

proposals for political union with that country. He should be glad to learn Mr. Colmer's views as to the extent to which Canadian enterprise and prosperity had been affected by the relations of Canada with the United States, and especially whether those relations had in any way fettered Canadian progress. The facts contained in the paper seemed to him to supply answers to various points of inquiry, and enabled them to test the practice and actual working of economical theories. There had been great enterprise on the part of the Canadian Government, and he thought that similar enterprise in other directions might possibly lead to a similar happy result.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. F. Hendriks) said that before calling upon the author of the paper to reply, he should like to ask a few questions with respect to railway statistics in which he did not find himself quite in accord with some of the previous speakers. He noticed that Mr. Colmer had said that the cost of 12,000 miles of Canadian railways had been about 8,500*l.* per mile. On looking at the figures however he thought they would find that the cost down to 1886 had been 12,216*l.* per mile. Of course statistically that was a very startling amount of difference; he thought however he saw how it was accounted for: in his estimate of the lower average of 8,500*l.* per mile the author had omitted to include Government and municipal aid. He submitted that that was not quite right from a statistical point of view. If the Government and the municipalities of Canada had come forward, as shown by the statistics, with \$156,904,000 in aid of the railways, this had entailed so much debt and burden upon the Dominion of Canada, and consequently the outlay upon railways must be reckoned inclusive and not as exclusive of this large investment in aid of a special enterprise. The investment, it might be said, was to some extent recuperative, for it had the chance of producing in the end some interest or dividend. But this did not differ at all from the position of the expenditure of other and private shareholders, and he could not distinguish the one from the other. It had been suggested by one or two speakers that it would be useful to make comparisons with other countries. Of course in those matters they must be careful not to put together in parallels things *comparatis non comparandis*, the circumstances being so very different; at the same time he thought the author had a little challenged such a proceeding where he spoke of the capital expenditure of our London and North Western Railway, with its 1,800 miles of line having been as great as the cost of 12,000 miles in Canada. But such a comparison must be qualified by looking into facts. It was quite true that the railways in the United Kingdom had cost 43,365*l.* on an average per mile, calculated to the year 1886, as contrasted with 12,216*l.* per mile in Canada. But look at the enormous difference in the traffic and the earnings in the two countries respectively, and observe that the earnings of the railways of the United Kingdom in 1886 were in proportion to those of Canada as five to one, in other words they were nearly five times as productive in gross revenue. He would not make a comparison as to the effect upon the revenue returns