HE
3017
C92

# RAILWAY NATIONALISATION

---

W. CUNNINGHAM

# RAILWAY NATIONALISATION.

# SHOULD OUR RAILWAYS BE NATIONALISED?

By W. CUNNINGHAM.

(FOURTH, AND ENLARGED EDITION).

DUNFERMLINE:
A. ROMANES & SON, "PRESS" OFFICE.

1906.

# CONTENTS.


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction | [illegible] |
| Should our Railways be Nationalised? | 15 |
| Our British Railways | 23 |
| Legal Railway Rates | 35 |
| Diversity of Railway Rates and Charges | 45 |
| Our Water Ways | 56 |
| Freights to South Africa | 62 |
| Shareholders' Meetings | 69 |
| 50 Years of Railway Legislation | 77 |
| Lawyers' Bills | 81 |
| The Clearing House | 84 |
| Waste and Loss through Drumming | 91 |
| Wages and Risks | 100 |
| Immorality of Mis-Declarations | 106 |
| The 1905 Agricultural Commission | 108 |
| The Post Office and the Railways | 164 |
| Wasteful Management in Ireland | 178 |
| The American Railways | 186 |
| The Indian Railways | 198 |
| British and Prussian Railways Compared | 208 |
| Further Comparisons | 230 |
| Egyptian Railways | 234 |
| South African Railways | 237 |
| Belgium Railways | 239 |
| French Railways | 242 |
| A Cloud of Witnesses | 245 |
| Traders' Wagons | 260 |
| Monopoly | 261 |
| Passenger Traffic | 265 |
| State Purchase | 267 |
| Economic Opinions | 269 |
| Private versus Public Management | 276 |
| Money | 278 |
| Questions that want Answering | 280 |
| "Times" Ultimatum to the Railways | 283 |
| Railway Statistics | 285 |
| Index | 289 |

# INTRODUCTION.

I have been more than once asked why I should have taken so much interest in our railways as to spend some of my energy, time, and money in discussing this transit question which bulks so largely in our country's prosperity or adversity, which has taken and is taking up the time and thought of many of our best tradesmen and manufacturers, as well as the shareholders and directors of our railways. It is admitted by all these classes of men interested in their own welfare, and the prosperity of our common country, that something is wrong. The cost of carriage both of animate and inanimate nature never was so high, and the price paid by the nation for doing it never was so great. The number of passengers, and tons of goods, is the largest on record. The dividends never were so low, and the discontent never was greater. What is wrong? All sorts of opinions and proposals are afloat. The companies say the State should leave them alone to work out their own salvation, and not tackle and trammel them with all sorts of Committees, Royal Commissions, and Board of Trade conditions. On the other hand, the manufacturers, tradesmen, and some of the men in the street say the Government must not let them loose to prey upon the people in the internal parts of the country, to give an advantage to the dwellers on the sea coast, to ruin the traders and farmers in the centre of the country, as well as the private shipowner. But I have been running off the track, so answering the question put down at the start: — About twelve years ago, earning my living as a commercial traveller, I sold a parcel of goods to a customer in Cardiff. I was allowed seven days to have them delivered. They were for a marriage. I thought I had ample time. I sent home the order. They were sent away from Dunfermline the following day with five clear days to get to Cardiff, but it took the railway company eleven days to get them there, and the customer would not take the goods in, as he had had to be supplied from another source. The Great Western communicated asking what they were to do with them. We answered what they liked, but we would look for payment for them. They were paid for, but that did not cure the trouble. When I went round to the customer in my usual course of

business, he would not do any more with me. He said I had sent on the invoice a week before the goods, he had to go and pay retail price for them to keep his word. I asserted that the goods were given to the Railways the day the invoice was dated, but he said he could not believe the Railways would take eleven days to carry a parcel 400 miles. I protested my innocence, but to no purpose. This part of the drama annoyed and irritated me. Not only had I lost the customer, but in his estimation any virtue I might have for telling the truth. This incident having been so strongly impressed upon my memory, I retailed it over in the Commercial Rooms and to my customers here and there, till I found that I was not by any means the only one that had had goods lost, stolen, or strayed on our railways. So I made up my mind that I would try to probe the cause of these delays a little further. When I got home I went to our Dunfermline goods agent and asked him if he would try to find out the reason or cause of the delay. He said he would try. Some two months after, he came to our warehouse and made a statement something like this :—On the first day the Cardiff truss got to Leith Walk transferring station ; the second day it was put into a Carlisle wagon, and got into Carlisle on the third day ; the Midland on the fourth day could not load a wagon for Gloucester, and kept it over till the fifth ; that day they put it in a wagon for Derby. A day again was lost here, and on the seventh day it was sent on to Gloucester, got there on the ninth, and was offered to my customer on the eleventh, and rejected. This story excited my curiosity more than ever. Why was it the Midland did not send on the ½ cwt. truss at once to Gloucester ? Because they had not enough goods to load a wagon to the West of England. Next day they were in the same position, but they put it into a wagon that was loaded for Derby, and so on. On thinking the matter over, it seemed clear to me that the trouble lay in the fact that we had three trunk lines contending for the Scotch trade to the West of England, and, the trade from Scotland not being very big or heavy, all the three systems were not able to load a wagon each every twenty-four hours, the result being that small parcels of No. 2, 3, 4, and 5 class goods had to be laid aside, or sent from point to point and transferred from one wagon to the other, till six, eleven, and sometimes fifteen days are taken to deliver a truss or box not 200 miles from where it started. It struck me then, and I am of the same opinion still, that if our railways were all in one pool or belonged to the State, the above classes of goods travelling say one to 400 miles would be all sent to one centre in Scotland—say Glasgow or Edinburgh—and all these goods

that the three systems get divided among them would then go into one wagon, and that wagon would likely be full, and not as it is now, only one-third full. The wagon would then be sent direct to some centre in the West of England, another to some centre in the Eastern Counties, the South of England, the Midlands, London, and so on. These wagons would run to and from with full loads, and full train loads every twenty-four hours, and, as a rule, the goods from leaving their starting point would be delivered in three days from town to town. Now, it is never much short of a week at present from city to city. The wagons being full and the train loads tripled in weight, instead of the average merchandise train load being between 50 and 60 tons, it would then be from 150 to 190, or about the same train load as on the Continent. Our railways would then have a chance of paying as well and working as cheaply as on the Continent. But before we can have any economic change, there are other very influential and powerful interests that will have to be reckoned with before the commercial economist can step into his rights. The lawyers will fight their best to keep the railways in their present condition, so that they may go on fighting each other and getting enormous fees to advocate the companies' special rights and privileges. The chairman of one of our Scottish railways, after the working agreement that took place between the Caledonian and the North British, said by that arrangement they would save that year £40,000 in lawyers' expenses. It is not doubted that of the £1,200,000,000 of invested capital in our Railways that the country is forced to pay interest upon, nearly £300,000,000 of it was paid to lawyers. So I think it is clear that the railway reformers may take it as a foregone conclusion that they will get the most powerful opposition from this highly educated and powerful profession. Then another very influential and powerful force against reform is the advertising newspaper press. By the present separate and contentious condition of our railways, they get enormous sums of money for advertising—the Bills the lawyers intend to push through Parliament, and for advertising their cheap trips from John o' Groats to Lands' End. Then they spend lots of money printing and posting large bills on the hoardings all over the country, and sending round handfuls of small bills to all the hotels and public places in the towns about their cheap trips. I have seen and handled handfuls of these small bills in the W.-C.s in the hotels of Leeds, Sheffield, and Nottingham, advertising their cheap trips to Scarborough, Cleethorpes, etc. I feel sure if a Parliamentary return was got showing the amount of money spent in this way, it would astonish the people of this country as well as the railway

shareholders. The result is that meetings got up to consider railway reform are boycotted by these papers, or they only get a ¾ inch space intimating that so and so said such and such. Then our letters to the editor are thrown in the waste paper basket if they happen to touch on the wastefulness of the present methods, and the want of a more economic system of working. If the railways were in one pool under the State, none of these wastes would require to go on. They do not go on in the Post Office. It does not advertise its cheap ½d. and 1d. stamps, that will frank a post card or letter from Land's End to John o' Groats or New Zealand, and the result is we have a profit of thirty per cent. from our Post Office, and they pay their servants much better, while the railways have less than 3¼ per cent. Then the average British working man will not bother himself about the railway question ; he is looking after something he thinks more substantial. He says he only gets a holiday twice a year. Then he gets a cheap trip to Blackpool. You tell him that he has to pay more for his food and clothing, seeing the tradesmen have to pay more for the carriage of the food and clothing he is served with, and he looks you in the face quite seriously and says :—"No, I don't ; I deal in the Co-op., and we have eight steamships upon the sea, and we get our goods carried very cheap by the railways from any port on either side of the Island to our principal stores, because we can give them wagons and train loads to carry," and so the Co-op. man shut me up. Then we have the trader class split up into sections, such as the railway nationalisers, the canal nationalisers, the railway free traders, and the leavers-alone of everything as it was or is. The first section seems to be the largest of what may be called the progressive party. Resolutions in favour of Nationalisation have been unanimously carried by the Fabians and all the sections of the Socialist party, the co-operators, the commercial travellers, and the British Ironmasters' Association, and the Chamber of Trade is limping on the road half way behind with its 13,000 members, and last, but not least, the whole of the trades unions. The Canal Nationalisers, County Council or Municipalisers are a smaller but much more influential body, principally represented by the Chamber of Commerce. Their leaders say that if the canals were taken over by some communistic system, national or local, they could do for a farthing what the Railways take six farthings for doing. They seem quite prepared to sacrifice those parts of the country where there can be no canals, such as the North of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, and other mountainous and hilly parts of our country, if the low, flat centre of England is saved to them, and if these other parts do not

look out they may accomplish their object. The railway free traders don't seem to have much bulk or back-bone. Their best and ablest advocate is J. Buckingham Pope. He would allow promoters to construct a railway on proving before a Committee that they have the money and the will to contend with the other railways running into and supplying the district with all the transit it can possibly want. He seems never to have got to know that the new railway that he proposed through his free trade principles would at once have to conform to the arrangements made by the older Railways that cover the country now ; but if any reason were wanted to induce people to consider this transit question, it is the statement made by Sir Edward Grey, M.P., Chairman of the North Eastern Railway, to the Darlington Technical College. He said the country was becoming more and more convinced that Germany was much more advanced in higher education than we were. He thought we had something to learn from them, but if we brought over German and American methods into this country, and introduced them into railway managements, there was at once an outcry that they were not suited to this country. May we ask who is raising the outcry against these improvements the honourable gentleman is referring to ? It is not the general public, neither do I think it is the rank and file of the railway servants. Can it be possible that the Chairman of the North Eastern is gathering the same impression that the Chairman of the Midland threw out at the shareholders' meeting in Derby the other day, viz., that the Directors were afraid of the general managers of the railways ? Let us hope that there is still some manhood left in men yet, and that common sense and better things will prevail some day. The two statements made by these men are humiliating. Any one that will take the trouble to read my abbreviated report of the 1905 Agricultural Commission should not fail to see the injustice the country is suffering through preference railway rates given to foreign imports.

W. CUNNINGHAM.

Dunfermline, March 1906.

# SHOULD OUR RAILWAYS BE NATIONALISED?

SUCH a question in what it suggests! The nationalisation of our railways is not more Socialistic than our Post Office, the Parcel Post, Telegraphs, Telephones, Corporation Tramways, Gas, Water, Co-operative Societies, or Railway Combines, &c.

It is not a political question in the ordinary sense. There are 566,460 shareholders of Railway stock; they are not all of the same political faith; and, in addition, according to the Duke of Devonshire, the railways employ 581,664 workmen. These men vary in their politics as much as do their masters.

### What the Country would Save.

It is purely an economical matter. By adopting it, the country, as a whole, would save £30,000,000 per annum. There are only three countries in the world that have not their own Railways—Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. All our colonies, except those in North America, have their own railways. Our King reigns over the cheapest and the dearest railways on the globe: India is the cheapest, the Transvaal is the dearest, with Ireland running it hard for that bad eminence — a good second.

At the Coommercial Travellers' yearly meeting, held at Norwich in 1900, a unanimous resolution was passed in favour of Railway Nationalisation. The Chairman of the British Ironmasters' Association (Sir John Jenkins, M.P.) induced that body to support a proposal for Railway Nationalisation, and he also put a notice of motion on the notice paper of the House of Commons to get a Select Committee to inquire into the same

subject. At the annual meeting of the co-operators of Great Britain, held in Middlesbro' in 1901, over 1000 delegates, representing over one and a half million shareholders, passed a unanimous resolution in favour of nationalising the railways. The associated Chambers of Commerce in Manchester, September 1904, carried a resolution to ask and press the Government to nationalise the canals by 61 for to 40 against. The Chamber of Trade has about 100 affiliated societies, consisting of about 13,000 members. In Blackpool in March 1905, it passed a unanimous resolution to ask the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the economic working of our railways.

## The Government has Power to Purchase.

By the Act 7 and 8 Victoria, cap. 85, it is enacted that the Government should have the right to purchase the railways constructed after the date of the passing of this Act (1844) at 25 years' purchase, upon giving in writing three months' notice of their intention to do so. The purchase value to be calculated on the amount earned by the companies in three preceding years.

## The Chief Dates in Railway History are :—

1602. Rails of timber laid down at Newcastle.

1738. Iron rails substituted for timber at Whitehaven.

1781. George Stephenson born.

1814. George Stephenson's first locomotive, "My Lord," ran six miles per hour. It carried Mr Pease, Stephenson running by its side poking up the fire.

1825. Stockton and Darlington Railway opened for passenger traffic. The weight of the rails was 28lbs to the yard.

1829. Stephenson's engine, the "Rocket," carried off the prize of £500 offered for the best locomotive.

1830. The Liverpool and Manchester Railway opened.

## The War of the Gauges.

From 1830 to 1840 we had what was called the "War of the Gauges." Mr Brunel, a great engineer, supported by a party of London financiers, asserted that Stephenson's 4 feet 8½ inch gauge would not allow trains to run over 20 miles per hour, while Brunel's broad gauge (6 feet) would easily

allow a 40 mile per hour speed. Stephenson, who was backed by the Darlington Quaker family of Pease and other capitalists in the Midlands and North of England, asserted that his favourite gauge was quite wide enough. Brunel got the Great Western Railway to build, the Great Eastern Railway and the Great Eastern Steamship also; but his work soon was discarded. Not an inch of his ship or a yard of his railway stands to-day in England, and Stephenson's system reigns supreme.

## The Rush for Railway Stock.

1845. About this year, after the controversy between Brunel and Stephenson was settled in favour of the latter, a tremendous rush was made on Parliament for powers to make railways. During this year no fewer than 815 companies were formed, and their plans laid before Parliament and the Board of Trade. Landowners at once took advantage of the demand for land, and the railways had to pay double and treble the value, while construction contractors and ironmasters made enormous fortunes out of the railway mania—and the unfortunate and greedy shareholders. The capital involved in these transactions amounted to over 560 millions, and cash was deposited to the extent of 60 millions as a guarantee of their faith in the railways.

## Three Thousand Directors.

The expense of running our railways goes into enormous figures. For the 51 Companies we have 250 Boards of Directors, including 3000 names. (The German railways are managed by one man, responsible to the Government.) Our Post Office has one head—the Postmaster-General. The larger railways have Boards over the Carriage, Audit, Secretarial, and Rates Departments, and so on. Under one system, one Board could control both Islands, and the saving would be very great. One Railway-Master-General, working hand in hand with the Postmaster-General, would result in great economies.

## Empty Trains.

Another great source of waste is the running of trains empty, or nearly so. Nine empty seats are run for one occupied. In the year 1888 the L. & N. W. Ry., in 320 working days, ran an aggregate of 630,040,320 seats, and only carried 56,629,440 passengers. So over 537 million seats were unoccupied, or 10 empty and one filled. Each passenger paid for nine seats beside his own.

## The Cost of Railways per Mile.

One result of the enormous expenditure is, that British Railways have cost an average of £54,000 per mile, against the United States, £12,000 ; Germany, £12,000 ; Australia and New Zealand, £7650 ; India, £6500 ; Cape Colony, £9000 ; Belgium, £29,000.

The Great Central from Sheffield to London cost about £130,000 per mile, and its preferred stock stands at 54 and its deferred at 17½. The Waterford and Tramore Railway cost £10,000 per mile, and devotes £52 out of every £100 it earns to pay five per cent. The North London costs £330,000 per mile, and only devotes £42 out of every £100 it earns to dividends and pays 6¾ per cent. Preliminaries and law expenses averaged £4000 per mile.

The reckless waste of money spent on building up our lines caused the Companies to combine, almost immediately, amongst themselves and against the public. The 815 companies of 1845 stand now at 51. We are, I believe, better with 51 than with 815, and we would be better still with only one.

It is estimated that railways represent a tenth of the total wealth of the civilised world, and a quarter, if not a third, of its invested capital. It is doubtful whether the total plant used in all the manufacturing industries is equal in value to the railways, while the world's whole stock of gold bullion and coin, silver bullion and coin, copper bullion and coin, would not purchase one-third of its railways. This is much under the estimate for our own country. Our railways are put down at value for twelve hundred millions, and all the mineral tokens we have in circulation and in reserve only tots up to £120,000,000. The vegetable token is only a promise to pay, and is not money. It amounts to about £20,000,000. The English speaking race has more than half the railways and capital of the world.

The premier railway of the British Islands is the London and North-Western Railway Company. This great undertaking has a capital equal to one-eighth of all the others combined. If we had other seven as large there would be only eight railways on the two Islands, instead of fifty-one. The capital of this great system is £129,715,853. The five Scotch Railways have a capital of £122,081,916, and the capital of all the Irish Railways is only £42,755,328. The revenue of the London and North-Western is over £14,498,123. It has swallowed up 45 Railway Companies. It has 3068 engines, 4571 horses, employs 60,000 men, and has nine large hotels. Not content with the above, it has seventeen large steamships on

the Irish Channel, running from Holyhead and Fleetwood to Dublin, Greenore, and Belfast. It works 1929 miles of rails. It makes all it can for itself, has its own iron and steel works, builds its own engines, carriages, waggons, and bridges; manufactures its own paper, prints its railway tickets; and makes coffins and wooden arms and legs for the benefit of the employees. The works at Crewe turn out an engine every five days. The life of an engine is 40 years.

## The Low Earning Power of Our Railways.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Each British Truck Wagon | earns | on the | average | £85 | per annum. |
| Each West Australian | ,, | ,, | ,, | £153 | ,, |
| Each New South Wales | ,, | ,, | ,, | £191 | ,, |

This low earning power of the truck wagon arises from the fact that contention for traffic is so keen. For example, Leeds is served by five Companies, of which four run to London. They can't all get full wagon loads, but they must run the trains every day, full or empty, or lose the traffic. It is the case all over the country.

