

variable judgment, so much arrant nonsense. The same thing was stated in the United States. What did Vanderbilt and Gould say? Why, that even with respect to the Commission which they proposed to establish, either the railways would own the Commissioners, or the Commissioners would own the railways. The same thing might be said with respect to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. The only way by which we can secure justice to all parties, I think, is by the establishment of a Board of Railway Commissioners. It is said there is no necessity for it. Why the experience of everyday life shows the necessity for it. Let me give you one or two instances. The same thing was said in England. Now, if any one will take the trouble of turning to a valuable little work upon Railway Corporations, published by Mr. Parsloe, in England, he will find just the very argument that has been adduced now against this Bill fully answered. The author points out the absolute injustice to localities and to individuals, of the preferences that were allowed there before the establishment of this Court of Railway Commissioners. My hon. friend has referred to an instance that also came under my notice last year, when the Grand Trunk Railway carried a car of oil cake from Baden to Belleville, a distance of 185 miles, and charged \$52. They carried the same cargo from Chicago to Belleville, a distance of 628 miles, and charged \$50; in other words, they charged \$2 less for carrying it 443 miles further. Now, Sir, I ask you, is that a state of things that ought to continue? It is all very well for us to say that men who have invested their capital in these companies ought to be protected. So they should, fairly and honestly; but there is somebody else that ought to be protected as well as they. We invested in the Grand Trunk Railway, if I remember aright, something like \$16,000,000 of the people's money, and think that while we are protecting the interests of the English capitalists, who have invested their money in this and other railways, we ought not to forget the people of this country who contributed largely to the construction and equipment of that road. It was stated in a Toronto paper, on the 20th February, 1881, and has not been denied, that the Grand Trunk Railway charged \$75 a car for coal oil from the city of London to the city of Ottawa, to all the manufacturers and refiners there, except to one man to whom they gave a drawback of \$38 per car. Now, it is quite manifest that if they charge \$75 a car to every refiner and manufacturer of coal oil, who had his oil shipped from London to Ottawa, and gave one man a drawback of \$38 a car, that one man had the advantage in the market to the extent of \$38 per car. Why, Sir, some manufacturers send their coal oil from London to Ottawa *via* the Suspension Bridge, and over the New York Central and the Rome, Watertown, and Ogdensburg Railways, and they get their oil carried by that roundabout way from London to Ottawa for \$56 per car. Still the man who got the rebate, or the preference, or the drawback, had an advantage of \$19 per car even over those who sent their oil *via* the United States. Is that a state of things that ought to continue? It is quite clear the Railway Committee of the Privy Council cannot deal with it; they would not deal with it; and it is quite clear that it ought to be dealt with by some tribunal. Now, here is a case that happened not long ago—a gross case, an outrageous case, if it be correct. It was stated openly in the press of Toronto, and has not been contradicted. The correspondent of a Stratford paper stated not long ago that a car load of flour is carried from London to Montreal for \$15 less than from Stratford to Montreal. Is that so? Because, if it is, it is a gross outrage, and one that ought not to be tolerated by a free Parliament for a single day. Although we may have every sympathy with the unfortunates—if they have been unfortunate—who invested their money in this undertaking, still, as I said before, we ought to protect the interests of our people. It is further stated that the Grand

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Trunk Railway carried a car load of flour from Brantford to Montreal *via* the Grand Trunk, 39 miles further than from Stratford to Montreal, at a much less rate than from Stratford. Now, Sir, if that be true, I say that it is an outrage that ought not to be tolerated. It is further stated that freight on a barrel of pork from Chicago to Brockville is 80 cents, and from Brockville to McKay's Station, a distance of 100 miles, is 95 cents. They carried a barrel of flour 100 miles and charged 8 cents more for carrying it that distance than they charged for carrying it 723 miles. I know an instance that occurred in my own neighborhood a few days before I came here. A gentleman wanted to ship some stuff to Winnipeg. He found that the freight upon mutton from Goderich to Winnipeg, distance of 1,333 miles, was \$3 per 100 pounds; while from Clinton to Winnipeg, though 12 miles nearer Winnipeg than Goderich, the freight was only \$1.61 per 100 pounds, so that the man was paying, \$1.39 from Goderich to Clinton, a distance of 12 miles. Now is that a thing Parliament ought to tolerate a single moment, if a free Parliament can check it? So, with respect to passengers, you can get a ticket from Boston to Chicago much cheaper than you can from Montreal or Ottawa to Chicago. It may be difficult to check these things, but I think that Parliament ought, at all events, to make an attempt to check them. Let me—in answer to my hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb), and my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who appear to think that the proposition submitted by my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has proved a practical failure when submitted elsewhere—read the opinion of the New York Chamber of Commerce, as expressed by their spokesman, Mr. Simon Stern, on the propriety of legislative interference. That gentleman says:

"Gross inequalities arise from this condition of affairs. Individuals and communities are put at the mercy of these great corporations, who have it in their power to make one man rich and keep others poor, and they actually exercise that power in an arbitrary manner, without rule, without consistency, and seemingly without reason.

It may be said that this is all true enough, but the Board of Commissioners which the hon. gentleman proposes to create by this Bill will not cure the evil we complain of. I say, Sir, that we have already tried the experiment of having these matters disposed of by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and that it has been a failure. In England they tried to solve the problem through the Board of Trade, but that experiment proved a failure; they tried it through the intervention of the common law courts, but that plan, too, was found unsuccessful. Let us at all events make the experiment proposed in the Bill, and see whether or not we can check what I cannot look upon otherwise than as a most iniquitous state of affairs, viz., that these railway companies should have unlimited and unrestricted powers to discriminate against individuals or localities, and make one man rich, as Mr. Stern says, and another poor—to destroy one locality and build up another. The experiment is worth trying at all events, and if the hon. Minister of Railways has no other objection to the Bill, except that it will necessitate the creation of a new court, and the appointment and payment of new Judges, I humbly submit that that is not a sufficient argument against the Bill. The hon. gentleman did advance another argument, viz., as to our right to attempt to interfere with railways that obtained their corporate existence through the Local Legislatures. But, Sir, it is not necessary to discuss that subject at any length, or, indeed, to discuss, it at all just now, because, as I understand the hon. Minister of Railways, he is willing that the Bill should be referred either to the Railway Committee or to a Select Committee. I wish to remind the hon. gentleman, however, that that question has practically passed beyond the region of discussion in the United States at least. The State of Pennsylvania undertook to deal—not exactly in the