

at their own cost. He regretted the example recently set by the city of Toronto in undertaking a costly work, which should really be carried out by the companies themselves.

That such an interest has been taken by the members is very satisfactory. It was hardly to be expected that those who were connected officially with our numerous railways would be in entire sympathy with the objects of the paper, which was written largely in the interests of humanity and rather from the point of view which the public would take.

The main point of the paper has been in part lost sight of by some who have discussed it. Control over railways is needed in the interests of the public, and has to a certain extent been provided for by Parliament. The channel through which this control was intended to be exercised has not proved efficient from causes which are apparent. What is being done to remedy this? The general fact, which must appeal to every one's feelings of humanity, is apparent that both in the United States and Canada large loss of life and injury to persons annually arise in connection with railways from causes some of which certainly can be remedied. Provision exists on the Statute books for investigation into this. What under these statutes is being done in Canada to consider efficient remedies and secure their adoption?

The statistics have been given in the paper to call attention in general terms to the number of accidents, and to the lack of uniformity in and the defective nature of the statistics in the United States, and not to afford a means of comparison between the accidents in the United States and Canada. The smallness of the passenger returns from Canada strongly suggests some way of making up the returns in the railway offices here, different from elsewhere. It seems unaccountable that States, with a population so very much less than that of Canada, should have as large and in some cases an immensely larger passenger traffic, and the result is still surprising even after allowing for the domesticity of the French-Canadians.

Mr. Wallis and Mr. Macklin appear to have overlooked the fact that no comparisons are drawn from the statistics given. Mr. Wallis is correct in so far as he says that the passenger mileage should be taken into account in ascertaining the proportion of accidents to number of passengers carried, but at the same time it is indisputable that even the passenger mileage is an unfair criterion, more particularly as actual facts indicate that suburban travel leads to a very largely increased proportion of injuries and deaths to employees. Though the passenger mileage in Canada is not given in the official returns, Mr. Wallis must