What is it that stops us from having large car loads and heavy train loads as well ? Is it not the fact that the contention of the three trunk lines from Glasgow to the south, four from Leeds, five from Manchester and Liverpool, have something to do with the small wagon and train loads they get ? It is the splitting up of what there is to carry that is ruining the railways, and will ultimately ruin the country, if the expensive contention is not put a stop to. In Boston it is possible to travel seventeen miles for five cents, which is the minimum and maximum fare for any distance up to seventeen miles.

Mr Stewart, of the L. & N.-W. Ry., has stated that very often a wagon was dispatched with a quarter of a ton, and I find that the general average is no more than 1½ tons per wagon on the London & North-Western. The British system is to have a truck at each little station and load it up with half a ton or a whole one. Thus a train going from Aberdeen to Glasgow couples on a half empty truck and leaves one off at every station, so losing a great amount of time. In America the train leaves the starting station with its load and arrives at a station which has a long platform, on which both a passenger train and a goods can stand at the same time. The goods for this station are whipped out, and the goods for the rest of the stations are chucked in, and away the train goes again to the next stopping place.

This statement shows the percentage of total working expenditure applied to the maintenance of way and traffic expenses respectively:—

| Countries | Maintenance of Way. | | Traffic Expenses | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | State lines | Private lines | State lines | Private lines. |
| | per cent. | per cent | per cent. | per cent |
| Germany | 35 90 | 28.20 | 31.10 | 35.30 |
| Austria-Hungary | 38.12 | 30.21 | 29.03 | 32.54 |
| Belgium | 24.04 | 24.86 | 25.06 | 3[illegible].79 |
| France | 24.15 | 20.83 | 27.57 | 34.77 |
| Italy | 22.01 | 26.68 | 35.98 | 31.14 |
| Holland | 29.70 | 25.50 | 36.00 | 35.53 |
| Roumania | 38.10 | 29.20 | 22.70 | 28.40 |
| Russia | 40 40 | 31.03 | 11.83 | 21.34 |

Two facts stand out with special prominence in this table—the first, that the cost of maintenance of way is generally higher on the State lines; the second, that traffic expenses take a higher range on the lines of private Companies.

"Everywhere reforms are being made in railway tariffs; everywhere there is an increasing objection to leaving in the hands of private enterprise, however respectable it may be, the solution of questions which exercise such weighty influence on the economical development and industrial life of the country."

## The Absurdity of Railway Contention.

Talking with a customer one day in Sheffield, he said he had occasion to order some pieces of calico from Manchester, some ladies' dress stuff from Bradford, and some fancy drapery from London. A few days after a dray came up to his shop, delivered the calico, got the bill signed and the carriage paid, and off he went. Some minutes after, up came another Company's dray, and, after the same preliminaries, left the dress stuff; in another half-an-hour, up came the third dray, and in like manner delivered the London fancy drapery. He said at the time he thought it would be very strange if the postman came up and delivered him a letter from Ireland, and shortly another came and handed him another from Scotland, and still another came and handed him a London letter. The railway arrangements offer a striking contrast to that of the Post Office system.

## Waste of Life and Labour.

Another enormous waste, both of life and property, arises from shunting. I once travelled with a N.B.R. servant, and, in the course of conversation, he told me he was a foreman shunter in the great goods yard at Leith Walk, Edinburgh. He told me that at least two-thirds of the time and labour of himself and his men was taken up by getting out the wagons of other companies from their own. But that was not the worst of it. For eighteen years he had been there, and for half that time he had been a foreman, and he had seen five men, on an average, killed or maimed every year during that time, especially through shunting in winter. If the wagons had the ownership of "E.R." instead of the 51 companies, the saving in life and limb, to say nothing of springs and buffers, would be enormous. The waste of life and property goes on all over the country, and no one seems to notice it.

## "Watering" Stock.

An Englishman is supposed to be able to do what he likes with his own. But the railways of this country are not absolutely the property of the shareholders. They only work them on sufferance. An Act of Parliament says that in 25 years from the time of building they can be taken from the Companies, and the railways have no right to "water" their stock capital for the purpose of hoodwinking the public and their own workmen. An article in the *Glasgow Herald* of 19th September 1899, says:—"There has been a larger increase of the capital of the Railway Companies than most people will be prepared for. No less than £45,000,000 were added to capital account last year, and the total now stands at the enormous figure of £1,134,468,462. No doubt a good deal of the addition was merely nominal by reason of the conversion, consolidation, and division of stocks. This was notably so in the case of the Midland Railway, and by the Board of Trade figures it would seem that of the £1,134,468,462 of capital ranked, not less than £183,500,000 has been due to book manipulations of stock. The total stock should be £950,968,462." This watering of stock seems to be done for two reasons. (1) Of late years the trading public has been greatly dissatisfied with the Companies for charging high goods rates for home produce, and carrying foreign stuffs at half rates all over the country. They have been crying out for lower rates, and the watering of stock makes the dividends look smaller, and the trader says that, as the railways are not getting big

dividends, we cannot press them too hard. (2) They hope to hoodwink their own workmen. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants are constantly on the alert for higher wages, and when dividends go up they get more restless and more exacting.

# OUR BRITISH RAILWAYS.

In 1904 our Railways belonged to about 566,460 shareholders having an average investment of about £2074 each, showing a total capital invested of about £1,175,001,000, or about £51,913, 2s. per mile of line. The capital is made up of £480,290,032 ordinary stock, and £117,477,191 guaranteed, £329,373,270 preferred; £19,316,270 loaned, and £322,038,033 debenture stock. These five items include about £200,000,000 of watered stock that the country has no moral or legal right to acknowledge. The shareholders through their general managers control 22,634 miles of line, and employ 581,664 men, or about twenty-six men per mile of line. It is rather a strange coincidence that we have about one shareholder for every employee on our Railways. The men are employed under thirty-four headings:—

EMPLOYEES.

| | |
|---|---|
| Stationmasters | 8,528 |
| Inspectors | 8,799 |
| Engine Drivers | 25,042 |
| Firemen | 23,242 |
| Engine Cleaners | 18,851 |
| Carriage and Waggon Examiners | 3,612 |
| Capstan Men | 1,509 |
| Carmen and Vanmen | 22,914 |
| Carriage Cleaners | 6,193 |
| Ticket Checkers | 8,382 |
| Chockers, Charmen, and Slippers | 806 |
| Clerks | 65,093 |
| Gate Keepers | 3,485 |
| Greasers | 1,806 |
| Goods Guards and Brakesmen | 15,122 |
| Passenger Guards | 7,601 |
| Horse Drivers | 2,192 |
| Lamp Men | 2,233 |
| Labourers | 55,001 |
| Loading and Shetting | 4,032 |
| Mechanics | 84,433 |
| Messengers | 3,525 |
| Number Tackers | 1,671 |
| Carry forward | 373,872 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Brought forward | 373,872 |
| Permanent Waymen | 66,812 |
| Pointsmen | 689 |
| Policemen | 2,058 |
| Porters | 52,977 |
| Shunters | 11,856 |
| Signal Fitters and Wiremen | 4,437 |
| Signalmen | 30,058 |
| Ticket Collectors | 3,820 |
| Watchmen | 1,113 |
| Yardsmen | 1,813 |
| Other Classes | 32,159 |
| Total | 581,664 |

This gives us 26.9 men per mile of line.

This is surely a very remarkable Board of Trade return. We have here tabulated all the working bees. The other classes are the railway drones. If we took the other clases, which must be principally composed of the drummers, 32,168; inspectors, 8799; and the number takers, 1671—making a total of 42,638 men that could be done without if the Government had the Railways, then if we include the 3000 directors and the 4000 clearing house clerks, we have practically 50,000 expensive men on the backs of the working bees sucking the honey they gather. The Great Northern general manager stated before the 1905 Agricultural Commission that his Company kept thirty clerks doing nothing else all the year round but reducing the agricultural and other rates. Now, if all the other fifty Companies keep thirty clerks each for doing the same thing, that would give us 1536 more men the State would not require, as a reasonable mileage rate would be made and stuck to by Government, as in the case of the Post Office. I submit that there is no commercial business in the King's dominions or in any other country could stand such a *strain* of directors, clearing house clerks, drummers, shopkeepers, etc. There is no doubt that these 50,000 railway drones pick up half as much money as all the working bees do. I do not mean to say that the whole of these I designate as drones could be done without; but I think, in the hands of a Railway Master General, at least 40,000 could be dispensed with, and still leave 10,000 to effectively boss the show. We have only 22,000 miles of lines, and if one man is not able to look after and inspect two miles of line it is a pity for both him and us. The men work 22,443 locomotives, or about one engine per mile of railway. The total number of vehicles for passenger trains is

70,543, or 3.12 per mile ; the wagons for conveying merchandise, live stock, and minerals, 1,242,601, or about 55 per mile. The income for the work they did in 1904 was £111,833,000, or about £4940 per mile. The expenditure was £69,173,000, or about £3055 per mile, leaving a net profit of £42,660,000, which, on an average, enabled them to pay 3¼ per cent. To earn the above money the English and Welsh Railways carried passengers first-class, 27,768,790 for £2,855,121; second-class, 67,561,492 for £3,021,440; third-class, 957,059,686 for £25,007,989. From season tickets, £3,537,196 ; and from excess luggage, parcels, and mails, £6,841,866—total from coaching, £41,263,612. Of minerals, they carried 349,551,611 tons for £25,672,000, or about 17½d per ton ; and they carried 100,705,997 tons of merchandise for £29,728,000, or about six shillings per ton—total tons, 450,257,610, or about 11 tons per head of the population. The Scottish Railways carried 5,689,876 first-class passengers for £410,844, averaging 1s. 5¼d. per journey; and third-class, 111,714,124 passengers for £3,191,044, or 5⅞d per journey, showing about 27 trips per head of the population. Minerals, 52,152,430 tons; general goods, 12,563,079—total tons, 64,715,509, showing a little over 14 tons per head of the population. The Irish Railways in the same year carried 1,471,767 first-class; 3,732,567 second-class; and 23,775,136 third-class; season tickets, 10,039—passengers, 28,979,628—a little over 6¼ railway journeys per head of the population; about 1s. 2d. per journey. The minerals carried was 1,927,124 tons; general goods, 3,750,501; total tons, 5,677,625, or about 1¼ tons per head of the population. Passenger trains in England travelled 200,362,026 miles; goods and mineral trains travelled 129,749,934 miles ; mixed trains, 433,050—total train miles, 330,490,312, a little over nine miles per head of the population. During the last four years the English and Welsh Companies have carried 33,571,434 tons more materials, and have run 23,505,687 fewer goods train miles, and have taken £2,000,000 more for doing it, yet they are no better off. In Scotland passenger trains travelled 28,378,017 miles, and goods and mineral trains 20,268,121—total train miles, 48,646,138, or about 11 per head of the population. They have reduced their goods trains mileage during the last four years over one million miles, and taken £279,151 more for doing it, and they are no better off. In Ireland passenger trains travelled 11,287,906; goods and mineral trains, 5,208,015 — total miles travelled, 16,495,921, about four miles per head of the population. They increased their train mileage during 1903-4 by 339,927 miles.

The length of single track lines in the British Isles in 1904 was 10,044 ;

double track, or more, 12,640—total miles, 22,684. England and Wales had 15,626 ; this gives about one mile of railway for each 2129 of the population. Scotland has 3712 miles of lines, or about one mile for every 1228 of the population. Ireland, 3296, or one mile for 1376 inhabitants. The amount of capital in the English and Welsh Railways at above date was £1,050,895,877, or about £67,253 per mile ; the capital in the Scotch railways at same date was £179,186,706, about £48,272 per mile, and in the Irish railways £38,412,098, or about £11,654 per mile.

England and Wales at same date had 19,184 locomotives, or 1.23 per mile. Scotland had 2394 locomotives, or 0.64 per mile, and Ireland had 865, or 0.26 per mile. The total number of locomotives in the United Kingdom, 22,443 ; or about one per mile of railway. The British locomotive runs about 17,690 miles a year, or about 48 per day, and costs about 1s per mile for upkeep, or £844 per year. Twenty years ago, our heaviest engine did not weigh more than about 75 tons. Now we have them on the Midland up to 112 tons, and there has been a rise in the steam pressure from 140 to 200 per square inch in the same time. The total number of vehicles in the two Islands belonging to the Railway Companies was 813,153 ; the total vehicles, excluding locomotives, in the United Kingdom was 1,313,153, or 58 per mile. About 500,000 of these are wagons belonging to private traders. Our passenger trains ran 240,028,039 miles, and earned £48,387,617, or about 4s 0⅜d per train mile ; goods and mineral trains ran 157,009,724 miles, and earned £55,400,052, or about 7s 0¾d per train mile. England and Wales ran 200,362,026 passenger train miles for £41,263,612, or about 4s 1½d per train mile ; their goods and mineral trains, 130,128,286 miles (or nearly 4,000,000 less than the previous year), and earned £46,891,641, or about 7s 2½d per mile. Scotland ran 28,378,917 passenger train miles for £4,980,425, or about 3s 6d per train mile, and goods and minerals, 20,268,121 train miles for £6,654,947, or about 6s 6¾d per train mile. Ireland ran 11,287,996 passenger train miles for £2,143,580, or about 3s 9½d per train mile, and goods and minerals 6,907,090 miles for £1,853,464, or about 5s 7¼d per train mile. The average gross income per mile of line from the railways in the United Kingdom in 1904 was £4585 8s, the highest ever reached.

Up to 1870 the amount never reached £3000 per mile. The average for England and Wales in 1903 was £5699 per mile ; for Scotland, £3134 10s ; and for Ireland, £1212 8s. The Central London Railway earned over £50,000, and the Metropolitan District £20,000 per mile of line. Among the great English Railways, the Lancashire and Yorkshire was

first with £9,497. The North Western got £7059, the Great Central earned £6075, and the North Eastern took £5350 per mile of line. In the same year the Caledonian drew £4515; the North British, £3312, and the Highland Railway only got £1080 per mile of railway. The Great Northern of Ireland drew £1689 per mile; the Great Southern and Western earned £1166, and the Midland Great Western got £1031 per mile per annum.

In 1903 the invested capital in the British Railways was about 1000 millions; 83 per cent. in England, 14 in Scotland, and 3 in Ireland. Our railways devote 62 per cent of their takings to working expenses, leaving 38 per cent. for the shareholders for ever. Railways never reduce their capital account, or buy back their stock, as our Government used to do to reduce the National Debt. Corporations that take over Water, Gas, Tramways, Markets, or other undertakings, have always to pay into a Sinking Fund, which at the end of a term of years, 21 or 29, or 39 or 49, extinguishes the Capital Account. Not so with the Railways. The burden under present conditions will be for all time. Sir George Findlay, of the North Western, stated that the gross earnings in 1871 from 1st class passenger mileage was 13.59d, and from 2nd class, 16.17d, and from 3rd class, 18.46d. But in 1888 1st class had fallen to 5.81d, 2nd class to 3.97d, while 3rd class had risen to 24.50d; and in 1904 1st class earned 3.42d, 2nd class, 3.75d, and 3rd class, 29.50d, making the revenue from passengers about 3s 0½d per passenger train mile.

The average passenger fare is about 8½d, and at 15 passengers to the ton gives 10s 6d, against 7s 0¾d for goods—and passengers load and unload themselves.

No one thinks that the Railway Companies are overpaid; the average return of 3⅛ per cent. is not too much. The contention is that they are wastefully conducted, and as a result badly worked. There are 40,000 more men on the railways than there should be. Mr R. W. Giles stated in 1893 that millions were wasted annually for want of a better understanding among the Companies. He said that it could easily be arranged that each passenger train on an average could earn 5s per train mile. Under Government the Railways in Ceylon, with less than half our traffic, earn 12s 4d per train mile. In India, 7s 8d per train mile; Australia, 7s 1d; France, 5s 10¾d; Germany, 6s 5½d. Then there is the Board of Directors. But what is the Board? Mr Hanbury, President of the Board of Agriculture, said they were only figure-heads. It consists of men that have no training on Railways, and most of them sit on all sorts of Boards, and

when they sit they are directed by the General Manager of the line to let him do what he wants to do. They dare not refuse him. The real managers of our Railways are far removed from any influences of the shareholders, and the latter are to a great extent a fluctuating, ignorant, and helpless body.

The Chairman of the Great Eastern says the directors do a great deal more than appear at Board meetings and draw their fees, but he does not give particulars, and none of the King's men know. Sir Edwin Chadwick estimated that the multiplicity of Railway management caused an increase of 20 per cent. in the working expenses.

One of the most irksome duties of the Line Superintendent is the drawing up of time tables. The time and labour involved in their production, the cost of printing and distributing new time tables and cheap trip bills is no inconsiderable item in the expenditure of a railway, and would not be needed under a Government system. The Railways pay our newspapers a very large sum for advertising their cheap trips, and their pictures of the hills, glens, and mouldy castles they run through or pass cost a big lot.

There are within six miles of Charing Cross about 300 miles of Railway and about 300 stations. The passenger journeys on local lines is computed to be about 200,000,000, and adding the passengers entering London from outside the six mile radius brings up the estimated total to about 350,000,000 annually.

PER CENTAGE OF PASSENGERS CARRIED.

| | 1st Class. | 2nd Class. | 3rd Class. |
|---|---|---|---|
| United Kingdom ..... | 2 | 6 | 92 |
| France ..... | 8 | 32 | 60 |
| Germany ..... ..... | 1 | 13 | 86 |
| United States ..... | 99 | ½ | ½ |

Mr W. R. Chessman stated before the 1902 Trades Union Congress in London that the Railway Companies, to earn £100 from first class passengers had to spend £97 ; and from second class, to earn £100 the Companies had to spend £104 ; so that, upon the two fancy aristocratic classes the Railway Companies spend £101 to earn £100 ; on the other hand, they spend £41 on the third class to nett £100, leaving £59 profit on the third class, and £1 loss on the two top classes. He also stated that the Companies had received remission of passenger duty to the extent of £12,000,000, so as to induce them to run cheap workmen's trains into the large cities, so that they are not

so philanthropic as some men seem to think they are. Mr Will Thorne, M.P., made the same statement to the President of the Board of Trade on February 16, 1906.

Mr George Arnold, London District Superintendent of the Midland Railway Company, said his Company first commenced to run workmen's trains in 1885. For a distance of seven miles the Company then charged 3½d for a return ticket, and no change had ever been made. The distance over which the workmen's trains ran had been extended, and the number of trains increased. There was no overcrowding.

The Chairman—How do you account for the fact that the G.E. Railway carry more workmen from Tottenham than you do ?

Witness—I don't think they carry more than we do from Tottenham. They bring people from beyond.

Mr Lough—You run very few workmen's trains, and you have refused every application for more ?

Witness—Yes.

Mr Lough—Do you know that in 20 years, under the Act of 1883, the Midland Railway Company received £1,080,000 in consequence of being relieved of the payment of passenger duty ?

The Railway Companies must be taught that for the privilege of getting dividends out of the pockets of the travelling public they will have to provide the *quid pro quo*.

The result of careful inquiries shows that the fare per passenger mile is as near as possible one penny. The excursion fares are low, but the first and second class fares are higher, which as near as possible squares the compass. In 1904 the average passenger receipts per train mile in the British Isles were 3s 4d. This shows exactly an average of forty passengers per train mile at a penny each. Then excess luggage, parcels, carriages, horses, dogs, cycles and mails give 9d per passenger train mile, making in all 4s 1d per passenger train mile. The average for merchandise, reckoning the haul at 40 miles, is about a penny seven-eights, and for minerals about seven-sixteenths of a penny per ton per mile, making the all-over average 1.16d per mile. To haul 50 tons of goods one mile 20lbs of coal is consumed, and to haul 600 tons over the same mile only 60lbs is required. Organisation of traffic, and the general expenses of working, bear the same relation in diminishing expenses and increasing the return, so that our greater density of traffic should give us an advantage over other countries, but it does not.

| | Tons of goods carried per mile of railway for a year. | Average charge per ton of goods carried one mile |
|---|---|---|
| Britain | 20,205 | $1\frac{2}{8}$d. |
| Belgium | 18,462 | $\frac{9}{10}$d. |
| Germany | 9,856 | $1\frac{3}{10}$d. |
| Austria | 6,828 | $1\frac{4}{10}$d. |
| Holland | 5,487 | 1d. |
| United States | 4,275 | $1\frac{1}{10}$d. |
| France | 3,954 | $1\frac{8}{10}$d. |
| Japan | 2,945 | $1\frac{9}{10}$d. |
| Sweden | 2,716 | $1\frac{2}{10}$d. |
| Denmark | 2,311 | $1\frac{1}{10}$d. |

The average passenger train load for England and Wales is only forty-one persons, even counting the always crowded trains of our great cities, and the average carrying capacity of these trains is between 300 and 400 persons.

A large proportion of the first class accommodation in British trains is not occupied. At least three-fourths of it was run empty in 1904.

The mileage of single track railway in England and Wales is about 28,000 ; in Scotland, 5000 ; and in Ireland, 4000 ; total, about 37,000 miles. Adding 13,624 miles of sidings makes up about 50,624 single track miles. Our tramways in 1904 carried 2,959,352,673, or 870,935,080 more passengers than our railways carried. There is £52,675,152 invested in 2117 miles of tramways, or about £24,882 per mile. 1148 miles belong to Local Authorities, at a cost of about £24,425 per mile, and 692 miles belong to private companies, at a cost of about £26,576 per mile. The average fare per passenger on the Municipal trams is 1.05d, and on the private trams the average fare is 1.23d. The income was £3,351,977.

The "Cornhill Magazine" says :—"Up to 1845 the third class passenger had no legal status. Many Companies would not carry him at any price. Others put him in open goods trucks with moveable seats placed across them, and charged him 1½d per mile. He was conveyed with other unclean animals in cattle trains. He was shunted about in his bufferless wagon for hours, and when he got to his destination the Company's servants were strictly ordered not to porter for third class passengers. One style of conveyance was known as a Stanhope (it consisted of a box about 18 feet long, divided into four compartments by two wooden bars crossing each other in the middle, with no seats). The passengers all were the sons of the upright." The writer many a time stood in them from Glasgow to Greenock. The fare was 4d.

A prominent writer in a new publication says, when the student of Railway economics thinks of the meagreness and obscurity of the statistics put at his disposal by the Board of Trade, and then contemplates the wealth of detail available from almost every country but his own, he will be filled with envy. For from America, Germany, France, Italy, and Switzerland comes the fullest information about every line from every point of view. In Britain it is difficult to find an authentic statement as to the distance between two stations, and the length of sidings possessed by the different Companies, the engine, miles run, the proportion of engine-power expended in shunting, etc., which are essential to an intelligent understanding of the operations of a Railway.

The Railway Companies are road carriers, ship-owners, dock-owners, hotel-keepers, general caterers, manufacturers of iron and steel for constructing their own locomotives, carriages, wagons, bridges, and signalling apparatus, and everything else they need in connection with their work. The North Western at Crewe have their own steel works, at which they can turn out 50,000 tons per annum, roll their own rails, and build their own engines, carriages, and bridges. Each Company doing its own work is a serious obstruction to uniformity, and consequently of economy. It also stops enterprise on a large scale in our locomotive export trade. Our little makers cannot go in for big orders at short notice, as the Baldwin Works in America, and our Railway competitors in Germany and Belgium can.

The North Western Superannuation Fund, out of 83,000 employees, has only a membership of 9000, who contribute 2½ per cent. of their wages, and the Company adds another 2½. All the salaried staff under 28 years of age must become members, and their subscriptions are deducted off their pay sheets. Does it not seem strange so few are members? The Company distributes about 15,000 suits of clothes annually, and pays in wages about £87,000 weekly. The salaried staff is paid monthly, but no mention is made of the amount.

## Rates and Taxes.

Great complaint is constantly being made by the Railways of the heavy rates and taxes they have to pay. In 1904 they paid £4,279,960, or 0.87 of a penny per £ of their paid up capital. This at 25 years' purchase comes to about 2s 5¾d per £ per annum. The United States Railways pay £12,051,993, or 1.10 of a penny per £. The London and North-Western has a paid up capital of £129,375,853, and Lord Stalbridge at their last meeting complained bitterly of their heavy rates and taxes.

He said they had to pay away for this cause £250,000, or 1¼ per cent. of their divisible dividend. This works out at ⅜ of a penny per £ of their sunk capital. Taking the Railways at 25 years' purchase, they are only paying 10d in the £ of their own valuation, and they take as much or more use of the police, workhouses, hospitals, roads, and all the public institutions as any other class, company, or combinaiton of individuals in the island. It seems to me a shame that they should dare to complain while some are paying 10s against their 10d.

The system of issuing stock at a discount, owing to the unfavourable position that some Railways are in financially, is a great drawback to the Companies. Suppose they want £100,000 at 5 per cent. They issue at a discount of 2 per cent., £98. They have to issue £102,040 to get the £100,000 cash, and they have to pay 5 per cent. interest on the £102,040, which comes to not £5000, but £5102. Then when the time comes that they want to buy the stock back, they have to pay not £100,000 that they got, but £102,040 that they did not get. Some of our Railways have been known to issue stock at a discount of 32 per cent., but have never been able to pay the interest upon it.

A first class season ticket between Brixton and Ludgate Hill cost £8. A third class passenger pays 6d per day return ; if he travels six days per week it costs him £7 16s a year. If he got a third class season at the same proportion it would be £4 8s 8d. If season and return tickets were granted to third class on just and easy terms, an enormous trade would be done. The London General Omnibus reduced its rates by half, and owing to the great increase of passengers continued to pay a high dividend. Telegrams since reduced to sixpence have much more than doubled their number, and parcels from the same cause have tripled their number.

On some of the Railways south of the Thames they issue a return ticket, and say you must return the same day or it is void. You must pay again to get back. You feel you are robbed. Again, if a man offends against their self-made by-laws by trespassing on their Railways, or travelling without a ticket, he is punished by the Magistrates. The Railway Company then takes the liberty of punishing him again for the very same offence by printing his name and address on bills and pasting them all over the country side. What would be said of a tailor who made the same man a suit of clothes, and had to haul him before the Magistrates, and after the law had decided the case as well as it could do, the tailor put a bill in his window repeating the whole case, and exposing the man to ridicule, to the detriment of his after prospects ? Yet this is what the

Railways continually do ; take the law into their own hand and punish a man twice for one offence.

It has been reported that a scheme is on hand for the issue of interchangeable tickets between London and the North, available by either of the three trunk lines North. It was proposed (to save expenses) to run the sleeping saloon one night from Euston, next night from St Pancras, and the following night from King's Cross, and vice versa. It is reported that all the Scottish Railways have agreed to this, but it is doubtful if the English lines will agree.

The Midland Railway in 1872 issued third class tickets by all its passenger trains, and in 1875 it did away with all its second class compartments, and lowered its first class fares to 1½d per mile. Before that the Caledonian had done away with its second class, and the Great North of Scotland never had any second class coaches. There is no such thing in Scotland now. About this time the Midland Railway imported the Pullman car, 57 feet long, from America, and they are now on nearly every Railway. The third class carriages about this time weighed about ten tons, and had five compartments with sitting room for fifty passengers. So about four cwt. of deadweight was hauled for every passenger that could be carried. At the present time the standard weight for our corridor bogie carriages is about twenty-five tons, seated for about thirty-six passengers ; the deadweight is about fourteen cwt. per seat. Thirty years ago two hundred third class passengers could have been taken in four carriages, weighing about fifty tons, from Glasgow to London. To-day it would require seven carriages weighing about 200 tons. The length of some of the present corridor carriages is about seventy feet. Thirty years ago the fastest train from London to Glasgow took over eleven hours. To-day the journey is done in eight, and to Edinburgh in seven and three-quarter hours.

Instances of overcrowding London trains, presented by the London County Council to Colonel Yorke, who had been inquiring into the overcrowding of workmen's trains. Take these few as a sample.

| Train | No. of Seats | Actual Passengers |
|---|---|---|
| To Fenchurch Street ..... | 874 | 1100 |
| ,, ,, ,, ..... | 894 | 1286 |
| ,, ,, ,, ..... | 1082 | 1400 |
| ,, ,, ,, ..... | 757 | 1149 |
| ,, ,, ,, ..... | 674 | 900 |
| Whitechapel and Bow ..... | 400 | 661 |
| ,, ,, ,, ..... | 400 | 822 |

This means that the capacity of the third train was eighteen passenger coaches having sixty seats in each coach, with ten seats in each compartment, but as the train carried 1400 passengers, each coach had seventy-seven passengers, or thirteen in each compartment. The last train, with four hundred seats, would have seven coaches with forty compartments, or 20.5 in each compartment. I think further comment would be useless.

In 1845 no fewer than 1263 Companies applied to Parliament for powers to make Railways in the United Kingdom, involving a capital of over 560 millions, and deposited cash to the extent of nearly 60 millions. The financial jobbery, incident to the mid-century Railway promotions, stands out as one of the blackest spots in modern English history. Notorious swindlers exploited the credulity of the public to amass great fortunes out of perfectly bogus schemes. Mr Herbert Spencer has probably written no stronger attack upon any abuse than his scathing indictment of this phase of Railway history. And it is a commonly asserted fact that the opposition of the House of Lords to the London and Birmingham Railway was bought off by the promoters, who bribed several prominent inmates of the gilded chamber. Thus a hostile vote was reversed within a few days. It is true that several of the most glaring of these promotion abuses have passed away, and with the growth of the Railway construction opportunities for their practice on a large scale have also been removed, but many still remain.

In 1844 George Stephenson was Chairman of the Yarmouth and Norwich Railway: A Mr Tuck claimed £9000 for severance of his land, after he had been paid a very high price for the land. A jury awarded him £850, or less than a tenth of what he claimed. A Mr Driver pushed a claim for from £35,000 to £40,000, for which the jury awarded £2000.

The results of contention are clearly brought out in the three Southern lines from London, which have been a notorious and long standing scandal. It has been estimated that their senseless contention has cost them about £200,000 per annum in running nearly empty trains and boats to the North of France, and the public has to suffer in a slow, poor, bare train because of the Directors' folly. It was the same in Scotland before the 1892 arrangement between the Caledonian and the North British. The Chairman of the Caledonian said if the contention had gone on much longer it must have resulted in serious disaster to one or both Railways. The Chairman of the North British said that £40,000 in Parliamentary expenses would be saved in the first half of 1892. So, too, in the fight between the Midland and Great Northern ; they increased their train service to

the extent of a million a year for the increase of one passenger more in each of their trains, and a ton of goods to each train load. But the nonsense still goes on. Three great trunk railways were not enough to London from the North, with their four lines of rails half of the way, but we must get a fourth pushed in to ruin itself and the others, if it can. I think our descendants, when they have learned to substitute co-operation for contention and social enterprise for private struggling, will laugh at our stupidity.

## Legal Rates.

To promote a Bill in Parliament, a Company employs a Parliamentary agent, and deposits 5 per cent. of the estimated cost of the Railway before the subject can be discussed in either the Upper or the Lower House. It is then sent to a Select Committee of the House, where the promoters on one side and the objectors on the other, give all the evidence they can for and against the new line, and the Committee's decision is generally accepted by Parliament. Half a dozen Committees are engaged simultaneously in the consideration of as many different Bills. Their decisions are announced, but their reasons are never given.

Nearly all the complaints that have been brought by traders against the Railway Companies have been put forward through want of knowledge of their legal power to charge a man, a company, or a community one rate, and another man, a company, or a community for the same service a different rate. The great majority of our Railways have a legal right to charge per mile for a 1st class passenger, 3d ; for a 2nd class, 2d ; for a 3rd, 1½d ; and by a Parliamentary train, 1d. Except by the Cheap Trains Act, 1883 :—(1) They must carry parties of His Majesty's army, navy, or police at fares reduced in proportion to the number of the party. (2) They must provide what in the opinion of the Board of Trade is a due and sufficient accommodation for Government men third class at fares not exceeding one penny per mile. (3) And they are to run proper and sufficient trains for workmen going to and returning from their work at such fares, and such times, between 6 P.M. and 8 A.M., as may appear reasonable to the Board of Trade. The first Railway ever passed by Act of Parliament, that of the Stockton and Darlington Railway, was empowered to charge coal for local use at 4d per ton per mile, and for export the maximum was ½d per ton per mile.

The Railway Companies in 1847 framed a goods classification of 326 articles. In 1852 the number had grown to 760, and in 1890 to 4000, but

they were again put through the mill, and reduced to 1400. To get these rates arranged with the traders 79 meetings were held in England, 31 in Scotland, and 14 in Ireland. The meetings began in June 1889, and continued for a year. During the hearing no less than 43,657 questions were asked and answered, and dozens of diagrams were put in. The minutes of proceedings, including speeches of counsel, extended to 3728 pages, and the minutes on classification cover 709 pages. The expenditure of money by the Government in these protracted and expensively organised meetings must have been enormous to get an understanding between the Railways and the traders, yet, after all, on the 16th of May 1893, Mr Mundella, then President of the Board of Trade, moved that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the manner in which the Railway Companies had exercised the powers conferred upon them by the Railway Rates and Charges Acts, 1891 and 1892, and to consider whether it is desirable to adopt any other than the existing means of settling the differences arising between the Companies and the traders, with respect to the rates and charges of goods. This is surely proof positive, if any is wanted, that the whole system from top to bottom is rotten. Mr Mundella was asked to take the Chairmanship of this Committee, but he would not, and Mr Shaw Lefevre was appointed in December 1893. This Committee (which I think no mortal man could understand) recommended that if a complaint is made by a trader, it shall lie on the Company to prove that any increase of rate or charge is reasonable, and so ended, for the time, this silly conflict that goes on from generation to generation. "We object," said one trader frankly before the Committee, "to the Railway manager acting as a special Providence to set up one town and pull down another. The spirit of the law is, that they should treat all trades alike."

In the Act of 1888 a clause was inserted that there should be no preference of foreign over home produce, yet the Committee of the Chamber of Agriculture of 1892 states, "Your Committee desire to draw special attention to the fact, that notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of 1888, they have received reliable information that instances continue to exist of preferential charges in favour of foreign produce."

It has been the aim of the Railway Directors to make the rates conform to the requirements of trade, or, in other words, to charge what the traffic will bear.

## The Transport Rates of the British Railways.

The premier railway of England, the London and North Western, has a legal right to charge under Class A (applicable to four tons and upwards,

consisting of such as coal, ironstone, limestone, manure, etc.) from 0.875d to 2d on from 30 to 40 of their incorporated railways. On the remainder of the railways the maximum rate is:—

| | For the first 20 miles or any part of such distance | For the next 30 miles or any part of such distance. | For the next 50 miles or any part of such distance. | For the remainder of the distance. | Station terminal at each end. | | Loading. | | Unloading. | | Covering. | Uncovering. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Per ton per mile | Per ton per mile | Per ton per mile | Per ton per mile | Per ton | | Per ton. | | Per ton. | | Per ton. | Per ton. |
| | D. | D. | D. | D. | S. | D. | S | D. | S. | D. | D. | D. |
| Class A .. ..... | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.50 | 0.40 | 0 | 3 | ... | | ... | | ... | .. |
| ,, B ..... | 1.25 | 1.0 | 0.80 | 0.50 | 0 | 6 | ... | | ... | | .. | ... |
| ,, C ..... | 1.80 | 1.50 | 1.20 | 0.70 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| ,, 1 ..... | 2.20 | 1.85 | 1.40 | 1.0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1.50 | 1.50 |
| ,, 2 ..... | 2.65 | 2.30 | 1.80 | 1.50 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 2 |
| ,, 3 ..... | 3.10 | 2.65 | 2.0 | 1.80 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| ,, 4 ..... | 3.60 | 3.15 | 2.50 | 2.20 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| ,, 5 ..... | 4.30 | 3.70 | 3.35 | 2.50 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 |

Thus for two hundred miles Class A would cost the traders per ton, 9s 7½d; B, 13s 1d; C, 20s 3d; 1, 26s 6½d; 2, 34s 10d; 3, 40s 5½d; 4, 48s 9½d; 5, 56s 1½d.

MILK MAXIMUM RATES.

| Any distance not exceeding 20 miles. | Exceeding 20 but not 50 miles. | Exceeding 50 but not 75 miles | Exceeding 75 but not 100 miles | Exceeding 100 but not 150 miles. | Any distance exceeding 150 miles. | Station terminal at each end | Loading. | Unloading. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Per gallon | Per gallon | Per gallon | Per gallon | Per gallon. | Per gallon. | Per can. | Per can. | Per can. |
| 0.50d | 0.60d | 0.70d | 0.90d | 1.00d | 1.20d | 1.50d | 1.00d | 1.00d |

RETURNED EMPTY CANS.

| Any distance not exceeding 20 miles. | Exceeding 20 miles, but not 50 miles | Exceeding 50 but not 75 miles | Exceeding 75 but not 100 miles | Exceeding 100 but not 150 miles | Any distance exceeding 150 miles. | Station terminal at each end | Loading. | Unloading. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Per can. | Per can | Per can. | Per can. | Per can. | Per can | Per can. | Per can | Per can |
| 1.50d | 2.00d | 2.25d | 2.50d | 3.00d | 3.00d | ... | 50d | 50d |

For butter (fresh), cheese, cream, eggs, fish, salmon, sole, trout, turbot, fruit (hothouse), game (dead meat, fresh), poultry (dead), rabbits (dead), maximum rate per cwt. per mile:—

| For 20 miles or less. | For the next 30 miles or less. | For the next 50 miles or less. | For the remainder of the distance. | Station terminal at each end. | Loading. | Unloading |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Per cwt. per mile. | Per mile. | Per cwt. per mile | Per cwt. per mile | Per cwt. | Per cwt. | Per cwt. |
| 0.60d | 0.45d | 0.24d | 0.10d | 0.75d | 0.75d | 0.75d |

The above are a few of the principal rates on the London and North Western, but it is practically nowhere when compared with the legal power of the Irish Railways to charge rates. Take as a sample of this:—The L. and N.W. carries coal at 0.95d for the first 20 miles, the next thirty at 0.85d, and the next 50 miles for 0.50d. The Irish railways have a legal power to charge coal for the first 20 miles or less at 1.40d; the next 30 miles or less, 0.90d; the next 50 miles or less, 0.70d. This is surely another injustice to Ireland. The English Railways cost five times the money to build, the labour is much dearer, and why the rates should be so very much higher in Ireland baffles the wit of the writer to understand.

