

From the general tenor of the information, it would appear that in the United States the principle of Commissions as independent bodies was entirely in favour, the only question really being as to the extent and description of their power; and in this they differ to some extent in the various states, each state having complete power over the railways within its borders—the Interstate Commerce Commission only dealing with those railways running from state to state. This naturally causes a good deal of extra expense. In Canada, however, the Dominion Legislature has, speaking generally, the power to deal with the more important questions relating to railways, thus making the railway problem much more simple, and more easily managed.

The Railway Commission system has also been in force in England in various forms for many years, and there is now before the British Parliament a measure pointing to making the Commission permanent, with some changes, one of which is the appointment of a Superior Court Judge for each of the three parts of the empire, England, Ireland and Scotland, as *ex-officio* members, to be called in when any question of importance arises.

The Commission had under their consideration two systems under which the railways may be properly and fairly controlled; one of which was the independent Railway Commission, and the other using the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, through whom the necessary control could be obtained.

With regard to the first method, the Commissioners, apparently not wishing too hurriedly to advise a permanent Commission before the Interstate Commerce Commission has had another trial, as it has so far been less than a year in operation, and also to allow time for the passage of the proposed English Act making a permanent Commission, and also on the ground that none of the American Commissioners have sufficient power, and, for these reasons principally, do not recommend that a Commission of a permanent nature be at once appointed to deal with this all important question.

The second method before them was the extension of the powers of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, who should hear and determine all disputes arising between railway companies, with power to appoint proper officers to take evidence locally.

The Committee itself to decide all questions of classification of freight tariff and uniform railway returns.

The Committee to have power to appoint officers in each Province to hear and determine all complaints against railway companies, subject to the power of reference by such officer of any point to the Committee, and also subject to the right of appeal by either of the parties to the Committee itself.

The Commissioners apparently recommend this latter course as only a temporary expedient, as they say, "They think it better to test the working of the proposed law by temporary provision for its execution, and after fair experience of the results of the Interstate Railway Commission, and of our own legislation, to consider whether such system should be made permanent."

The Commission, when recommending this latter course, candidly admit that it has very serious defects. These are thus stated: