

ing, and with ample remuneration which would, he believed, command the confidence both of the country and of the railway interest. . . . The Committee had to consider whether the Act in the public interest could not be strengthened in its provisions . . . and they found, as they believed, a method by which the Act could be greatly improved. . . . One Running powers. was a proposal that general compulsory running powers should be given to every Railway Company over the lines of every other. The other was a system of general through rates under Through rates. new provisions and regulations. . . . The question of running powers was fully sifted, and the conclusion the Committee arrived at was, that it would not be wise to enforce general running powers by any general Enactment . . . that they were not, as a rule, necessary; that they were only convenient in some cases; that to enforce them upon unwilling companies would be an interference with the management of lines. . . . At the same time it was quite evident that there were now, and there would be in the future, many cases in which running powers to be exercised by one company, in case of need, over the lines of another might be properly and wisely given. . . . Running powers reserved to the action of Parliament. But the Committee desired to leave that to the determination of the Railway Committees as a condition to be imposed in amalgamation Bills if it should be thought fit, and to be enforced by the Commissioners whom this Bill proposed to set up. . . . The question of through rates and fares was found to be a different one, and the Committee came to the conclusion that something useful and valuable might be done in that direction by general legislation. After most careful consideration they came to the following resolution . . . "Second, and only second, to the question of railway charges is that of the interchange of railway traffic or, in other words, the question of best utilising and developing under the present system of occasional conflicting companies, the capabilities of a railway . . . If the company monopolising a district is to be allowed to arrange or disarrange the traffic as it pleases, to time passenger trains so that they shall not meet at a junction with other passenger trains; to obstruct traffic coming over their lines and to send traffic by the longest and least convenient route in order to keep it on its own line, there may be the greatest possible inconvenience." . . . And they went on to recommend that under proper conditions railway companies should have a right to acquire and obtain through rates over the lines of their neighbours. . . . The prima facie rule for the determination of the apportionment of these rates would of course be mileage, but that was a rule which was not capable of being always rigidly observed and would, in some instances, even work injustice, and therefore the committee were of opinion that the Commissioners proposed to be created should be invested with ample power to settle that matter between company and company. . . . There was one duty of a very important kind with respect to which there appeared to be positive unanimity of opinion among experienced railway witnesses who were examined, and that it would be of the greatest advantage to allot it to the Commission, that, namely, of exercising the functions of arbitrator under the provisions of the Railway and Canal Acts . . . The Committee were very much struck by the Arbitration.

Pro rata mileage not an absolute rule.