

what the Toronto general committee, in its report recently published, says on this point:—

“When the people of these counties have to choose between a railway which will bring their produce by the shortest route to the best port on Lake Ontario, and another, which, besides being circuitous, would after all, be tributary to another railway, there ought to be no two opinions as to the project to which they should give their support. If they elect to take the circuitous route they must expect to pay extra freight, *and to pay it for all time*. It would be the greatest folly for the farmers of these counties to burden themselves *and their posterity for all time*, with the charges necessary to bring traffic *around two sides of a square*, in coming to Toronto, when the direct route can be obtained, and a large and *perpetual* saving effected.”

I need scarcely, after the above, coming from the Joint Committee of the Toronto Board of Trade, Corn Exchange and City Council, say any more on this point. But there is one objection mentioned, which might be suggested as applying to the Guelph line, and which I must anticipate. Note the words—“tributary to another railway.” Applied to the Angus and Durham line, this objection has great force, for the “tributary,” is to *one* railway only. The Guelph and North-Western would be “tributary” also, but, remember, not to one railway only, *but to two*. There is a world of difference between the two cases, as you will perceive. Bring your produce to Guelph, and, as I have already said, you have the Great Western and Grand Trunk in competition for the carrying of it. Bring it to Angus, and you have the Northern Railway alone, master on its own ground, and able to dictate terms. I need not further enlarge upon this consideration, the force of which is so obvious at a glance. But a word or two in anticipation of another objection to the Guelph line, that seems to be implied in the above quotation from the Toronto report. There is