paper in a French village, and before he appreciated the fact that he was being sued, a judgment had been given against him for default of defence. After Auger & Son had obtained judgment by way of default on Magann's part in not defending in response to the advertisement, they caused the Sheriff to seize the ties, and they were then sold over again and bought for very little, under an agreement, as Magann alleges, between Auger & Sons and the purchaser, by which Auger & Sons got the actual price at which the ties were subsequenty sold by the Sheriff's sale purchaser. Magann's solicitors, Mac-donell, Boland & Thompson, of Toronto, applied to be let in to defend, alleging that the whole cause of action did not arise in the City of Quebec, and that the Quebec courts had no jurisdiction, and further, that Magann had a defence on the merits as the ties had not been accepted, not being up to specifications. In addition to that there was a further defence on the question of freight rates, Magann contending that it was represented that Auger & Sons had a freight rate which Magann could use to move the ties, which representation turned out to be incorrect, and in addition to the ties not being up to the specifications, there was a prohibitive rate of freight. On the application to be let in to defend, the Quebec court held that it had jurisdiction, but allowed Magann to defend the whole action, and to enter any defence he thought fit. The case was subsequenty tried, but the Court refused to admit Magann's evidence in connection with the freight, and in connection with the ties not being up to specifications, and after reserving judgment he was condemned to pay the whole amount of the purchase money and the costs. Magann appealed and was again unsuccessful, but the Court moderated the damages which he was adjudged to pay. He again appealed to the Supreme Court, and the matter came up early in March, when judgment was reserved and was given a few days later, maintaining Magann's objection to the jurisdiction of the Quebec court. He claimed in the action that the contract having been closed in Toronto the whole cause of action had not arisen in Quebec, and in consequence Quebec courts had no jurisdiction. With this the Supreme Court agreed, the plaintiffs being also condemned to pay the costs.

Growth of Canadian Railways.

The following table shows the growth of railways from year to year since the opening of the first line in 1836:

| MILEAGE | MILEAGE. |
|------------|----------|
| 1868 | 35 0 |
| 1869 2,52 | 36 16 |
| 1870 2,61 | 37 16 |
| 1871 | 38 16 |
| 1872 2,89 | 39 16 |
| 1873 3,61 | 40 16 |
| 1874 3,83 | 41 16 |
| 1875 4,33 | 42.,, 16 |
| 1876 4,80 | 43 16 |
| 1877 5,21 | 44 16 |
| 1878 5,78 | 45 16 |
| 1879 6,12 | 46 16 |
| 1880 6,85 | 47 54 |
| 1881 7,19 | 48 54 |
| 1882 7,33 | 49 54 |
| 1883 8,69 | 50 66 |
| 1884 | 51 159 |
| 1885 10,27 | 52 205 |
| 188610,77 | 53 506 |
| 1887 | 54 764 |
| 188812,18 | 55 877 |
| 188912,58 | 56 |
| 1890 13,15 | 57 |
| 1891 | 58 1,863 |
| 189214,56 | 59 1.994 |
| 189315,00 | 60 2,065 |
| 1894 | 61 2,146 |
| 1895 | 62 2,189 |
| 189616,27 | 63 2,189 |
| 1897 16,55 | 64 2,189 |
| 1898 16,71 | 65 2,240 |
| 189917,25 | 662,278 |
| 190017,65 | 67 2,278 |

Railway Statistics for Years Ended June 30, 1899 and 1900.

Following is a comparative statement of the railway statistics of the Dominion for the above mentioned years:

| above mentioned years. | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| | June 30, 1899 | June 30, 1900 |
| Miles of railway completed | | |
| (track laid) | 17,358 | 17.824 |
| Miles of sidings | 2,402 | 17,824 2,558 |
| iron rails in main line. | 178 | 130 |
| " steel " " " | 17,180 | 17,694 |
| double track | 562 | 591 |
| Capital paid (including 4 fol- lowing items) Dominion and Provincial bo- | \$964,699,784 | \$998,268,404 |
| Dominion and Provincial bo- nuses paid | · • | \$169,706,725 |
| nuses paid | \$20,468,245 | |
| paid Provincial Govt. (subscription | e | |
| to shares paid) | \$300,000 | \$300,000 |
| Miles in exerction | \$15,740,668 | \$15,884,542 |
| Miles in operation | 17,250 | |
| Gross earnings | \$62,243,784 | \$70,740,270 |
| Working expenses | \$40,706,217 | \$47,699,798 |
| Net earnings | \$21,537,567 | \$23,040,472 |
| Fasight as gried (tops) | 19,133,365 | 21,500,175 35,946,183 |
| Freight carried (tons) | 31,211,753 | 35,940,103 |
| Passengers killed | 52,215,207 | 55,177,871 |
| | 20 | |
| Elevators | 163 | 1 |
| lic roads | 197 | 169 |
| roaus | 11,013 | |
| Level crossings of other rail- | 276 | |
| ways | 347 | |
| " branch lines | 234 | |
| Engines owned | 2,142 75 | 2,179 |
| Sleepers and parlor cars owned. | 231 | |
| hired | 37 | |
| First-class cars owned | 1,170 | |
| mileu | 69 | 74 |
| Second-class and immigrant cars owned | 621 | 640 |
| Second class and immigrant | | |
| cars hired | 19 | 1 |
| cars owned | 639 | 632 |
| cars hired | 29 | |
| Refrigerator cars owned | 665 | |
| " " hired Cattle and box freight cars | : | 1 |
| owned | 38,839 | 39,112 |
| hired | | 3,420 |
| Platform cars owned | 15,434 | 14,947 |
| " " hired | 377 | |
| Coal and dump cars owned | 5,540 | 5.739 |
| IIII Cu | 3,000 | 1,05 |
| Conductors' vans owned | 42 | 133 |
| Tool cars owned | *910 | *872 |
| Snow plougns owned | 302 | 300 |
| nirea | | |
| Flangers ownedhired | | 311 |
| | | |

*Including steam shovels, pile drivers, water tank cars, store cars, gravel cars, boarding cars, etc.

Railway Accidents in 1899-1900.

Following is a statement of the fatal accidents in Canada during the year ended June 30th, 1900:

| | Passengers killed. | Employes killed. | Others killed. | Total killed. | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|
| Falling from cars or engines, | 3 | 25 6 | 7 | 35 | |
| Getting on or off trains in motion | 1 3 | 6 | 11 | 20 | |
| At work making up trains | 1 | 11 | | 111 | |
| Putting heads or arms out of win- | ĺ | 1 | l | l | |
| dows | l | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Coupling cars | l | 16 | | 16 | |
| Collisions and derailments | | 15 | 3 | 18 | |
| Striking bridges | | 3 | i | 4 | |
| Walking or being on track | | 18 | 103 | 121 | |
| Explosions | | l | | | |
| Other causes | 1 | 28 | 70 | 99 | |
| Total | 7 | 123 | 195 | 325 | |
| | | | | | |

Mackenzie, Mann & Co. have given \$1,000 to promote immigration into the Thunder Bay and Rainy River districts of Ontario.

The Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River Rate Committee.

The official minutes have been issued of a meeting of representatives of railway and steamship lines interested, which was held in Toronto Feb. 5.

The following lines were represented:—Algoma Central S.S. Co., Anchor Line, Buffalo Ry., Buffalo and Niagara Falls Electric Ry., Buffalo and Lockport Ry., Canada Atlantic Ry., Canadian Pacific Ry., Cleveland and Buffalo Transit Co., Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Rd., Detroit and Cleveland Navigation Co., Duluth, South Shore and Atlantic Ry., Grand Trunk Ry., Goodrich Transportation Co., Huntsville and Lake of Baye Route, Lackawanna Green Bay, Line of Bays Route, Lackawanna-Green Bay Line, Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry., Lake Erie Navigation Co., Lake Michigan and Lake Superior Transportation Co., Lake Ontario and Bay of Quinte Steamboat Co., Lake Onand Bay of Quinte Steamboat Co., Lake On-tario Navigation Co., Lehigh Valley Rd., Manitou Steamship Co., Maple Lake and Port Cockburn Tally-Ho Stage Line, Minne-sota, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Ry., Monreal and Rochester Navigation Co., Muskoka Navigation Co., Niagara Falls Park and River Ry., Niagara Gorge Rd., Niagara Navigation Co., Northern Michigan Trans-portation Co., Northern Navigation Co. of Ontario, Northern Steamship Co., North-West Transportation Co., Parry Sound Yacht Fleet, Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co., Rideau Lakes Navigation Co., Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry., Windsor, Detroit and Soo Line.

A. A. Schantz, of the Detroit and Cleveland Navigation Co., was elected chairman, and G. C. Wells, of the C.P.R., secretary.

Decided that the organization be henceforth known as the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence

River Rate Committee.

The representatives of the various steamboat lines were invited to announce their rate for the season of 1901, and the Secretary was instructed to embody same in the proceedings. The U.S. lines being unable to announce their rates definitely at this meeting, it was agreed that they should hold an adjourned meeting at Chicago, on Feb. 20, and notify the Secretary of the result as early as possible, he to advise the Canadian lines if any changes affecting them are agreed to.

Mr. Ussher called attention to the fact that

although the sheet reads "between shore ports and certain other points," it did not seem last year to be fully understood that the rates apply in both directions. The Chairman, after asking for an expression of opinion from the interested lines, said that it was to be understood that all rates quoted in this sheet apply both ways, unless otherwise stated.

Mr. Ussher, representing Mr. Hibbard, of the D.S.S. and A. Ry., gave notice that that line would meet the rates and commissions of the lake lines from Duluth to and via Sault Ste. Marie.

The Canadian railway companies gave notice that for the season of navigation, 1901, their basing rates to shore ports [other than Windsor and Detroit and Parry Sound (Rose Point)] on Upper Lake business, would be as follows

From Toronto-One way, 1st class, \$2.85;

2nd class, \$2.85; return, \$4.75.
From west of Toronto—Local fares to nearest shore port, it being understood that variations in same may be necessary for proper adjustment of rates by different routes.

From east of Toronto-Local fares added to Toronto basing rates on one-way business, and regular return rates on first-class round trip business.

This notice does not carry with it the acceptance of above basing rates as railway proportions of through rates, and such proportions will be subject to re-arrangement between the lines interested.