## ANIMAL CLASS—ALL RAILWAYS.

| Description. | Rate for Conveyance per Mile. | | | | Station terminal at each end. | Loading. | Unloading. | Minimum total charge per consignment. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | For the first 20 miles or any part of such distance | For the next 30 miles or any part of such distance. | For the next 50 miles or any part of such distance. | For the remainder of the distance. | | | | |
| | s. d. | s. d. | s. d. | s. d | s. d. | s. d. | s d. | s. d. |
| 1. For every horse, mule, or other beast of draught or burden..... | 0 3 | 0 3 | 0 1.65 | 0 1.65 | 0 6 | 0 4 | 0 4 | 2 6 |
| 2. For every ox, cow, bull, or head of neat cattle ..... ..... | 0 2 | 0 2 | 0 1.30 | 0 1.30 | 0 4 | 0 3 | 0 3 | 2 6 |
| 3. For every calf not exceeding twelve months old, pig, sheep, lamb, or or other small animal ..... | 0 0 75 | 0 0.76 | 0 0.40 | 0 0.35 | 0 2 | 0 1·50 | 0 1.50 | 2 6 |
| 4. For every animal of the several classes enumerated conveyed in a separate carriage by the direction of the consigner, or from necessity ..... | 0 6 | 0 6 | 0 6 | 0 6 | 1 6 | 1 0 | 1 0 | 5 0 |
| 5 For each truck containing any consignment by the same person of such number of oxen, cows, neat cattle, calves, sheep, goats, or pigs as may reasonably be carried in a truck of 13 feet 6 inches measurement inside ..... | 0 6 | 0 5 | 0 4.90 | 0 4.20 | 1 0 | 0 6 | 0 6 | 5 0 |
| 6. For each truck containing any consignment by the same person of such number of oxen, cows, neat cattle, calves, sheep, goats, or pigs as may reasonably be carried in a truck of 15 feet 6 inches inside measurement ..... ... | 0 7 | 0 6 | 0 5.20 | 0 4.50 | 1 0 | 0 9 | 0 9 | 5 0 |
| 7. As above that may reasonably be carried in a truck of 18 feet measurement ..... ..... | 0 8 | 0 7 | 0 6 20 | 0 5.50 | 1 0 | 1 0 | 1 0 | 5 0 |

| DESCRIPTION | Rate for conveyance per mile for the first 20 miles or any part of such distance. |
|---|---|
| 1. For any horse, mule, or other beast of draught or burden ..... | 3d. |
| 2. For every ox, cow, bull, or head of neat cattle..... | 2d. |
| 3. For every calf not exceeding 12 months old, pig, sheep, lamb, or small animal ..... | 0.75d. |
| 4. For every animal of several classes above enumerated conveyed in a separate carriage by direction of the consigner or from necessity..... | 6d. |
| 5. For each truck containing any consignment by the same person of such number of oxen, cows, neat cattle, calves, sheep, goats, or pigs, as may reasonably be carried in a truck of 13 feet 6 inches, measurement inside ..... | 6d. |
| 6. For each truck containing any consignment by the same person of such number of oxen, cows, neat cattle, calves, sheep, goats, or pigs as may be reasonably carried in a truck of 15 feet 6 inches, measurement inside..... | 7d. |
| 7. As above, that may reasonably be carried in a truck of 18 feet measurement..... | 8d. |

THE NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY LEGAL RATES FROM CLASS A.

MAXIMUM RATES FOR CONVEYANCE.

| | For the first 10 miles or part of it. | For the next 10 miles or part of it. | For the next 15 miles or part of it. | For the remainder of the distance | Station terminal at each end. | | Maximum terminals. Loading. | Unloading | Covering. | Uncovering. | For 200 miles. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Per ton per mile | Per ton per mile | Per ton per mile | Per ton per mile | Per ton. | | Per ton | | | | | |
| | D. | D. | D. | D. | S. | D | D. | D. | D. | D. | S. | D |
| A ..... | 1.75 | 1.25 | 0.75 | 0.60 | 0 | 3 | .. | .. | ... | ... | 11 | 8¼ |
| B ..... | 2.00 | 1.25 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 0 | 6 | ... | ... | ... | ... | 15 | 3¼ |
| C ..... | 2.25 | 1.75 | 1.50 | 1.25 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 24 | 10¾ |

It will be seen that the N.B. legal rates give the Company great advantage over both the London and North Western and the traders on the N.B. Railways. The North British is getting something like 25 per cent. more than the North Western for doing the same work. Their legal powers of charging in the other five classes are both practically the same. There are remarkable anomalies in the legal powers of the North British Company that I think are worth looking at. For instance, the general rate under-

Class A is 1.75d, but for the Stirling and Dunfermline Railway the Class A rate is 1.50d. Then there are ten or twelve Railways in and around Glasgow and Edinburgh, incorporated in the N.B. Railway, over which the Company have the legal right to charge 2.25d for Class A for coal. But the strangest anomaly of the lot is the rates between Edinburgh, Leith, and Granton on the one hand, and Glasgow on the other. The general legal rate for Class 3 goods is 3.10d, but the Edinburgh and Glasgow rate is 1.90d, or a little over half the general rate. The result of this is that the rate for Class 3 goods, Edinburgh and Glasgow, is 12s 3d per ton, and the general rate is 18s 3d.

These remarkable inequalities should be looked into by Parliament, which is the only body that has the right to deal with them. Another remarkable thing is the enormous powers they have for charging on special parts of their Railways. For instance, for the Tay viaduct they have a legal right to charge 12 miles 18 chains, and for the Forth Bridge as 14 miles 16 chains. This is for traffic on North British stations inside 25 miles from either Bridge, and they can charge 23 miles for all traffic outside of this distance.

I think it would to some readers be interesting to mention in passing that under Class 3 the great bulk of the goods we use are carried by our Railways. There are 800 separate articles of constant use and consumption. Their enumeration takes up ten pages in the Board of Trade's Railway Rate Book, and from this class of goods our Railways draw the principal portion of their revenue.

The Severn Tunnel is for rating purposes 12 miles long.

Not content with their enormous legal tonnage rates, the Railways, for what they call small parcels, by goods trains, of three cwt. or less, are authorised to charge as follows :—

| | Per ton. | | | Per ton. | Authorised additional charge for 3 cwt or less per parcel. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| When the maximum tonnage charge does not exceed ..... | 20s. | | | | 0s 5d |
| When the maximum tonnage charge exceeds | 20s, | but does not exceed | | 30s. | 0s 6d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 30s, | ,, | ,, | 40s. | 0s 7d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 40s, | ,, | ,, | 50s. | 0s 8d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 50s, | ,, | ,, | 60s. | 0s 9d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 60s. | ,, | ,, | 70s. | 0s 10d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 70s, | ,, | ,, | 80s. | 1s 0d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 80s, | ,, | ,, | 90s. | 1s 2d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 90s. | ,, | ,, | 100s. | 1s 4d |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 100s. | | | | 1s 6d |

And where a parcel exceeds three cwt., and the maximum tonnage charge comes to less than what the Company can legally charge, they may call it three cwt., and charge accordingly. This is a remarkable ruling in favour of the Railways. It is well known to all traders as well as the Companies that parcels of goods averaging from one to three cwt. are the handiest and most convenient both for lifting and laying, as well as shipping and transhipping, that the Company could possibly handle. Yet they seem to devise all sorts of schemes to worry the traders so as to get double the prices that other countries do the same work for at half the cost. Nearly all the complaints that have been brought by traders against the Railway Companies have failed because of their enormous powers and side issues.

The plan of legal maximum Railway rates has proved all along to be a delusion and a snare, which has been exposed over and over again by officials, by statesmen, by economists, by collectivists, and by spokesmen of the Railway Companies. In 1872 Sir H. Tyler condemned it. Lord Farrier said legal maximum rates were of no value. Professor Hadley said that every careful student of the question from Morison in 1836 to the Committees of 1872 and '82 have come to the conclusion that fixed legal rates are of no use to prevent extortion. Dr Hunter says the circumstances that determine the cost of carrying goods, that influence the remuneration of the carrier, are so varied and complicated that it is impossible on the one side, and unjust on the other, that they can stick to a hard and fast line. Mr John Macdonnell recommends the abolition of legal rates and classifications as they are useless. They are a mistake, a superstition, that breed and foster immorality in both parties. Mr Acworth says the attempt to make legal rates into actual charging schedules must all break down. Nearly three-quarters of the traffic of the country is carried at special rates, which, as a rule, are far below what the companies are legally empowered to charge. But the small traders are caught in the trap, and they don't see it. What is called fate among fools is natural law among wise men.

Mr Acworth admits that British fares are the highest in Europe, and goods are double the price they are on the Continent. A free breakfast table as an economic point would not be in it compared with the saving that would take place if the Railways were nationalised; and one of the disadvantages of private as compared with State Railways is that they cannot afford to try bold experiments, and they hardly ever do. The State Railways of the Continent have, and are surpassing us every day in, speed, comfort, and cheapness.

Sir H. W. Tyler, in his memorandum report to the Committee of 1872, says they have their legal powers, and they defy interference and control. These words were written by one who had 19 years' experience as a Railway Inspector, and could speak with authority in favour of State purchase. The Committee stated that, so far as the evidence went, the only remedy suggested for the trouble is the purchase of the Railways by the Government.

On the 17th October 1904, Mr H. B. Hay, President of the Staffordshire Iron and Steel Institute, addressing the members in Dudley, said he did not object to the reasonable demands of the shareholders, but he thought that every trader would agree that some reform in Railway rates was absolutely necessary if the trade of the country was to be maintained, for they constantly heard of works being closed and others being removed to the coast, as the result of unreasonable Railway rates. He thought a Commission should be appointed to inquire into what was the cause of the apparent disaster to the country through preference rates given by the Railways and shippers against us. In Germany the carriage of goods costs only about half what was charged here. This fact also applied to Belgium; and the difference in passenger fares was even greater. A five days' ticket which cost 9s 3d entitled the holder to travel over the whole or any portion of the Belgian Railways, and 7d per day for a bicycle.

Mr Balfour Brown, K.C., stated that the present Railway rates do more harm to the trade of this country than all the foreign competition of which so much is heard.

About the year 1767, the cost for conveying goods by road from London to Exeter was about £12 per ton—1s 7d per mile. Some Railway Acts of Parliament gave them enormous powers of charging, as much as 8d a ton per mile, while others had a legal right to charge three-farthings for the same service.

Mr C. J. Wilson stated in a public meeting in Hawick that the North British Railway carried coal to Carlisle, passing through Hawick, 3s per ton cheaper than they would to Hawick, and that when his father commenced as a manufacturer, blankets were conveyed to Glasgow by road for 25s per ton, and the Railway charges now 25s 9d.

The question of Railway rates occupied Parliament almost continuously for thirteen years, commencing in 1881, and not finishing till the end of 1893. One of the Parliamentary Committees reported, it suits the companies in many cases to charge rates much lower than the maximum, therefore such rates must be reasonably profitable; and it is reasonable for the

State to reduce perforce certain existing rates, where there is no competition. They take a higher rate where they can, and accept a lower rate where they must, and so they act as a special providence to pull down one district of the country to bolster up another. It is argued that it is unfair to ask a Railway Company to give an inland town the same low rates that are given to a seaport town. The Government could not differentiate in this way.

Mr Acworth, in his "Railways and the Traders," page 123, says South Staffordshire claims that its rates are much higher for the same distance than it is for South Wales or Cleveland; nor is this fact denied. The answer is that Nature discriminates, and not the Railways. If Providence would remove the sea from Cleveland and South Wales, they would make these districts pay more. Our answer is, the Post Office does not make the South Staffordshire people pay more than the rest of the country. We are told by the same authority that to charge more for the short haul than for the long haul has a strong appearance of injustice, and is often made impossible by public opinion *if not* by positive law. This looks very like special pleading.

The chief issue between the public and the Railways is this—Shall the latter be forced to carry at the same rates of payment *for one* individual or community as another, and by a motion of their will make property in one district enormously valuable, and at the same time ruin the same class of property in another district, thus artificially nursing some and heavily taxing others, and performing the part of an irresponsible Government?

Mr J. Buckingham Pope, in his book, states that the carriage of coals at a colliery on the Great Central, by the through rate to London, is 6s 11d per ton; but, if the coal had to go over other Railways, the G.C. has to haul the coal 1½ miles to the Midland and 5½ miles to the Great Northern and Great Eastern. The G.C. charges 1s per ton. If the Midland Railway charged in the same proportion, the rate to London would be 100s, and the rate by the other two Companies 27s.

Mr Grierson, General Manager of the Great Western Railway, before a Committee, said—"I say competition is utterly impossible between two Railway Companies. A coaching proprietor with £5000 could run off the road another coaching proprietor with £3000 and get all the trade to himself, but that is impossible with Railways. It is impossible to close a Railway, and it cannot become bankrupt."

Then, again, Mr G. Scutter, goods manager of the Great Central, says, in answer to this question—"You hold you would not be showing an undue

preference if two traders in Liverpool, one consigning English cheese and the other American, both lots for London, if you charged a much higher rate for the English than for the American." Answer—"Certainly not. I say there is nothing to prevent a Railway Company giving a preference. But it is not an undue preference." What next?

## Diversity of Railway Rates and Charges.

The diversity of Railway rates and charges for passengers causes great injustice to certain communities. The rate for cotton yarn delivered from Manchester to Glasgow and the West of Scotland is 25s per ton. To Dunfermline it is 37s 6d per ton. For plumbers' lead from Glasgow to Alloa the rate is 7s 6d per ton. From Glasgow to Dunfermline, only 13 miles more, it is 18s 6d. The fare for a passenger from Edinburgh to Dunfermline, 17 miles, is 1s 6d; and the fare from Edinburgh to Kirkcaldy, 27 miles, is 1s. The return fare from Glasgow to Dunfermline is 5s 6d, and to Kinross, 13 miles further, it is 5s 10d. The fare from Liverpool to Glasgow, *via* Carlisle and Edinburgh, is 15s, and the fare to Edinburgh only is 18s 7d.

These anomalies and injustices are spread all over the country. The rate for a ton of English apples from Folkestone, or any part 100 miles from London by rail, is 24s 1d. The carriage of a ton of apples from Normandy in France is 15s 8d. It was stated before the last Royal Commission on Railways that the farmers of the English Midlands had to pay £400,000 to get £1,000,000 worth of produce conveyed to market. Mr Acworth pointed out to the same Commission that the rate for foreign dead meat from Liverpool to London was 25s per ton. British meat from the same place to the same place was 40s per ton. The fishermen of St Ives in Cornwall sent to market £15,000 of fish. The railways took £9000 for carrying it. From Dublin to London, *via* Holyhead, a horse and groom can travel for 25s. A horse and no groom from Liverpool to London will cost 40s for conveyance. A ton of eggs from County Galway to London, Birmingham, or Nottingham, would cost 90s 10d, while a ton of eggs from any part of Denmark would only cost 24s to the same three markets. But a ton of eggs from Russia only cost 22s, and a ton of eggs from Normandy or Brittany to London only cost 16s 8d. One result of these rates is that the Irish egg trade has been almost entirely destroyed.

A box of herrings from Norway to London cost 2s, while the Scotch curer has to pay 7s 6d. A ton of calico from Manchester to London for the home market costs 40s; if sent to the docks for export, the rate is 25s.

Some four years since, a company was formed in County Sligo to press peats into bricks for fuel, and send them to Dublin and Belfast. The bog was equidistant from both cities, about 150 miles; but the Railway charges were 11s per ton, and the industry died. The rate for hauling coal to any part of London from the Midlands (a greater distance than Sligo is from Dublin) is 5s 11d. Nails, wire, and tubes from Germany cost 4s 9d per ton, while English goods hauled the same distance cost 10s 9d. Spades and shovels cost for haulage—German, 6s 6d; English, 21s 9d. At a meeting of the Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce, it was pointed out that the P. & O. S. N. Coy. carry manufactured iron from Antwerp to Bombay, *via* London, for 10s per ton. The English maker has to pay from London to Bombay, 15s 9d! and both lots go in the same ship! The charge from the Midlands to London is 15s—making in all 30s 9d. For every 14s the Cockney workman pays to be carried to and from his work, his comrade in Brussels pays 5s 7d; in Paris, 7s 7d; in Vienna, 8s; in Berlin, 8s 4d; in Buda-Pesth, 8s 5d! The L. B. & S. C. Railway Coy. actually pays the S. E. & C. Railway Coy. £24,500 per annum as compensation for *not* running trains to Eastbourne! In Germany and the United States the fares for clerks and workmen is all day long something between $\frac{1}{8}$d and $\frac{1}{4}$d per mile.

At the South of Scotland Chamber of Commerce, held at Hawick, the Chairman, ex-Bailie Innes, said "The North British and Caledonian Companies were not blameless in this matter—namely, the cause of the depopulation of Galashiels and Hawick. The distance from Edinburgh to Aberdeen was 157 miles, and the rate charged for woollen goods was 21s 8d per ton, or $1\frac{3}{4}$d per mile. The distance from Aberdeen to Hawick was 209 miles, and the rate was 37s 6d, or $2\frac{1}{6}$d per mile; and the rate from Hawick to London, 65s; and from Tillicoultry to London (about 100 miles farther north), 47s 6d." Mr T. Craig Brown said it was very extraordinary. (Hear, hear.)

Fish from Thurso, all along the coast of Scotland to Dunbar, to the Midlands of England and London, is 3s 9d per cwt., up to three ton; and 3s per cwt. for three tons, or over that weight. Shellfish, lobsters, is 4s 9d per cwt., or 95s per ton; and over and above these Railway charges the fishermen have to pay cartage at both ends, the Railways only haul them once over their rails. Foreign fish brought in to Aberdeen, Dundee, Leith, or Berwick, is carried to London by the same Company *at* 20s *per* ton.

The average per ton mile over the American lines in 1867 was 1.925 cents; in 1898 it was only .735 cents. On English lines the average is 2.5

cents, or about three times as much as the American Railways per ton. Why is this? It is not because labour is cheaper in America. It is about double the price. Our traders are daily presented with the spectacle of meat sent from America, dairy produce from Denmark, fruit and vegetables from France, and manufactured goods from Belgium and Germany, being dumped down at our markets at half, and sometimes less than a third, of the carriage our traders have to pay.

In 1892 the minerals raised in the United Kingdom were 290,000,000 tons ; imported, 6,000,000 ; total, 296,000,000. The estimated value being £95,000,000, giving an average value of 6s 5d per ton. According to the return of the Railway Companies, 221,000,000 tons of mineral were conveyed by rail at a total charge of £18,000,000, or a tonnage rate of 1s 7½d —that is, a charge of 25 per cent. for Railway rates is made on the selling price of minerals. This amount coincides with the evidence of Mr J. S. Jeans (before the Depression of Trade Commission) and Sir Alfred Hickman (before the Railway Rates Committee), and derived from entirely different sources. This charge, then, of 25 per cent. is the tribute rendered by the community to the Railway Companies upon raw materials alone.

