of the rolling stock on the Victorian railways became so bad that many people were killed in a series of accidents, which enabled Premier Service to carry a measure transferring the management of the railways to a Commission, and some improvement was made. But the public could not break with the practice of forcing the Minister of Railways to override the Commissioners. The Commission system broke down completely in Victoria, and the "non-political" management was also abolished in New Zealand. In New Zealand, four years ago, the passenger rate, on the Government railway, was five cents a mile for first class, and their first-class cars, at that time, were such that Canadians would refuse to patronize them. There, also, the man with the political pull will telegraph the Minister of Railways to give precedence to his car of freight, at the expense of the average business man, whose goods would be left lying on the siding, while the Minister would excomplified the saying that "the last shall be first."

In Germany and other European countries, State ownership of railways has the same basis as in India, where the arguments for State ownership were stated by Mr. Thomas Robesrtson, a special commissioner, to be as follows: "That it is very important, for military reasons, that the Government should have control of the railways, that State lines are needed for the training of military officers in railway duties, that State railways are needed as a training ground for the supervising staff and for the officers of the Government and of the consulting engineers, and so on. A modern railway, such as is known in Canada, is unknown in most of the countries where the railways are owned by the State. Professor Meyer says: "The railways of the Europe of to-day are essentially the same as the railways of the Europe of 1875," and, that State ownership " has precipitated a conflict of sectional interests which has retarded enormously the decline of railway rates. It has led to local discrimination and to a demand that the railway shall be used to protect one section from another. For instance, the Prussian Minister of Finance, from 1890 to 1901, said: "This opposition of the agriculture interest of the west to low rates on grain and flour brought from the east, is but one of many illustrations of the desire of the various sections of the German Empire to re-establish a system of State protection by means of the regulation of railways in Europe, are illustrated in the rejection, in 1896, of the proposal to establish, on the Russian railways, a uniform rate on grain. A body of landowners, millers and railway officials, convened by the Government to report on the proposal, rejected it on the grounds that it would cause a loss of revenue that it would benefit the southern regions and the more remote eastern ones at the expense of Central Russia, that the landowners able to market their produce by river would lose the advantage which they had over other landowners who were obliged to use the railways, and, finally, that a considerable and sudden reduction in freight rates would so stimulate the production of grain as to cause a decline in price in the international

Professor Meyer concludes his chapter on Russia by giving the reasons why the Government cannot prosecute with proper despatch the work of covering the country with a net of railways, that shall make it possible to cultivate the whole of the arable area.

Mr. Thomas Robertson, who travelled seventy thousand miles, including Canada, and made a report to the British authorities at Calcutta, came to the conclusion that the disadvantages of direct State management, outweigh any advantages that such a system may possess. Then he goes on to say :---

But it will probably also be seen that the majority of these disadvantages are not due to state management itself, but through the system of working some railways through companies, and some directly by the state, and if the duality of system were eliminated, most of the objections to direct state management would disappear. The G

which Divisi part c

ľ

Gover who v perhaj contra to ple: was ar Gover the lir compa line so public

It commi a comm ern Di that it tried, a conditi In Ney Englar have tl

monwe to 1899 who wa

> wor not bers in the befo dogs disp

Th the man political tical th versity, perience

inter