

seriously clash with those of the public. Apart from this, however, a properly constituted impartial railway commission is a tribunal of which the railways themselves would take frequent advantage, as in the matter of railways crossing each other, roadway crossings, right of way, municipal taxation, interchange of traffic, parallel railways, and in many other respects.

Mr. Macklin's criticisms are briefly answered by the fact that the Royal Commissioners' Report of January last expressly admits that both the public and the railways have been benefited by the existence of railway commissions in the United States and Great Britain, and recommends the extension of the powers of the Railway Committee, not as a permanent remedial measure but as in the Royal Commissioners' own opinion the best plan, until further experience has been gained of the working of the commissions elsewhere. Further, whilst these Royal Commissioners' enquiry was intended to be chiefly if not almost exclusively into discriminating rates, the report expressly recognizes by its recommendations that investigation into the causes of accidents on railways should be an important function of the Railway Committee. The Interstate Commerce Act, to which also Mr. Macklin refers, is intended to deal it might be said entirely with discriminating rates, does not touch the subject of accidents, and can only affect railways running from one State to another or to a foreign country. The Act, therefore, whilst dealing with one subject which the Railway Commissions in the separate States had not been able to satisfactorily meet, left these State Commissioners' powers practically where they were before.