## Mr Hanbury and Railway Rates.

On the 10th October 1902, the late Mr Hanbury, the Minister for Agriculture, speaking at a Farmers' Dairy Show in London, said, as to the question of Railway rates and the advantages given to the foreigner to place his goods on the English market, the British farmers could help themselves; they should combine, and send their produce in large quantities. They could not expect a Railway Company to carry small freight at the same rate as they would for large quantities, BUT, AT THE SAME TIME, THE DIFFERENCE WAS FAR GREATER THAN IT OUGHT TO BE. He would not cease pegging away at the Railway Companies to reduce their rates, and he should like the charges made by the different companies to be more alike than at present. A few days after, practically the same statement was made to a meeting of farmers at Worcester by the General Manager of the Great Western Railway. This seems to the writer the purest irony on the part of these two gentlemen with their deep, broad, and high experience on this question. They tell our little farmers to combine and bring in their little parcels of goods to one centre at a certain specified time to be sent to another specified city a few miles away to glut the market there and have the goods sold for half their value. These two men seem to think that our little farmers, working an average of 200 acres of land or

less, and producing all possible varieties of foods for the people, can compete with the man in the States, Canada, or Australia, farming two to five thousand acres of land and reaping one to five thousand acres of wheat or other grain. They can load a train, and a few of them putting their produce together can load a ship of four or five thousand tons, and their agent has the whole command of our country to dump the foreign grain down in. Our little farmers are in their own little corner with only very small lots of any one thing. Let us take a case of what we think Mr Hanbury and the Great Western Manager mean. Let the centre be Huddersfield, as it is about the centre of England, and let the zone be ten miles East, North, South, and West of Huddersfield, and say, on a certain day in every week, these farmers bring in their market produce to the railway depot where men and wagons are ready to dispatch it to some great consuming centre—some men bringing theirs ten miles, others eight and six, and so on. How is this combination going to work? The Hanbury's, who have been talking like this for the last thirty years, should explain and show the poor, ignorant farmers how to do it. However, there is one thing, he says, that we should all be thankful for. He will keep pegging away till the Railway Companies reduce their rates; but he will be older and the world colder before that happens under the present system; they must have dividends.

## Are our Railway Directors all they should be?

Professor W. Hunter, one of the greatest authorities on railway rates, was examined before the Railway Rates Committee to the following effect:—

"*Q.* Will you take first the case of the London and South-Western, and give the Committee what, in your opinion, are overcharges?

"*A.* From Petersfield to Nine Elms, for guano and packed manure, the Company charge 12s 6d—the legal rate is 9s; to Wimbledon the charge is 13s 4d—and the legal rate 8s 2d; to Woking the charge is 10s per ton—and the legal rate 5s 9d; to Guildford the charge is 9s 2d per ton—and the maximum rate 4s 4d; to Whitby the charge is 6s 8d—and the maximum rate 3s. (The terms 'legal' and 'maximum' refer to the rates allowed to be charged by Act of Parliament.)

"*Q.* In some cases the charges are 300 or 400 per cent. above the charges allowed by the Act?

"*A.* Yes. Thus, for carriage of hops from Nine Elms to Exeter the charge is 55s—and the maximum, 48s 6d; hops, Basingstoke, the charge

is 25s—and the legal charge is 11s 9d; from Petersfield to Exeter the charge is 60s—and the legal charge, 36s; for dead poultry and meat the charge from London to Windsor is 19s 2d—and the legal charge, 8s 6d.

"*Q.* Now let us take the London and Brighton Railway.

"*A.* For new potatoes, the charge is London to Sutton, 6s 8d—and the maximum, 1s 9d; London to Three Bridges the charge is 10s 10d—and the maximum, 3s 8d; Brighton to Portsmouth the actual charge is 16s 3d—and the maximum is 6s.

"*Q.* Will you give the Committee some examples of charges on the London, Chatham, and Dover?

"*A.* From Dover to Shepherd's Well, where manure is sent in quantities of not less than four tons, the charge is 2s 11d per ton; if less than four tons, 3s 4d—the legal maximum is 9d per ton, and so on."

Mr Balfour Browne, K.C., in a paper read before the London Chamber of Commerce, on 10th February 1897, said—"I am not exaggerating when I say that the agricultural question, which has been attempted to be met by an Agricultural Rates Bill, is nothing else but a question of railway rates."

The rate from France to London for hops is 17s 6d per ton. The rate from Ashford, near London, for home hops is 35s.

Mr J. W. Barclay, M.P., one of the Rates Committee, addressing a Traders' Conference, said—"I may bring the result home to the minds of landlords and farmers, by stating that the difference in the rates charged between foreign and home grain is equal to a tax of 5s per acre against the home grower."

Mr Rowlandson, a farmer near Darlington, told the Committee that a wagon of cattle from Newcastle to London cost £5 19s 3d, and a wagon of foreign cattle or sheep from the same place cost £4.

The Chatham and Dover Company's rates for walnuts, apples, plums, pears, etc., Flushing (Holland), *via* Queensborough, to London, is 12s 6d per ton. The same fruits from Queensborough (Kent) cost 25s per ton. Mr George Neve (Staplehurst) said that the effect of these preferential rates gave the Continent a bounty of 10s per ton, or something like 30s per acre against the home grower.

| Coal from Ebbw Vale. | British, per ton. | | German, per ton, same distance. | | Belgian, per ton, same distance. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To | s. | d. | s. | d. | s. | d. |
| Talybont | 3 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 11 |
| Talylln | 3 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| Brecon | 3 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Netherton | 5 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| Park Head | 5 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| Woodhouse | 6 | 11 | 7 | 11 | 5 | 3 |
| Round Oak | 6 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Kingswinford | 6 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Brettel-lane | 6 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Corbyn Hall | 6 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| Stourbridge | 6 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Cradley | 6 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Lye | 6 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 |
| Worcester | 6 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 9 |
| Bushey | 10 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 0 |
| Berkhampstead | 9 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 10 |
| Dunstable | 10 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 7 |
| Bletchley | 9 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 8 |
| Banbury | 8 | 9 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 6 |

In "Page's Magazine," July 1902, Mr B. H. Thewbaite states that the cost of transport in the United States for materials on the railways feeding the Steel Trust is equal to one-sixth of a penny per ton per mile—the transport cost in Great Britain for the same materials is seven-eights of a penny per ton per mile. He states that what would cost 6s 3d in America for mineral transit, would cost 29s 2¾d in Britain. He says the economic system in the States gives the American ironmaster an advantage of 18s per ton on finished iron over his British competitor; this advantage will allow the Steel Trust to dump down pig and finished iron in England at prices that the British maker can't touch.

## A Strange Thing.

In a letter to the Editor of the "Scotsman," 20th September 1902, on the excess luggage rates, the writer states that on the North Eastern Railway a passenger bought a sixpence ticket to travel six miles. He had 156 lb. of luggage, and it was charged 2s excess. If he could have bought another sixpence ticket that would have cleared him of excess, but the Company refused to allow him to do so.

Last year English merchants and farmers paid £2,000,000 more for the carriage of their goods than would have been charged for an equal service in Germany. In 1898 the profits on the German State Railways paid the

interest on the Imperial Debt. This, too, in spite of the fact that many German lines were built not for commercial purposes, but purely for strategical reasons.

Mr W. A. Massey, of the Hull Chamber of Commerce, gave this typical instance before the 1881-2 Committee:—

"I should just like to mention the rates that are charged upon the German Railways, from some of the German manufacturing centres to the sea-board, in order to enable the German manufacturers to compete with the English manufacturers in foreign markets. From Birmingham to Newcastle, which is the longest haulage that I can conveniently lay my hands upon for hardware, a distance of 207 miles, the rate is 25s per ton, or 1.449d per ton per mile. Now, given this low rate, and comparing it with what the Germans have from Dortmund, which is a large hardware manufacturing centre, to Rotterdam (the *port* of shipment for this centre), a distance of 153 miles, the rate charged is 10s per ton for the whole distance, or 0.784d per ton per mile."

For the service for which the Great Northern Railway exacts £2 6s 8d, India charges 18s 8d; South Australia, £1 6s 8d; Queensland, £2; Victoria, £2; Natal, £2 3s 4d; Transvaal, £2 13s 9d; Orange River Colony, £2 13s 4d; and Cape Colony, £1 6s 8d.

On 9th March 1904, at the annual meeting of the delegates of the British Chamber of Commerce, held in London, the following resolution was moved by Mr Wright, Birmingham, and seconded by Mr Parkes, M.P., and unanimously adopted:—"That the trading interests of Great Britain are injuriously affected by the discrepancy between the railway rates for the carriage of goods from foreign towns to the sea and the rates charged by Railway Companies in this country, and that this injury is increased by the advantage given by our Railway Companies to foreign producers for the conveyance of goods from the outports to the great centres of distribution at lower rates than from the seats of home production. That a memorial be addressed to the President of the Board of Trade *praying* that he will be pleased to receive a deputation from this Association, to urge upon him the desirability of moving for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the question, and to recommend some means for removing the present grievance, either by a readjustment of the Railway rates, or by the development of our canals, or by both."

This is a very vague and colourless resolution, but it is a step in the right direction for which we ought to be thankful. It is astounding to think that, with all these complicated arrangements, our railways have

about 150,000,000 rates. A complete set for the North Western alone would fill 2000 volumes ; and all the other Railways have their hundreds and some of them thousands of volumes of rates, while the rate book for the whole of Germany is less than 80 pages, and a trader carries it about in his pocket.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carriage of a ton of apples, California to London | £0 | 15 | 8 |
| ,, ,, English pianos, Liverpool to London ... | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| ,, ,, Foreign ,, ,, ,, ... | 1 | 5 | 0 |

In February 1904, the Blackburn Chamber of Commerce appointed a deputation to interview the Board of Trade respecting excessive Railway rates. Mr Whittaker, cotton manufacturer, said a London order for ten thousand pieces of cotton stuffs was recently lost by a Lancashire firm owing to high Railway rates. The English and German price was identical, but the German freight was so much less to London that Lancashire had no chance; and the Lancashire mill went on forty hours a week.

A German iron importer, writing to the "Glasgow Herald," November 6th, 1903, states that for iron from Dusseldorf to Hamburg, about 200 miles, in ten ton trucks, the special tariff is 54 marks, or about £2 14s, or about 5s 4½d per ton. I think if the Midland ironmasters had such rates as the Germans have, they would not have moved their works to the sea shore.

A ton of radiators from Nottingham to Glasgow cost £1 16s 8d, or about 1½d per ton per mile. The same goods from New York to Glasgow cost 12s per ton. In France the rate for silk goods is 1s 1d per ton per mile, the Government taking all the risks. In England the rate is 2s 2d, the Companies taking no risk.

Board of Trade report of complaints by traders of unreasonable rates, printed 11th August 1904, states that, in 1902 and 1903, 180 complaints were made and actions taken—53 of rates being unreasonable or excessive, 34 of higher rates for shorter distances, 27 of unreasonable increases in the rates, and 66 of a miscellaneous character, such as delay, want of accommodation, insufficient supply of trucks, claims for rebate for services not performed by the Companies, disputes as to the interpretation of the classification.

The Board of Trade got 64 cases amicably settled; 46 were not proceeded with, and 67 cases could not be settled by us (they could only be decided by the Railway and Canal Commissioners).

One very remarkable feature in the above 180 complaints is that there is not one ordinary trader, such as draper, grocer, baker, or butcher.

They are nearly all limited companies that are in a position, both with time and money, to fight the Railways before the Board of Trade.

One complaint might be mentioned of a bull that was sent from Birtley, near Carlisle, to Glasgow. £8 6s 11d was charged, but the complainant had to pay. Next comes the report of the Railway Commission, dated 29th April 1904. The whole of their work seems to centre round coal wagons and coal sidings, and entirely arises through difference of opinion, caused by the delaying of wagons at terminals and sidings. The £12,000 a year that the Government pays to the Commissioners is to patch up the differences that, under the Government, would not be needed, and at the present time have no interest for the general public.

Since the passing of the Corn Laws and the introduction of machinery, both by sea and land, great reductions have taken place in all sorts of commodities, to the extent of one-half, and in some cases two-thirds, of the cost of the same thing three-quarters of a century ago. Read this extract from the Board of Trade returns:—

In 1901 the British Railways carried 1179 million tons of goods, and received for the work £29,383,000. In 1902 the number of tons carried was 1165 million tons, and they received for the carriage £29,701,000. So that they carried 14 million tons less goods in 1902, and charged £318,000 more money for doing it. The screw is being tightened and heightened every year. They must have dividends!

The London and North Western in one day at Broad Street Goods Station, London, took in 900 tons of goods, consigned to 720 different stations. The number of packages was 23,067, the average weight was 2 qrs. and 16 lbs., and the average weight per consignment 3 cwts., 3 qrs., 22 lbs. They were loaded into 379 wagons, averaging 2 tons, 7 cwt., 3 qrs. Every consignment weighing less than 3 cwt. sent by goods train, over and above the maximum rates, can be charged from 5d to 1s 6d, according to its class in the tonnage rate.

An arranged discussion came up in the Norfolk Chamber of Agriculture on May 27th, 1905, between the members of the Chamber on the one side and the representatives of the G. E. Railway on the other. Mr E. N. M. Pratt, the President, was in the chair. The President said that the Chairman of the G. E. Railway was in favour of these periodical meetings between the farmers and the Companies so as to get transit grievances cleared up. He feared the tenant farmers were more given to squabbling with their landlords about their rent, instead of trying to get the most they could out of the produce of their labour. It was not

for farmers to ask for a reduction of Railway rates, for the shareholders had a right to their reasonable dividend; but they should turn their attention to the simplifying of the system of transit, so as to get the produce to market with the least possible delay and at the least possible expense. The question of Railway rates had long been a burning one in this country. He hoped gentlemen discussing this question would direct their remarks chiefly to the improvement of the system of transport. It had long been said that home produce should be carried from place to place in England at the same tariff as foreign produce. (Hear, hear.) Well, the theory might be sound, but in practice it would not work, for if the G. E. Railway increased their price for foreign goods they would lose the trade, and, to pay a dividend, they would have to raise the price of the farmer's goods to do that. Remarks were invited. Mr Easter stated that he offered a friend a truck of beet, but he declined the offer because of the high price for transit. Mr Cross said the tariff for barley from Norwich or Aylsham to Burton used to be 13s 4d. It was now 15s 10d for 20 ton lots. The distance was about 135 miles, about 1½d per ton per mile, and if the barley had been carried the same distance over the G. E. Railway the charge would have been only 7s 6d per ton. Mr Gardner, for the G. E. Railway, said that, when traffic went over other Railways than the G. E. Railway, the latter had no control over the charge. In sending barley to Burton, it had to go over six Railways, and they all had to get a share of the price. He quite recognised that there should be lower rates, not only for barley, but for all other grain, into the Midlands. He would not lose sight of the subject. A letter was read from Mr W. S. Everitt stating that he had been charged ½d a pound, about 93s per ton, for the conveyance of a box of apples 32½ miles. What encouragement was there in that to grow fruit? Mr Gardner said the charge looked high, but he did not know anything about it.

Mr Vincent complained of the difference in rates for cattle, and said it took more to bring cattle from Chester to Norwich than from Ireland to Norwich, and it took two days to get cattle from Beedham Lynn or Aylsham to Yarmouth. The Chairman said they must confine their attention to Railway rates. They could not deal with the question of delays, but Mr Gardner would inquire into it. (It will be noticed that at the commencement of the meeting the Chairman told them that they were not to interfere with the Railway rates, but only with transit questions.)

Mr Poll said he paid a penny per gallon for milk to London. Milk

carrying was a great, steady, and profitable trade. The Company had reduced the carriage of fowls and eggs, they carried season ticket-holders at a reduced rate, and he thought they should give some concession to milk.

Mr H. Tallent said he had to pay more for feeding stuff from London to Lynn than he had to pay for the same goods going 10 or 12 miles further on. The explanation he got was the three Companies running into Lynn had agreed to charge a certain price, and the G. E. Railway had to adhere to it. Mr Gardner said the G. E. Railway were not masters of themselves between London and Lynn, but they were between London and Narborough; yet we are told by all the men that don't know that the Railways compete with each other. Mr Tallent asked if the Companies could not give greater facilities for getting cattle to Lynn market. Mr Gardner said if the farmers of Norfolk could promise to make up a train of 10 or 12 trucks they might run a special; and it should be understood that Railway Companies could afford to carry large quantities of goods at lower rates than small lots. For instance, there is a very considerable quantity of radishes sent from Yarmouth to Newcastle. They were sent in 48 consignments. The cost of the carriage in this way was £9. Had they been sent in one lot, the cost would have been only about £8, a saving of 10 per cent. Large quantities of cauliflowers were sent from Norwich to one place, and they were sent in 53 consignments in one week. The whole amounting to 32 tons, the cost was £17. If they had been sent in one sonsignment, the cost would have been £14 17s 0d. He hoped that these facts would show them the benefit of combination. The Railway Companies gave no benefit to the foreigner they would not give to them. He advised the farmers of Norfolk and Suffolk to combine and co-operate and send large consignments. But it can't come off.

# OUR WATER WAYS.

At the meeting of the Rochdale Canal Company in Manchester on August 11, 1904, the Chairman, Colonel Boyd, M.P., said the possibility of a public trust being formed to take over the canals had been frequently discussed of late. It was a very big subject, and the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce proposed to take the matter up seriously. At the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce at Manchester, the President said that through the Manchester Ship Canal came a great amount of goods that could be distributed by the smaller canals. They could combine with the Liverpool and Leeds, the Bolton and Bury, the Bridgewater, the Calder and Ribble, and the Ashton canals would serve an enormous cotton district. The Chairman of the Great Central Railway said their canals had cost them nearly a million of money, and if a Trust were to be formed, the Company would be quite willing to sell these under their control upon reasonable terms. Mr S. W. Royse, in the Associated Chambers of Commerce meeting in Manchester, 29th September 1904, moved a resolution that the Government nationalise the canals. He did not think that the Railways would further lower the rates. Mr G. H. Cox, Liverpool, seconded, and said Germany was spending much money on her waterways, and France had spent, since 1879, £55,000,000 in that direction, and was now spending a further £20,000,000. Mr Whitemore, Leicester ; Mr Firth, Halifax ; Lord Brassey, and Mr E. Parkes, M.P., supported the motion. Mr S. W. Royse, in answering the critics, pointed out that the subject had been before the Chambers for years, and no inquiry by Royal Commission was needed. On a division the resolution was carried by 61 votes to 40 against. Sir Christopher Furness, M.P., speaking as the Chairman of the Manchester Liners Company, Limited, said the Chambers of Commerce had been passing a resolution to induce the Government to take over the canals. In his judgment the time had arrived in this country, if it is to maintain its position as a manufacturing nation, when it must devise some means of cheapening the transit to and from the various parts of the United Kingdom, and the canals should be nationalised.

