

office to reduce the rate. Let me give a little information upon this subject. In the state of Illinois they practically have a two-cent rate. They have made it compulsory for the railway companies there to sell a thousand mile ticket for \$20, so that in that state they have a two-cent a mile service. In the state of New York they have a two-cent a mile service, and it was obtained by the adoption of one little act dealing with the New York Central, but by reason of that Act and by reason of competition, other railways in New York state were compelled to adopt the two-cent rate and the people have the benefit of it. A man can go from New York to Boston at two cents a mile. There are no return tickets. A ticket is made to read 'good both ways' and if you wish a return ticket you buy two of these tickets. They do not encourage people to buy return tickets by giving a cut on the return. People do not want that; they want a low level rate, so that they may return by whatever route they wish. A man going from Toronto to Montreal at the present time might wish to go by way of the Grand Trunk Railway and come back by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In order to transact his business, but as a result of the system now prevailing upon our railways he must return by the same road as that upon which he travels to Montreal if he desires to get the benefit of the reduction that is made on a return ticket. He does not want to return by the same road, he wants to return by another road, but if he wishes to do that he is obliged to pay so much per mile more. On the contrary, in the state of New York you can go by any line you wish and you can return by any other line simply by buying tickets at the rate of two cents a mile. In the state of Illinois practically the same condition exists when you buy a thousand-mile ticket. These thousand-mile tickets are good over any road, and surely, if they have conveniences like that for the travelling public over there, we should have the same here. Another great advantage that the railways of Canada have, which is an unfair advantage and one in regard to which great hardship exists and against which many complaints are made, and that is the advantage resulting from the law against the sale of railway tickets. The railway companies have an immense lever in that respect and they are using it to the disadvantage of the people in a great many cases. There is no such law in the United States. I do not believe in ticket scalping, and I would not like to see it justified, but if you have purchased one of these high priced tickets in Canada and you wish to go by another route, it is very hard to get your money back, and if you try to sell your ticket you are liable to be sent to jail. There is no such law in the United States that I know anything of. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always opposed paternal

government, and yet we are pampering our railways in a way that is not thought of in the United States. In the United States they tax railway companies, they give them no subsidies, they prescribe a maximum rate and they oblige them to give a level rate for passenger travel. These things have been obtained as the result of agitation and legislation. Let me read a statement in explanation of the system in New York state:

The state law—

Of New York—

—does not compel a two cent rate on all lines here, but business sagacity on the part of the Central has resulted in this reduction. The other lines at competing points are forced to the same basis. Therefore, while wise business policy dictated originally this maximum rate in the Central management, other lines charging this rate in New York have come to the basis as a matter of competition. But in all cases it has proven a stimulus to business.

This company has been the pioneer in the two-cent rate campaign. It operates 78 passenger trains every 24 hours between New York city and Buffalo, covering four tracks.

The query is frequently made in railway circles why, if the Vanderbilt lines in New York state and Michigan find two cents so profitable and so stimulating in developing travelling, the officers should not enforce the same two cent maximum rate in Canadian territory. The company admits that its traffic on the passenger trains in Canada is very heavy. Then what is the secret of the higher rate there? There is active competition—four through-lines from Buffalo to Detroit through Canada. The reply is: the arbitrary agreement to keep up the rate to three cents in Canada.

In other words the New York Central, which is connected with the Michigan Central, would give the people a two-cent a mile rate over the Ontario peninsula were it not that they fear the antagonism of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are willing to give it to-day. It is their policy to give a two-cent a mile rate over every road that they control, and they would like to give it over their road in Canada, and they are willing to give it, as far as I can gather, were it not for the fact that they fear that they would incur the traffic hostility of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. American railway men speaking of this anomalous position in Canada say this:

Here is the reason as outlined by progressive railroad men in America; Canada has not insisted upon her passenger tariff being reduced since the era of railroad travel was introduced. The rate is the same to-day as half a century ago, when the Dominion possessed but the scantiest railroad mileage. Yet the expense of operation has decreased enormously and there is every economic reason why rates should have been readjusted every decade in Canada.

You cannot tell these officials that two-cent fares don't pay; that you can't enlist capital to promote railroad construction with a two-cent maximum rate. They know better, and so does all New York state know better. One pro-