

"The distance from Montreal to Winnipeg *via* Chicago, is 1,711 miles; Montreal to Chicago, 850 miles; Chicago to St. Paul, 409 miles; St. Paul to St. Vincent, 390 miles; St. Vincent to Winnipeg, 62 miles."

"In round numbers, freight from Montreal to Chicago, 70 cents per 100 lbs.; Chicago to St. Paul, 70 cents per 100 lbs.; St. Paul to St. Vincent, 140 cents per 100 lbs.; St. Vincent to Winnipeg, 25 cents per 100 lbs. These are not the exact figures, but they are very near, and represent the proportions. That is, the Grand Trunk carry double the distance for the same money as the Chicago and St. Paul Railroad, and the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba charges four times Grand Trunk rates; nor is this all—no private person can tell what he will have to pay in extras when his goods arrive at Winnipeg. A man may make whatever bargain he pleases in Ontario, and get it in writing; when he comes to seek his goods here, every other immigrant on an average has to pay ex ras, and can get no explanation or satisfaction. These extra charges vary from \$2 in every 100 lbs., up to \$100 per car load. These over-charges are very discouraging to immigrants, and should be the subject of Government enquiry, they are doing great harm to the country, and are nothing less than frauds. The agent at St. Boniface told me they are regularly put upon. The people and immigrants have neither the time nor the money to contest them. Suppose a traveller comes by the lake to Duluth, rates can be had as follows:—Toronto to Duluth, *via* Collingwood, 933 miles, freight, 15c. per 100 lbs.; Duluth to Glyndon, 250 miles, 50c. per 100 lbs.; Glyndon to St. Vincent, 154 miles, \$1 per 100 lbs."

Of course, the country is but partially settled, and freights must consequently be right, but what I complain of is that when the immigrants get there, they are imposed on by somebody. It may not be the railway, but the railway officials; and a man who wants to get out to his farm cannot stay over five or six days to contest an imposition of \$5 or \$6. I wish I had this letter a week ago, and I would have said something on the Canadian Pacific Railway question, on which I did not speak. Had I this letter, I would certainly have spoken about it. It is just in time to prevent the immigrants going into that country being imposed on by officials, for I do not think it is possible the railway companies imposed on them, though, of course, they will get all the freight they can make their roads pay. The writer continues:

"You can bring freight from Toronto to Glyndon, a distance of over 1,200 miles, for 65c. to 85c. per 100 lbs., while for the next 154 miles over the St. Paul road, you pay \$1—not a cent less for any kind of freight, or eight times the rate of the rest of the route. When I came through I arranged for the freight on two parcels at Toronto to be delivered at St. Boniface for \$1.80 per 100 lbs. When they arrived here there was an overcharge of \$15.96 on 500 lbs., or \$3.19 per 100 lbs. No explanation; pay or do without your things. The Rev. J. Lawdon, Rapid City, had a cutter sent from Toronto by Prettie's party. The freight paid there was \$12. The receipt read, "freight on cutter \$12 paid." He had to pay \$39 extra charge. The Rev. J. Hewitt came to Portage la Prairie last August. He had four cases of household goods. The extra charge was \$40—no explanation. I could go on multiplying almost indefinitely. I wrote to all the companies and all have replied and refunded but the St. Paul and Manitoba road, they give no redress. The conduct of this road towards this country has been such in the fact that you can easily imagine the feelings of the people towards the Syndicate, and nothing but the great anxiety to get a road soon through our own country could keep them quiet concerning the monopoly for a time given to the Company. In the interests of the country there should be an immigration office at Winnipeg, or other suitable point on the road, with power to investigate all complaints and guard the interests of the people. We have the making of a fine country here, and I hope in a few years we will be able to look better to our own interests. It will take time and capital to develop the resources we have. There is another point in which there might be great improvement, namely, the homestead duties. Many persons have taken up land under the Act which compels residence and cultivation. There are many, too many, who make no attempt at either. They are simply holding the lands for others. Would it not be well for the Government to demand residence with the cultivation of a certain number of acres per annum; say two to five to be broken and cultivated each year, and appoint an inspector of homesteads for each land office. Good men could easily be obtained; in fact, if the Government could get no others, some missionaries might be found willing to act."

I think that is a most important letter, and with regard to those ruinous freights, I think some means ought to be taken to prevent immigrants into the North-West being imposed upon by the railroad officials; for I scarcely think the roads themselves would endeavour to make such enormous overcharges as one mentioned in this letter.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. You had better send that letter to the Senate. It is not too late to do them some good.

Mr. JONES

Mr. JONES. It has gone to the press, and I hope the Senate will take cognizance of it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I do not see how we can give all the information the mover wants. An order showing the number of passengers who travelled on the railways of Canada for 1880 might be given; but as to the number who might have been carried had the accommodation afforded been fully occupied; the hon. gentleman must see this information is not possible. Where would we put the cars—at what stations, with a view to all this information? The number of tons of freight that might have been carried suggests the question—where was the rolling stock? While disposed to give all the information possible, these questions cannot be easily answered, because we cannot only say where at certain times the rolling stock was found, or what freight or passengers might have been offered at any particular points. If the hon. gentleman drops the two very difficult parts of his motion, we will try to comply with the remainder.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think there is the difficulty in dealing with the whole of the motion imagined by the hon. gentleman opposite. I have seen returns which seemed to me to implement the reasonable meaning of the motion. I will suppose what my hon. friend means is this: take any one railroad company, it has carried some tons of freight and so many thousand passengers a mile. Now, what is the average number of passengers to a car and tons of freight carried? For instance, you find as the general results in regard to a great many railways in the United States, that not more than thirty passengers are carried on an average in their passenger car, which, if full, would carry sixty or sixty-five. As a general result on the freight cars of the old small capacity of ten tons, more than six or seven tons are carried. So the company is able to say what the average amount of paying freight is per freight car, and what is the average number of passengers to each passenger car in use. It is not a question as to the whole rolling stock a company may have possessed at a particular date at any particular place, but as to how much they were actually using from year to year to do such an amount of business, compared with what amount they might have done if it had been used to its full capacity.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I understand that, but do not see the object of the parts of the motion to which I have objected. For instance, there is a passenger car which, instead of carrying sixty passengers, has only carried twenty. Well, you cannot take the rolling stock of a whole company and always fill the cars with the exact number of passengers, or amount of freight they can carry. Therefore, I do not see the object of this motion, though I could see the object of asking the amount of the rolling stock owned by a company and the amount of work done by it.

Mr. MILLS. I spoke to the Minister of Railways when I put the motion on the paper, and he told me he would do his best to facilitate the acquisition of the railway. He not only made no objection to the motion, but on the contrary showed he was quite ready to endeavor to obtain for me that information which, from my point of view, is valuable. Our railway statistical returns are perhaps more scanty than any others I am acquainted with. If the hon. gentlemen opposite would consult the railway returns from Ohio and Massachusetts, he would find that a great deal of this information, if it is not given every year, is frequently given, and there can be no difficulty such as the hon. gentleman suggests, because if you have a train running, say with five passenger coaches, and fifty passengers on the train, the company can have no difficulty in stating how many more they can carry. And so with regard to freight traffic; I think this information would be valuable. I mentioned the case the