The Railway Companies have got command of 1717 miles of the

country's canals by buying up from fifty to sixty of the Canal Companies, so selected as to strangle the whole of the inland water traffic. This gives them a monopoly of all ways barring the King's Highway, and where they had not ownership, they got its results by agreements such as when the Leeds and Liverpool Canal joined the Railway Conference in 1876, its rate was increased 5d per ton, because the Conference thought the canals were carrying cheaper than they should do. While this canal was leased to three Companies, the North-Western, North-Eastern, and L. and Y., the canal rate for coal was 16s per ton, Leeds to Liverpool, while the Railway rate was 15s. But when the lease expired and could not be renewed, the Canal Company reduced the rate from 16s to 8s, and yet was able at that to make it pay 15 per cent. on their sunk capital (questions, 827 and 2369). Another remarkable arrangement was the Great Northern Railway agreeing to pay the Witham Navigation £10,545 per annum for the privilege of losing £755 yearly, and the same Company agreed to pay the Channal of Fossdyke the sum of £9570 yearly for giving up the income of £689. These agreements were for 999 and 894 years respectively. Every £150 share in the River Don Navigation cost the Railways £3000 ("Chamber of Commerce Journal," October 10, 1892). Of the 160 miles of canal from South Staffordshire to London, 12 miles belong to the Birmingham Canal Company, for which 33 per cent. of the total freight is charged, leaving 67 per cent. for the other 148 miles. The absorption of the canals has been disastrous to the trade. A Staffordshire eye-witness stated that 15 works have had to leave and go to Wales, Scotland or Germany.

It has been suggested that the Government should set aside a sum of £60,000,000, which would buy up all the canals, put them in good condition, and compete with the Railways, but this would only make the Railways turn round on the parts of the country that could not help themselves, and rack rate them to get dividends.

On December 1, 1904, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, at a meeting of the Society of Arts (when a paper was read by Mr Arthur Lee on the Canal Problem), strongly advocated the canals being taken by Local Authorities, and formed into Trusts to checkmate the Railways. The Chairman, Sir Michael, said he did not pose as an authority on this question, yet he was not without some personal experience of our canals, as he had been President of the Board of Trade. During that time he got an Act passed to empower the Canal Commissioners to fix through rates over different canals in the public interest. The Act empowered them to prohibit un-

reasonable rates on canals that had been fixed by the Railways interested in their canals, but he was afraid the result had not been what he had expected, and the inland navigation was not what we could desire. As to other countries, it must be remembered that the practice in this country was to leave as much as possible to private enterprise, and, on the Continent, to do as much as possible by the State. He did not think our system was wrong, the circumstances were not the same, but he was prepared to associate himself with the opinion that we could not afford to disregard the experiences of our Continental neighbours in this matter. If it were possible to cheapen land transport for industrial products, it would be a great advantage to us. Local Authorities had been suggested. That was a practical proposition which certainly deserved the consideration of Parliament.

The right honourable gentleman wants to saddle the communities with what is really a national question. If the communities had canals, more than likely they would be at war with each other in London before they were well started This question of transit cannot be settled by Local Authorities. Sir John Brunner, M.P., said the State should buy up the canals. A Committee has been selected to draw up a Bill to be presented to Parliament to ask the Government to nationalise the canals.

During the last 40 years France has spent £55,000,000 on inland canals ; Germany, £47,000,000 ; Holland, £17,000,000 ; and Belgium, £16,000,000, and they are as free as our macadamised roads. It is said by experts that canal transit could be 65 per cent. cheaper than by railway. We have over 3500 miles of canals, and the Railways possess or control more than one-third of them.

They are not content with closing up the canals, but they are grabbing up the ships on the sea all round them. If the whole system were under the State there would be much greater mobility, and men and facilities would be drafted from one district to another.

Glamorganshire Canal per mile tonnage rates in 1799 were :—For minerals and manure, 2d ; and for all other merchandise, 5d per ton per mile. At the commencement of the 18th century the Peak Forest Canal carried limestone for 1½d per ton per mile ; other minerals and dung, 2d ; and merchandise, 3d. In 1815 the Sheffield Canal charged for carrying minerals and dung, turnips, carrots, and potatoes, 2d per ton per mile ; for partially-manufactured goods, 3d ; manufactured goods and green groceries, 4d ; for dry goods, dry groceries, corn, grain, or malt, 5d ; for all other goods not merchandise, 6d.

In 1801 the Surrey Iron Railway charged for dung 2d per ton per mile ; for minerals, 3d ; for corn, coal, flour, and potatoes, 4d ; for all other goods and merchandise, 6d.

The legal powers of charging on the Regent's Canal, for Class 3 goods, for the first four miles or any part of such distance, 9d per ton per mile. and for the remainder of the distance, 1.5 of a penny per ton per mile. Terminals at each end 1s per ton, loading 1s, covering 2d, uncovering 2d. This means that a ton of calico carried 4 miles or less would cost 7s 4d, and for 50 miles 11s 4d.

At the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway in 1828 their rates for minerals, dung, and timber, for the whole distance or part of it, were 8s per ton. For sugar, corn, dyewoods, and lead, 9s ; for cotton, wools, hides, drugs, and manufactutred goods, 11s per ton. For wines, spirits, vitriol, and glass, 14s.

Mr Arthur Lee, Bristol, in the Associated Chambers of Commerce, London, on February 28, 1905, speaking to a resolution in favour of nationalising the canals, said both sides were agreed upon the absolute necessity for abandoning the past policy of drift. They were agreed that private enterprise has been a failure, and was likely to be a failure in the future. Mr S. W. Royse, Manchester, said that he believed that the British traders paid over 50 millions a year more for the same transport service than their Continental neighbours did. (I believe that we pay 60 millions more, and can prove it.)

Mr Royse, continuing, said the present capital of the independent canals was £38,000,000. He could not tell the capital of the railway canals, but £9,000,000 of the 38 millions paid no dividend, and in the remainder it averaged only 1¼ per cent., and if the Government would find £60,000,000 the whole thing would come out splendidly. Mr E. Parkes, M.P., Birmingham, said he thoroughly believed that if they depended for the development of the canals upon the taxation of local communities there would be grievous disappointment. That system had often been tried in the Midlands, and had ignominiously failed.

The United States Consul-General at Frankfort, in a recent report on the foreign trade and industries of Germany, says that no one who studies the causes underlying German industrial progress can fail to notice the important and rapidly increasing part played by canals and navigable rivers, which are being improved and extended year by year, and carry freights at such low rates that Protectionists complain that they render the importation of foreign merchandise altogether too cheap and easy. As an

example of growth of traffic due to improvements in navigation, the Consul-General mentions that prior to the canalisation of the Main from Frankfort to its confluence with the Rhine at Mayence, which was completed in 1886, only small boats ascended the river, and Frankfort had a total river traffic of not more than 150,000 tons, against 930,000 tons by rail; during the first five years after the river was canalised the traffic rose to 700,000 tons, and that of the Railways to 1,400,000 tons. Since then the river traffic has steadily increased year by year to a total of 1,753,799 tons last year, to which are to be added 225,253 tons of logs and lumber arriving in the shape of rafts from the Upper Main. Similarly, the trade of Cologne rose from 200,000 tons in 1876 to 1,000,000 tons last year, and the grand aggregate of the German Rhine ports from 5,100,000 tons to 16,000,000 in the same period. The total length of the German canals and inland waterways is 8700 miles, and important extensions, such as the Oder Canal group and the Elbe-Trave Canal, are in course of construction. The Danube-Oder and Oder-Moldau-Elbe Canal will, when completed, form a continuous waterway nearly 2000 miles long, and will connect the waters of the Baltic with those of the Black Sea.

There are only 3 locks between Berlin and Hamburg, and on the Elbe there is not one. On our British canals there are 2822 locks, or one lock for every $1\frac{1}{4}$ mile of water. The Rochdale Canal, 34 miles long, has 94 locks; the Birmingham Canal, 158 miles, has 212 locks; the Stourport to the Severn, 7 miles, has 21 locks; the Huddersfield Canal, 19 miles, has 74 locks; the Leeds and Bradford Canal has 5 staircase locks, ascending or descending 60 feet at one place; and on the Edinburgh and Glasgow Canal there are 16 locks in one mile. Then there are 67 canal tunnels, all over 50 yards to 3 miles in length. The Standedge Tunnel, belonging to the L. and N.W. Railway, is 3 miles and 8 chains long, and several of these tunnels are over 2 miles long. In most of these tunnels the boat was or is forced through by the legging or kicking process. The boatman lay down on his back on the one side of the boat, and his wife on the other side, and they kicked or legged the boat through from the roof or sides of the tunnel where their feet could get the best grip. This looks like a system of barbarism that should not be encouraged. Then there are a great many canal aqueducts, ranging from 600 to 1200 feet long, such as that at Barton, on the Bridgewater Canal. Then that over the River Lune at Lancaster, which cost about £50,000, then the Chirk over the River Ceriog, the Pontcysylte, carrying the Union Canal over the River Dee, and that at Slateford, near Edinburgh, carrying the Edinburgh and Glasgow Canal.

Under ordinary conditions their speed is slow—about 2 miles an hour. Working 14 hours a day they can only cover 28 miles. With mechanical propulsion the speed would be 4 miles per hour, or 56 miles per day of 14 hours. The employment of mechanical force would necessitate the building of the canal with granite and cement, as the propeller would wash down the present earthen embankment at once and silt up the canal. One of the experts told me that a locomotive could move 300 tons to its destination in 8 hours. It would take 12 boats, 24 men, and 12 horses 4 days to do the same journey. Equally with the Railways have the canals suffered through the want of uniformity. Each Company built their canals on the principle that every Englishman has a perfect right to do what he likes with his own. The result is that the width of the cut, the depth of the water, and gauge of the locks, which regulated the draught and width of the boats, were all made according to their own sweet will.

# FREIGHTS TO SOUTH AFRICA.

At the Associated Chambers of Commerce, meeting in Manchester, September 29, 1904, Mr E. H. Langdon, Manchester, proposed, and Mr G. E. Davies, Bristol, seconded a resolution against the rates charged by the Shipping Companies carrying to South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, which are so high as to cause the diversion of trade to the Continent and America, where much more reasonable rates obtain. Mr Langdon declared that in many cases English manufacturers beat their competitors abroad, but they were handicapped out of the market by the excessive shipping charges. Mr Davies said the shipping rates were only half from New York to South Africa what they were from Southampton to the same place, although they had 600 miles less sailing from England than from America.

Mr Grimwade, North Staffordshire, said that the case of New Zealand was even more glaring than that of South Africa. Commercial men at home strongly objected to the owners of subsidised British steamships giving preferential rates to their foreign competitors. The rate from Hamburg to New Zealand, *via* London, was 29s 6d for crockery, and for British goods of the same class from London, it was 40s. The resolution was unanimously adopted. In October 1904 the Colonial Office issued an interim report from a conference of South African Colonies, appointed to consider the charges for ocean freights. The conference found :—

(1) That the present tariff rates charged and enforced by the shipping ring from the United Kingdom is excessive, and detrimental to the interests of South Africa.

(2) That the difference in the rates charged by the shipping ring from New York or Boston against Great Britain is injurious to the latter, and offers unfair advantages to the former.

(3) That the present system of giving special contracts by the ring is unjust to South Africa, disorganises trade, and if continued will have far-reaching and prejudicial effects on the commerce of the country.

(4) That the best means of obtaining reasonable and uniform rates of freight from Great Britain to South Africa is, that the South African Governments should jointly call for tenders for conveyance from the

United Kingdom of their own stores and such other cargoes as may be guaranteed, and, if unable to obtain suitable tenders, the South African Government should consider what other steps should be taken to have the goods brought at reasonable rates.

Mr J. F. Jones, Secretary of the British South African Company, stated to a press reporter on 19th October 1904, that as a result of the findings of the Commission a shipping struggle might be expected. The South African Governments were the largest exporters from England, and they had decided to combine to force the ring to lower their rates. He admitted that the Government and the Chartered Company had little to complain of. The freight for goods to them by the Conference steamers is only 17s 6d per ton, while the general rates for ordinary traders vary from 25s to 50s per ton. So the Governments have resolved to take a strong line of action. To a press representative, one of the South African shipping ring directors said that he regarded the formation of a steamship line to compete with the ring for South African business as quite impossible. He admitted it was true that the freight rates offered to the various Governments were lower than those charged to private shippers. Questioned in regard to the cheaper rates charged by the British ring steamers from America to South Africa, the Director admitted that New York rates were injuriously low. He admitted that the Americans secured an unfair advantage in the South African trade, but actually he had never found an instance where the lower rates made any material difference in the battle for African markets. (Of course, this Director was addressing one of the marines; the sailors know better.)

Earl Grey's letter in the "Times" of August 6, 1904, with a long extract from the American "Syren and Shipping Gazette," in which he says this New York statement from such an influential magazine shows conclusively that, if His Majesty's Government are blind to the preferential rate enjoyed by the American shipper in the South African trade, the American manufacturer is thoroughly alive to the opportunities given him by British shipping companies of cuckooing the British manufacturers out of the market supposed to be secured to him by a legion of lives and £250,000,000 of money. It must be remembered by the readers of this extract that the ports of Great Britain are 600 miles nearer South Africa than New York is:—

"The tremendous advantages that are being at present afforded American manufacturers in the way of trade to South Africa should not be overlooked by those who are wishing to extend their market. Since the

close of the Boer war South Africa has been Anglicized to such an extent that the best facilities for commerce on the soundest and most economical basis in banking and exchange have been organised, while in all other respects permanent channels of trade have been established and the solidity of British institutions pervades the country. For this reason it is natural that the manufacturers and exporters of Great Britain should themselves seek to monopolise the market, and it is no wonder that they are endeavouring to do so, but the cost of transportation from the United States is so very much smaller that Americans have by far the best end of the lever upon the trade. To illustrate the extent of this preference it may be repeated, as has already been stated in these columns, that English manufacturers are sending goods to South Africa by the way of New York, paying the extra transatlantic freight to this port in order to avail themselves of the lower rate from New York to South Africa. Such a discrepancy exists between the freight rates to South Africa from New York and from England direct that English exporters have been, and still are, moving their Government to endeavour to stop it, but so far apparently without avail, as the conference or 'ring' which control the trade from England seem able to maintain their status indefinitely. Under these circumstances it is not to be supposed that the cut rate prices which have been, and still are, maintained between New York and South Africa will last for ever. It therefore behoves American manufacturers and exporters to 'make hay while the sun shines,' and so establish a reputation for their wares that they will be able to stand the strain of competition if it should arrive with the removal of the handicap under which British exporters are now labouring.

"It cannot be denied that the advantages above referred to, which have increased the export of American manufactured goods during the past two years and more in great volume, are likely to go on for a considerable period longer. The prospect therefore of the American manufacturers is a very happy and prosperous one, which of course is being obtained at the expense of the people in the same line on the English side of the ocean. It appears that those who have already taken advantage of their opportunity and have won business for their goods by circularising the merchants of South Africa, securing local agents for consignments and cultivating the demands of the market, besides judiciously advertising, have in many instances developed splendid returns. In building material, agricultural machinery, lumber, canned meats, flour and meal, and some other food products a large demand has been created, not only in the new colony formerly known as the Transvaal and Orange Free State, but also in the

older colonies of the Cape and Natal. And still a large field is to be won in the export of the thousand articles which go to make life pleasant and luxurious in American cities, but which are notably dear and meagre of supply in the South African places more recently settled and developed.

"It must be admitted that no opportunities for grain export to the South African country present themselves to American traders at present, nor will they until our new crop may offer such possibilities as to invite the venture, for the Argentine and Australia have in the recent past been more than able to compete with us for that business; but this condition leaves all the more room in ships from American ports for other materials, and augments the opportunity for American manufacturers and exporters in other lines."

Earl Grey adds:—"It is melancholy to reflect that the 25 per cent. preference given by South Africa to home manufacturers is more than mitigated by the still greater preference of from 15s to 25s per ton given to American manufacturers by British Steamship Companies against their own country's goods and in face of the starvation of their own countrymen."

His Lordship, in the House of Lords, moved for a return showing the quantities and description of manufactured goods exported from New York to South Africa during the two years ending 30th June 1904, and the freight charged, also the freight charged on similar goods exported from the United Kingdom to South Africa. He contended that British trade was being injuriously affected by the preferential rates enjoyed by American shippers to South Africa over those charged to British shippers. The freight charged on nearly all articles shipped from New York to Port Elizabeth was at the rate of 15s a ton, while on similar articles shipped from the United Kingdom the rates varied from 22s to 42s 6d per ton. The result of these preferential rates was to give a great stimulus to American trade, and the American manufacturer had been able to introduce into the South African market goods which otherwise would not have found their way there. It was to the advantage of British shippers to send their goods *via* New York to South Africa, although the distance was 3600 miles further.

Lord Wolverton said the Board of Trade could give official figures of exports as desired by the noble Earl, but they had no official figures of the freights charged, and he feared that a return showing the exports without the freight figures would be of little service. He would be happy to discuss with the noble Earl the question whether any figures could be supplied for the purpose of a return which would be useful to him.

Earl Grey said he would accept the offer of the noble Lord to consult with him on the subject, but if he were convinced that the Government would do nothing to put an end to a system which was driving British trade to America, he would take another opportunity of reverting to the subject.

The Earl of Rosebery asked if they were to understand that it was impossible for the Board of Trade to obtain these figures. He should have thought there would have been no special difficulty in it, and as an illustration of the new policy of maintaining the Empire by preferential tariffs, it would be rather an instructive example.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said he understood that there were no official figures available, but his noble friend had intimated his desire to confer with the noble Earl, and to meet his views as far as possible.

The motion was withdrawn.

The "Yorkshire Post," of August 8th, in a leading article on this letter of Earl Grey's, says:—If a ton each of provisions—candles, soap, spirits, beer, aerated waters, cement, bricks, deals, galvanised iron, and bar iron—were sent from this country to Cape Town or Port Elizabeth, they would cost 270s, and identically the same things sent from New York would cost 165s. Is it not time the Government withdrew its subsidies from a system which enables our own shipping companies to charge a lower price to a foreign country than they do to our own? Mr Chamberlain should give them a lecture on Patriotism and Imperialism. They do not seem to have been trained to think Imperially.

The "Daily News," of May 31st, 1904, had a column on the South African Shipping Ring, stating that the Colonial Office was taking up the question of sea freights from Britain to South Africa. The Union Castle Steamship Combine is charging freights double what the American Combine is doing, and British trade is being ruined in the country, that we spent so much blood and treasure to possess. The distance by water from America to Cape Town is 6800 miles, and from Britain the sea distance is 6181 miles.

| | | Britain. | America. |
|---|---|---|---|
| The rates for | Provisions ..... | 31/3 | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Candles ..... | 25/ | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Soap ..... | 22/6 | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Spirits ..... | 42/6 | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Beer ..... | 23/ | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Aerated Water ..... | 22/6 | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Cement ..... | 16/3 | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Bricks ..... | 22/6 | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Deals ..... ..... | 20/ | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Iron (Galvanised) ... | 20/ | 15/ |
| ,, ,, | Bar Iron ..... | 22/6 | 15/ |

The result of this is Britain is doing little or no trade with South Africa. On the same date, at the meeting of the Union Castle Steamship Combine, Sir R. Herbert, the Chairman, said the exports to South Africa had fallen off so seriously that eleven steamers were laid up, and there was no appearance of any better prospects. He attributed their trouble to severe competition and freight-cutting.

