does. Even now, in spite of all that I have pointed out, matters are looking brighter, this city is growing again, many new settlers are coming in, and the clouds of dull times are lifting. How much brighter then would be our prospects, how much more rapid our progress if we only had the boon of railway competition, and if the burden of an almost prohibitive tariff were removed.

GEORGE PATTERSON.

Winnipeg, 20th April, 1886.