On the 2nd January 1906, the South African Shipping Freights Conference issued the following report :—

*To His Majesty's Government and Others.*

Your Conference, guided by evidence, arrived at the conclusion that the present freight charges were excessive, and that the rebate system was injurious to South Africa, and should be made illegal under penalty. We proposed that the shipowners reduce British rates to South Africa below the American rates 1s 6d per ton, 1st Class , 1s 3d per ton, 2nd Class ; 1s per ton, 3rd, and 4th, and 5th Class mile. The shipowners met the above proposals by a *non possumus*. In a letter, dated 18th December, they state that they could not agree to a further reduction in the rates, neither were they prepared to modify their views regarding rebates. On Saturday, 23rd December, the shipowners sent in their final offer :—

| Name of Port. | Class 1. | | Class 2. | | Class 3. | | Class 4. | | Class 5. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Present Rate. | Proposed Rate | Present Rate. | Proposed Rate | Present Rate. | Proposed Rate. | Present Rate. | Proposed Rate. | Present Rate. | Proposed Rate. |
| Cape Town... | 42/6 | 42/6 | 31/3 | 36/- | 25 - | 23 6 | 22/6 | 26/6 | 20/- | 20/- |
| Algoa Bay ... | 42/6 | 42 6 | 31/3 | 31/3 | 25/- | 23 6 | 22 6 | 26 6 | 20 - | 20/- |
| East London. | 48/9 | 48/9 | 38/9 | 37 6 | 32/6 | 30/- | 30 - | 28/- | 27/6 | 27/6 |
| Durban ..... | 52 6 | 50 - | 46/- | 37/6 | 32/6 | 30/- | 30 - | 28/- | 27 6 | 27/6 |
| Delagoa Bay. | 55/- | 52/6 | 42 6 | 40/- | 35/- | 32/6 | 32 6 | 36 6 | 36/- | 36 - |

It will be seen that these reductions were quite inadequate to meet the case, being less than 5 per cent. on the present high freight rates. The Conference then had no other course open to them than to close and terminate the negotiations.

In conclusion, the Conference, having exhausted every reasonable means of coming to terms with the shipowners, urges, in view of the strong feeling both here and in South Africa, that no delay should occur in dealing with this important matter, by the adoption of some measures designed to remove or mitigate the present disability in trade produced by the high rates of freight maintained by what is virtually a monopoly in ocean transport between Great Britain and her South African Colonies.

A. E. Bateman, *Chairman*.
T. Machado, Portugal.
Eduardo Feri Pinto Basto, Portugal.
L. S. Jameson, Cape Colony.
J. W. Jagger, Cape Colony.
Jno. G. Maydon, Natal.
Wm. Hasken, Transvaal.
H. D. Solomon, Transvaal.
H. F. Wilson, Orange River Colony.
Henry Birchenough, Rhodesia.

On the 7th March 1906, the representatives of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce stated to the Associated Chambers of Commerce, in London (1) that freights from New York to Sydney, *via* Liverpool, were from 15s to 20s per ton ; (2) that the carriage of the same goods, direct from Liverpool to Sydney, cost 32s 6d to 42s 6d ; (3) that cycle lamps from Hamburg to New Zealand, transhipped at London, cost 31s per ton ; and (4) that the same class of lamps (home made), sent from London in the same ship, was charged 60s per ton.

Is it not a fact that ships are more expensive to build in America ? Then, is coal as a rule not dearer there than here, and it is generally understood that wages are higher there than here ? What then is causing the enormous rates of the British Combine over those of the American Syndicate ? At the time the Houston Line was running in competition with the Donald Currie combine things worked fairly well; but about a year ago the combine issued a circular that the rate war was ended, that Messrs Houston would in future co-operate with the clique, and the lower rates which were in force had been withdrawn. So for the present the British people are in the hands of a

combination, which is not showing much mercy or concern for the success of our trade in South Africa. Besides combining, they have so arranged matters that we can get no competition, for the traders that must send their goods by their ships, at the end of a year's consignment, if they ship by no other company, get 10 per cent. discount. This is a most effectual cure for stopping all competition, and there is none. Then, the German firms have through rates from their own towns to centres in South Africa. America has the same arrangements. Both have Consuls in South Africa to see that their trade is increased as much as possible, but, as it is our own territory, we have no Consuls to make arrangements for British traders.

## Shareholders' Meetings.

At the Midland Railway meeting in Derby on August 5th, 1904, the Chairman (Sir Ernest Paget), in answer to a question as to co-operation amongst Railway Companies, said no one would welcome it more than himself, but it was by no means such an easy matter as Mr Davis seemed to think. It would certainly be welcomed by the Midland Board. The difficulty in the past had been the fear of the managers, lest by any re-arrangement they might lose the least advantage, and so nothing could be done. He did not, however, despair of something being done yet. Could there be anything more ridiculous and imbecile than this admission of the Chairman of the Midland Company, with a capital of 100 millions, that they and other companies are in the hands of their managers, with their petty jealousies, to the ruin of both the shareholders and the public ?

At the Great Central meeting in Manchester, August 10th, 1904, Sir A. Henderson, M.P., in the chair, replying to a question, said he thought they could not abolish first-class carriages and have only one class. They got about 2 per cent. of their income from that class. It was a very small percentage, but it was about the same as the aristocratic Great Western got from their first-class. With regard to the use of zone tickets, he was glad to say they were quite satisfactory.

Earl Cawdor, the Great Western Chairman, at their meeting on August 11th, 1904, said that their first-class passengers had decreased in numbers by 13,021 during the half year. He could not account for that, but he was told that upper class people had less to spend; but in the third-class they had an increase of 1,358,740 that made up for the first-class loss.

At the meeting of the Metropolitan District Railway, Mr R. W. Perks, M.P., Chairman, said that they had arranged to work their new electric

railway on the zone system. The fare from Hammersmith to Aldgate East would be 2d, or any part of that distance, and from Hammersmith, Hounslow or to Ealing would be 2d. Then from Ealing to the City would be 3d, or from Putney to the City, 3d. As to rolling stock, they had placed contracts for 420 cars, and a large portion would be ready for service by the close of the year. He had been asked whether an order for a considerable portion of the cars had been placed abroad. In answer to that, he had to say that an order for 280 of the cars, that was to say 40 trains, had been placed on the Continent by the Underground Company, the reason being that the tenders of the English car builders were at least 30 to 40 per cent. above the prices quoted by the Continental car builders on precisely the same specification, and for identically the same article. The Underground Company used their utmost endeavours to persuade the British car builders to reduce their price, but did not succeed, and, therefore, placed the order with Continental builders. But no sooner was the tender placed abroad to the extent named than the English car builders reduced their figure to the same standard as their foreign competitors, and the remaining 20 trains of 140 cars were taken at the same price practically as the foreign car builders had quoted. He did not know whether the shareholders wished them to spend £120,000 more for what was called patriotism. At any rate, they did not consider it their duty to do so. (Hear, hear.) Had the English car builders quoted in the first instance the same price as their foreign competitors, the whole of the work would have been placed in this country, and they would have been delighted to give a small—a very small—sum in excess even of the price given to keep the order here. (Applause.)

At the Great Northern meeting, August 10th, 1904, Lord Allerton, presiding, said the first and second-class passengers showed a decrease, but there was a good increase in the third-class. Referring to the great contention among the Railways, he said that the economies got out of goods and minerals were largely neutralised by the additional passenger miles run. He had taken a note of the figures of five Railway Companies, including their own—they were sinners like the rest—(laughter)—and he found that the five companies had run *1,750,000 more passenger* train miles than they did in the corresponding six months of the previous year.

These extra trains only earned £20,000 more, or 2¾d per train mile. What, my readers, is to be thought of this sort of work? The Railway experts tell us a slow passenger train costs, on an average, 2s 6d to run one mile, and 3s for an express; yet to fight each other, and ultimately, if

allowed to go on, to ruin our country, and all for the sake, as Sir Earnest Paget says, of pleasing the Railway managers. Lord Allerton says that everybody knows that it cannot pay. (Most noble judge.) He says the average train mile earnings of the Great Northern were 4s 6¾d per mile.

On 26th August 1904, in the Cannon Street Hotel, a meeting of the preferred and deferred London and North Western shareholders was held—Mr K. Spens in the chair. The Chairman said, in comparing the nine or ten great Railways having their headquarters in London, that, from 1899 to the end of 1904, the value of their stock had fallen 80 million pounds. The magnitude of that fact was best realised by the statement that this amount equalled the whole of the paid up capital of the 65 banks carrying on business in England and Wales; and, while this great loss to the shareholders was partly arising from general depression, they could not ignore the fact that the North Western Company persisted in rushing unduly into contention with other Companies, without any immediate prospect of success, by carrying passengers at ridiculously lower rates than formerly. Such a policy could not be otherwise than financially ruinous. This is surely clear proof, in any were wanted, that the British people have nothing to hope for from those brain-bound shareholders. All the evidence of the cheap transit of America and the Continent, of our own corporations in gas, tramways, and telephones, goes for nothing, before these know-nothings.

There is little or no competition in regard to passenger fares or merchandise rates. They combine and pool their traffic. They put their receipts into a common fund, which is divided between them according to their own agreements. In addition to such working arrangements as these, there are thousands of agreements and understandings between lines and groups of lines. Some of them are a very decided disadvantage to the public, such as the Eastbourne case between the South Eastern and the Brighton Railways. For instance, at regularly appointed times, there are meetings attended by the heads of all the chief administrative departments, that are vigorously contending with to snatch a passenger, a football club, or a ton of goods from each other.

Four times a year all the general managers meet in conference; and the superintendents of the lines have conferences; so have the goods managers—they meet to arrange the rates. These meetings are called Clearing-House Conferences, because they meet in the railway clearing-house; but the clearing-house has nothing to do with them. Then the engineers have their meetings to discuss the weight and power of their

engines; also the carriage and wagon superintendents, to discuss rolling stock; as well as the officials in the advertising departments (they are a very expensive luxury), who meet to discuss which of the papers will get their excursion advertisements and which will not. Again, when a Company is asked to give a rate for conveying a special class of goods that another Company could collect, carry, and deliver as well or better, they meet and arrange the rate. There are a number of conferences for this purpose. The most important are the English and Scotch Conference, the English and Irish Rates Conference, and the Normanton Conference, which deals only with the English rates. Then there is the Claims Arbitration Committee, consisting of the goods managers of the various Railways, who meet to discuss and arrange which Company shall pay for the largest or any portion of goods that have been lost, stolen, or strayed on the lines they have passed over. A similar committee exists for arranging through passenger traffic. What puzzles the writer is, can any sane man say, in the face of these facts, that we have competition by the Railways in the ordinary dictionary or commonsense understanding of the term?

The Companies received Parliamentary powers on the understanding that there would be competition between each other and the public. As soon as an amalgamation or a working agreement takes place, there can, of course, be no competition. That word contains three ideas—to compete for value, for quality, and for quantity. They partly compete for the two latter, but competition for value is ignored by them all. In this way they have broken the principal stipulation under which they were granted their powers. They do not compete in the only fair sense of the term.

But the chief count in the third-class passenger's indictment against the present system is the exceedingly high fares that are charged. Fares are as rigidly fixed by combination between the Companies as the rates for goods. Lord Randolph Churchill, as a member of the Select Committee of 1881-2, asked Mr Grierson if there was precisely the same combination for fixing fares as for fixing rates? "Yes," replied the Great Western manager, "the fares between all competitive places are agreed upon." The Parliamentary maximum of a penny per mile for the shortest route is made the Companies' minimum. The admissions of Mr Grierson are sufficiently conclusive to obviate the need of quoting from the aggrieved traders. The following is an abstract of his evidence :—

"*Q.*—You say there is no competition on the part of the Railway Companies?

"*A.*—There is competition of accommodation, but they do not undercut one another in the rates.

"*Q.*—They form a ring?

"*A.*—They arrange the rates. You will readily understand that that must be so; it could not be otherwise.

"*Q.*—It is not to the interest of the public, certainly, is it?

"*A.*—The public could not expect anything else. If you mean that the Railway Company should carry at a loss, that certainly would not be to the interest of the public.

"*Q.*—I think you stated yesterday that the great evil that lay at the root of all the trade at present, the coal and iron trade especially, was the severe competition one with another, and that the reduction of the railway rates would not materially assist them?

"*A.*—It is so with production.

"*Q.*—So that you have on the one side a severe competition among the traders, but upon the part of the Railway Companies the traders have none whatever?

"*A.*—They have this competition. The Midland Railway will do all they can to bring in coals from their districts; the Great Northern will do the same with theirs; the London and North Western from theirs; and the Great Western from theirs.

"*Q.*—I am quite aware of that, but they will not alter the rates. I believe they have drummers who go to the colliery districts, and they do all they can to get the trade on their line, but they do not offer any reduction of rates?

"*A.*—The drummers could not go to the colliery proprietor and say his Company would reduce the rates—the rates had been arranged beforehand. Yet, the man in the street tells us we have competition."

The result is that the principal Railways are in the hands of about 250 Boards of Directors, but, owing to amalgamations and agreements, about a dozen oligarchies control the traffic of the whole country. From 1846 to 1903, the London and North Western increased from 379 to 1937 miles, and the Great Western from 118 to 2632 miles, and the Great Eastern from 139 to 1109 miles. Those three Railway Companies hold more than a fourth of the whole lines of Great Britain and Ireland.

With regard to competition for time, on the 18th December 1900 the East and West Coast routes agreed not to run their Scotch day trains to Edinburgh and Glasgow in less than 8¼ hours. They agreed in Septem-

ber 1888, after doing some Railway racing, to run their day trains in not less than 8 hours, and the night express in 7¾ hours. The Midland Railway is not allowed to run their trains to Edinburgh and Glasgow in the same time that the East and West Coast trains do the journey. So it is clear that the Railways do not compete for time any more than they do for value.

In 1854 the writer, through a competition quarrel between the Caledonian and the Edinburgh and Glasgow Railways, travelled from Edinburgh to Glasgow for 6d. The fares were lowered, first-class from 8s to 1s; second-class, 6s to 9d; and third-class, 4s to 6d; and, because of the great number of people that travelled in those "langsyne" days, the dividends were only 1 per cent. lower.

If your tailor, grocer, butcher, or baker do not serve you well, you can try another shop, but when the Railway Company treats you badly you have no remedy. If the Post Office delays your mails, you can get your M.P. to put a question to the Postmaster General, and you will get a reason for the delay. The Railway will give no answer in the same manner.

## Want of Uniformity.

On the Continent and in America, the tyres for the wheels of the engines, carriages, and wagons are all made of one pattern, and all the manufacturers can compete for the work. In our country, about nine makers compete for this work. But scarcely two Railway Companies have the same weight of tyre, or, if the tyres are the same weight, the flange has a different shape. It may be straight, or it may be more or less bevelled, yet they are all running over the same rails with the same equal effect. The result of this variance is that all the tyre mills have to keep sets of rolls, to suit all the different fads of the different engineers, at enormous expense to the country; and any one can see that it must be paid for.

The same thing happens with the rails. All the Companies, or nearly so, use the same shape of bull head rails. The London and South Western use 83 lb. to the yard, and the London and North Western use 105 lb. rails to the yard, and all the other Railways in between these two weights. All the rolling mills have to keep rolls for a certain weight of rail. Then, again, we have two systems of vacuum or automatic brakes. On the 11th July 1903 an accident took place to a passenger train between Wakefield and Bradford. Major Druitt, for the Board of Trade, stated the cause of the collision was that the driver had no brake control over a large part

of the train. This, he added, illustrated the evil of two systems of brakes.

On 6th April 1906 a curious accident took place at Kirtlebridge to the Scottish express through the derailing of a goods train. The brakesman stated that his train of sixteen vehicles was fitted throughout with the automatic vacuum brakes. Several vehicles had no brake blocks; most of the vehicles had safety chains, but they would not work that night.

Then another great advantage would accrue if the Government had the Railways. If any of my readers will take a walk along the King's highway, he will see the Postmaster General's telegraph posts, and on the other side of the road he will see the telephone posts of the National Company, and over the fence he will see the Railway Company's posts carrying the wires they use. Under the Government, one set of posts could easily bear all the wires of the three systems, and the expense of a million posts would be saved to the country, and three sets of men running all over the country when and wherever a storm takes place. If we could only wake the electors; but they sleep so soundly, poor things, and are so fond of individual effort.

Then we have 12 different railway gauges on the two islands:—

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gauge ... | 1 ft. 11½ in. | 2 ft. 3 in. | 2 ft. 4 in. | 2 ft. 4½ in. | 2 ft. 6 in. | 2 ft. 9 in. | 3 ft. |
| Miles ... | 50 | 16 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 7 | 439. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gauge ... | 3 ft. 6 in. | 4 ft. | 4½ ft. | 4 ft. 8½ in | 5 ft. 3 in. |
| Miles ... | 18 | 21 | 11 | 18,785 | 2775. |

It took over twenty years of repeated ghastly demonstrations of urgent necessity to get the Act of 1889 empowering block signalling or safety brakes. It was only after nearly 300 children were killed on the Armagh and Newry Railway that the Government stepped in and forced the Railways to put on proper brakes to stop the trains.

In the years 1889 and 1890, out of 122 inquiries by the Board of Trade into accidents on our Railways, in 14 cases it was proved that excessive hours of work was the cause of them. One witness on the side of the Companies told the jury that he did not think 24 hours' continuous duty would impair a man's faculties so as to render him incapable of seeing dangers. Remarkable witnesses can be got when they are wanted, if there is a little money or a chance of promotion about.

In 1891, 549 men were killed and 3161 injured, only 12 due to accidents to trains. Most of the others were due to shunting. Mr Bell, M.P., in answer to an interviewer, said—"You see the position is like this. The great danger in shunting arises when the employee has to cross the metals,

and he is continually under the necessity of doing this, unless the wagons are labelled on both sides, and also the brakes can be operated from both sides. The Companies actually brought scores of witnesses before the Commission, who all swore that brake levers on both sides did not matter; but the arbiters were by no means convinced by this strange testimony."

Sir A. Hickman, speaking at Wolverhampton on April 1st, 1904, said that a Commission he was on found that a great many accidents were caused by men having to pass between wagons in order to ascertain where the wagon was labelled for. It was, therefore, made a condition in the Bill that all wagons should be labelled on both sides. He also said the question of brake levers on both sides of the wagons caused objections to be made both by the Railways and the private traders, and it was decided that experiments should be made, and they were still going on, and he had no doubt that ultimately brake levers on both sides would be put on.

If the Government had the Railways, the first thing they would do would be to save the men's lives.

In 1903 the Railways returns show:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Passengers killed ..... | 148 | Injured..... | 2687 |
| Servants killed ..... ..... | 455 | ,, ..... | 3805 |
| People at level crossings killed ..... | 73 | ,, ..... | 39 |
| Trespassers and suicides ..... | 422 | ,, ..... | 144 |
| | 1089 | | 6669 |

Instead of agreeing to one standard brake that could be universally applied to all the vehicles on the Island, some of the Companies adopted one thing and some another. The result was that some of the Railways had to fit up two brakes on their wagons, and even then they were sometimes of no use. This is mere pig-headedness, and could never have happened under one system.

Mr T. R. Fletcher points out that there are or have been 146 variations of load guage, and we should have a uniform standard. Our present maximum width of passenger carriage rolling stock is 9 feet 3 inches, and 8 feet for goods and minerals. The Natal Government Railways, on a width of 3 feet 6 inches, have their rolling stock 8 feet 9 inches, only 6 inches narrower than our broadest carriages. If our vehicles were built on the same proportion as theirs, we would have them 12 feet 6 inches in width. On the Continent the rail gauge is the same as ours, but their vehicles are 25 per cent. wider than ours.

Our Company system causes worry and trouble all over the country.

The Midland Railway, according to their returns, have 25 million goods rates. This Company holds about one-tenth of the Railway stock of the two islands, so that we have about 200,000,000 goods rates to contend with. In Germany a small pocket-book of 70 pages gives all rates and fares in that country. Our own Post Office has a uniform rate for one mile or 800 miles. Would it not be possible for the Government to simplify the Railways on the same lines as the postal service, parcel post, telegraphs, telephones, etc.? The Belgian State Railways carry a passenger anywhere over their lines for 14 days for 20s, and five days and nights for 9s 3d.

## 50 Years of Railway Legislation.

In 1839 Mr Gladstone brought in a Bill to revise the rates. In 1842 the Board of Trade got some Parliamentary power over the Railways, and in 1844 a Parliamentary Commission decided that rates were too high, and that competition between Companies would be harmful. An Act was passed to give the Board of Trade power to regulate rates, and to empower the Government to take over the Railways. At this time the leading lines were paying 10 to 15 per cent.

In 1845 the Companies got entire control of the Railways, excluding both the traders, engines, and wagons owing to the high tolls they charged. In this same year, "The Maximum Rate Act" was passed, which limited their aggregate to the three previous tolls, namely, Road, Locomotive, and Rolling-Stock Tolls. This was the start of the present conveyance rate; that a Parliamentary ticket was to be issued at a penny a mile, and the Duke of Wellington said it would cause the lower orders to go aimlessly wandering about the country.

In 1846 a Parliamentary Committee was appointed to inquire into the amalgamation of Canals and Railways. They justified their amalgamation, but recommended that a Railway and Canal Commission be instituted to supervise and watch over them in a motherly way. This was the Railway Commission which lasted till 1851. It was destroyed in that year by the power of the Railway Companies in the House of Commons, because they reported that a revision of rates was imperative.

In 1847 the Railway Clearing House was set a-rolling with one man and two clerks. It contains now between 3000 and 4000. In this year Mr Gladstone arbitrated between three large Companies on the division of their traffic.

In 1853 Railway Amalgamation was again brought before two Committees, with Mr Caldwell and Mr Gladstone at its head, which

recommended revision of rates, through traffic, and just facilities. An Act was passed to enforce through rates. In 1854 an Act was introduced to consolidate the equality rates. This was a great fight between the small parcels carriers, such as Pickford & Co., Parker & Co., and Chaplin. The question went from point to point till it was decided, in the House of Lords in 1869, that the Railways must only charge at the ton rate, if the goods were properly packed, irrespective of the number of parcels in the package.

Up to this time—1854—the Railways had spent on lawyers to fight for them in London about £70,000,000.

In 1858 an Act was passed to prevent the Railways buying up more of the Canals.

In 1859 meetings were held between deputations from the Railways and the Chairman of Parliamentary Committees to discuss the charges for terminal services. An arrangement was made to charge 2s per ton for goods and 9d per ton for minerals at each end, but this was strongly opposed by the traders, and was never enforced.

In 1863 strong complaints were made regarding excessive rates to Parliament, and it was pressed to guard the traders' interests from the injustice of the Railway charges. In 1864 an Act was passed to enable the Companies to construct unopposed Railways without the consent of Parliament, and to charge reasonable terminal rates. The first part of this Act has never been put in force, and the second part has been in force from then till now.

In 1865 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into excessive rates and charges. The Commission decided that no legislation should take place so long as the Railways kept within their legal maximum.

In 1867 another Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into Railway Rates. This was brought about by a great outcry and combination among the trades to have their charges compared with Continental countries. The Commission thought that the greatest grievance lay in the new terminal charges, which should be based on actual expenses, which should be included in the conveyance rate. This same Commission pointed out the very significant fact that no competition existed between the Railways. They also reported that the complaints of the traders were well founded. As a result of this report the Railway Commission was again appointed as a permanent tribunal at a cost to the country of about £12,000 a year.

In 1868 another Act was passed to compel the Railways to furnish on

application an account showing both the Railway rate and the terminal charges.

In 1872 a new system of Railway charges was put in force, which lasted until 1893.

In 1873 an Act was passed to force the Railways to publish the rates in the stations and station-books, and to give one Company power to propose through rates to another Company, and if they could not agree the Railway Commission was to decide between them and make a rate. This Act also required any Railway Company owning a canal to keep it in good working condition, and forbade such Railway Company from interference with the canal rates, charges, or traffic without the sanction of the Railway Commission. This Act was in operation till 1888.

In 1881 the terminal question rose again. The traders complained that the charges for short distances were beyond the maximum powers of the Railway Companies. They were charging for loading, unloading, covering, uncovering, checking, invoicing, watching, marshaling, shunting, and warehousing in the sense of taking charge of the goods, till they ran up some remarkable bills, which nearly ruined some traders. In this same year a Parliamentary Committee upheld the right of the Companies to charge terminals, but the charges should be reasonable. This Committee also discussed preferential rates, which they said were justified, as they prevented local monopolies. The lower rates from seaport to inland towns were contested by the inland traders, but the Committee held that to annul these rates would not benefit the shipping companies.

In 1884 Mr Chamberlain brought in a Bill to give a right of appeal from the decisions of the Railway Commissioners, but the Railway Companies opposed this, and the Bill was withdrawn.

In 1886 the Government brought in a Bill to appoint a new Railway Commission, with all the powers of a superior court, to enforce the co-operation of Companies, to accept through rates, and the adjustment of rates on canals, where excessive charges were made to divert traffic from the canals to the Railways. They were to submit their rates to the Commission and the Board of Trade for their approval. Terminal charges were to be reasonable. At this time these charges were 20 per cent. of the total charge. The Companies were ordered to keep on sale the Rate and Classification Book for inspection by the public. This Act also prohibited preferential rates in favour of foreign traders. It also prevented the further buying up of canals by the Railways, and the Canal Companies were ordered to establish a Clearing House.

In 1888, an Act was passed to consolidate various Railway and Canal Companies Acts.

In 1891, another Act was passed to definitely legalise rates for station terminals.

On January 1, 1893, the whole of the Railway Companies put up the rates to their maximum powers. The traders immediately raised a great hullabuloo, and the Companies (to calm their troubled souls) lowered the rates 5 per cent., and they lowered the flag of rebellion and rested in peace, thinking they had won at this time.

The President of the Board of Trade declared that the Companies are straining the patience of the small traders. They are being most grievously oppressed, and these rates, if persisted in, will be most detrimental to the trade of the country, and he urges the Government to deal promptly and effectively with the subject.

The Select Committee the same year, in a report full of unusual expressions of indignation, said the Companies seemed to have made up their minds to raise the rates, even when the maximum rates were above the actual legal rates. Then again Parliament tried, in 1894 by an Act, to give power to the Railway Commissioners to settle whether the increase of charges since 1892 were reasonable, but they were not to reduce them compulsorily if they were within the maximum limit. So this see-saw has gone on for 70 years, and we seem to "get no forrarder," and the consumer must pay the piper.

In 1894 another Act was passed to force the Railways to prove to the satisfaction of the Railway Commissioners that the increase of any contested rate over the maximum is reasonable. But as every individual case has to be tried on its merits, the whole thing is nonsense. In America the rate for grain is really fixed by the markets of the world. The Railways must carry it at a price that will sell it in Liverpool in competition with the East Indian and Black Sea produce. Arrangements and agreements take place between our Railways and the Shipping Companies, but the Railway Companies threaten to become masters of the sea as well as the land. In the transport trade the North-Western has about 20 steamships, the Great Central about the same. The Great Western, Midland, Lancashire and Yorkshire, North British, and Caledonian are all steamship owners to the extent of about 200.

In France the Railways have no arrangements of this sort with the Shipping Companies. But the Swedish Railways arrange rates with the Shipping Companies, and the Government of Denmark owns both the

shipping and the Railways working their transport trade. The United States Railways entirely own most of the merchant shipping, and fix the rates both for land and sea. The Belgian canals are like our highways and streets, free to all that like to purchase or build a boat, and put it on the water, and the Government Railways require to have very low rates to compete with them.

## Lawyers' Bills.

Each Railway Company has its own Act of Parliament. The most of our Railways have been originated and promoted by clubs or combines of lawyers. They get or take the right of pushing their Bills through Parliament. Then they become the lawyers for the Company at so many thousands a year, enter Parliament, become Parliamentary agents, or members of the Parliamentary Bar. They fight each other by proposing and opposing whatever may come up before the Committees from time to time, and the Railway Companies have to pay their enormous bills, then they in their turn pounce on the traders and workers with heavy rates and fares to keep these gentlemen living in luxury. The Railway Parliamentary Bar is an exceedingly close Corporation, and it is almost impossible for a new arrival to enter in. It is somewhat like the House of Lords—hereditary. The old ones introduce the young ones into what is probably the most lucrative and select departments of the legal professions. Sir Theodore Martin in 1845 went from Edinburgh to London, is now about 89 years of age, and was seen in the Committee Rooms last Session. He, like the others, never went North again. These swashbucklers of the Committee Rooms also represent the Railways before the Railway and Canal Commissioners, to fight the battle of the Railways against the traders, and generally win. The Commissioners are as a rule drawn from the Parliamentary Bar. About a dozen of these solicitors are retained by our larger Railway Companies, and, of course, each of these has his staff of clerks and messengers, so the department is quite a large one. The number of deeds that pass through the hands of the lawyers is almost enormous. Some of them go back as far as the sixteenth century. Some of the larger Railways have from 70,000 to 80,000 deeds stored away.

The lesser lawyers work the common law cases, such as prosecuting a passenger that had no ticket, trespassers, or a coal-stealer. But the Taff Vale strike drew out the bigger bugs, and they made the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants hand over a cheque for £23,000. There can be

no doubt that if the Railways and the Post Office were under one management, a great many of these expensive men would not be wanted, and they would find something better to do.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The South Western paid for land | £4,000 | per mile. |
| The Great Western and London and North-Western paid for land | 6,300 | ,, |
| The London and Brighton paid for land | 8,000 | ,, |
| The London and Brighton for law expenses | 4,806 | ,, |
| The Edinburgh and Peebles for land | 1,131 | ,, |
| The Edinburgh and Peebles for law expenses | 80 | ,, |

A single Company spent nearly £500,000 in nine years in law expenses. The South Western and Birmingham for law expenses, £650 per mile, and the Great Western for law, £1000, and the London and Brighton for law, £3000. The total amount of law expenses from the year 1829 to 1860 shows that the Railway Companies spent on lawyers 70 millions, or about 2½ millions a year, so that we must now, for our sins, set ourselves to the redemption of a second National Debt of a billion of money. But we must do it through a tainted and biased Parliament, which has 150 directly, and several hundreds indirectly, paid representatives of one party to the transaction. They seem to think that George Stephenson was sent into the world for their special benefit. Probably a majority in both Houses hold shares and bonds in some Railways, and a fellow-feeling makes them wondrous kind. It is said of one Committee appointed to consider rates that out of nine members of Parliament seven were Railway Directors, connected with 35 different Railway Companies. The Railway Commission on railway hours of labour had on it seven Railway Directors, and only two labour members.

Since writing the above a great change has come over the House of Commons. The Railway Directors have been nearly swept away, and we may now hope for some change in favour of economy and fair play.

## The Cost of Railway Rivalry.

Another great waste of money is the constant opposition they offer to each other's schemes in Parliament. By the end of 1853 they had spent £70,000,000 in opposing each other, and by the year 1898 that had reached £290,000,000, or nearly one-third of their present capital. Had the Railways been owned by the State very little of this enormous waste would have been incurred. Two or three years ago there were three Railway

Companies fighting for a short line of Railway into Inverness—the Caledonian, the North British, and the Highland Companies. They had to spend thousands of pounds fighting over this short road, and the country will have to pay for the lot in the long run.

The lawyers made the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway pay £4806 per mile for Parliamentary costs, while the Manchester and Birmingham Railway paid £5190 per mile; and the London and Blackwall, £14,414 in the same way per mile. The South Eastern Railway had a solicitor's bill of £240,000 for carrying the Bill through Parliament, in addition to the Parliamentary expenses.

Herbert Spencer's pamphlet reads like an Arabian Nights' entertainment. The Liverpool and Manchester Bill was only allowed to pass in the second year's fight on consideration that the Railway kept out of sight of all the mansions and game preserves lying on its route. The London and Birmingham Company's estimate for the land was £250,000, but they had to pay £750,000 for it. The price ranged from £4000 to £8000 per mile. The sums paid for land were so great that in one case the heir returned the greater part as conscience money. In another case land worth £5000, £120,000 was paid for it. Bills were passed or refused just as the squires dictated. £8000 was asked for land for which £880 was accepted. This, however, was but one form of plunder. The law expenses ranged from £650 to £3660 per mile. In one contest £57,000 was spent on six counsel and twelve solicitors. Then there was all sorts of rascality among the promoters. We are constrained to say that no amount of State bungling could possibly have been worse, and all the State-built Railways in the world have been eminently better.

Through folly and fraud the sunk capital in our Railways has been raised to £60,000 per mile, under the rapacious financial promoter whose plunder in one year had far exceeded in amount the sum of the thefts of all the highwaymen and burglars that ever were hanged. What the promoter could do then was summarised by Herbert Spencer in his "Railway Morals and Railway Policy."

In some agricultural districts in England as much as £1200 per mile was paid for land that would not have fetched £100 for any other purpose. In the early seventies the Railway capital stood at about half what it is now. We had then about 15,500 miles of lines, and it has doubled the capital to add the other 6500. The writer wonders how this remarkable fact can be explained away by our Railway philosophers.

In the House of Commons on 30th June 1905, owing to a debate on

the Public Trustee and Executor Bill, Sir Robert Reid, Dumfries Burghs, said the necessity for the Bill arose because of the lamentable frequency of robberies of the poor people and small estates. Sir Howard Vincent, Sheffield, said that, during the last fifteen years, £152,000 had been misappropriated from small estates, or about £10,140 per annum. The Solicitor-General said it was pathetic the number of harrowing robberies of this sort brought before him. But the barristers and solicitors fought the Bill with sheaves of amendments, and they will, we may be sure, do the same with the Railways.

It is rather strange that, living in a Free Trade country, we should have a cast-iron system of combination among our Railways as to fares, rates, and speed of trains, through our clearing house arrangements, while in highly protected countries, such as America, the Railways are allowed to compete to the best of their ability with each other, till they carry goods for ¼d per ton per mile, while our Railways charge 1½d for the same service.

In the House of Commons, it is not only the Railway interest that has to be fought, but the lawyers, both in Parliament and all over the country, are engaged by the Companies to fight their battles against the public. If the Government had the Railways, we would not need more lawyers than the Post Office has, and it has plenty (see our Post Office).

## Watering the Stock.

The North British in 1888 turned £5,000,000 of their stock into £10,000,000, and the Taff Vale, when it got the length of paying 18 per cent., turned its £100 shares into £250, all to throw more dust into the eyes of the half-blind, sleepy voter and trader. Then the Midland, Great Northern, South Western, Cardiff and Barry, North of Scotland, Caledonian, and a lot of others, all played the same game till they watered up the whole stock, nearly £200,000,000.

## The Clearing House.

The Railway clearing house began its existence in Drummond Street, Euston, London, in January 1842, in the infancy of our Railways. Mr Kenneth Morrison, a brother Scot, was its first chief nurse. It has been a most gigantic burden all the time on our devoted country. Mr Morrison and three clerks started the show. There are now nearly 4000 clerks in the clearing house. There is not such another concern in the world. America has private Railways, but no clearing house. The other

countries have State Railways, and need no clearing house any more than our Post Office does. This gigantic octopus is an entirely independent body, having the power to sue and can be sued. Its expenses are covered by each Railway Company in proportion to their turnover. Each Railway sends one or more delegates to the Clearing Directorate. Lord Claude Hamilton is the present Chairman of the Directors. They meet four times a year, and sometimes oftener. Then in Kildare Street, Dublin, there are about 200 clearing house clerks clearing the money on the six Irish Railways. In 1847 the clearing house took in hand the recovery and restoration of lost luggage, and in 1883 it undertook the further task of dividing the money paid by the Post Office to the Railways for carrying the mails and parcels. Regarding the clearing house work:—When a passenger buys a ticket, say from Inverness to London, he may pass over four Companies' lines. The clearing house divides the money paid for the ticket in the proper proportion to each Company, according to their mileage over which the passenger travels. As an illustration, suppose a ticket is bought from the Midland at St Pancras for Glasgow. The Midland gets from St Pancras to Petterhill, the North Eastern from Petterhill to Carlisle, the Caledonian from Carlisle to Gretna, the Glasgow and South Western from Gretna to the junction of the Glasgow and Kilmarnock Joint Railway. Then the Joint Railway gets the remainder. This shows that the ticket money has to be proportioned out in five parts, and the general public run away with the idea that there are only two Railways. This clearing house business seems to me to be the greatest nonsense under the sun. Then, again, the through carriages have all to be taken note of before going off their own line and on to another Railway, and if the through carriage is not sent promptly back to its own Company, demurrage has to be paid for it, varying from 10s a day for a composite passenger carriage to 6s for a third class carriage. The demurrage charge for an ordinary goods wagon is 3s a day. Then the tarpaulins that cross each other's lines have all to be taken note of and charged for. If not returned in time to their owners, they are charged 6d for the first day and 1s a day after. The whole thing is absurd, and would never be wanted under one system or under the Government. There would be no more need of a clearing house than in Germany, Denmark, or Switzerland. Our Post Office has no clearing house. Neither have our Colonies nor India.

At one time it was proposed to introduce the English clearing house system into the United States Railways, and a smart Yankee made out

the following calculation:—Assuming there is one station on this 50,000 miles to each 8 miles of road, there would be 6250 stations. To make one rate between all stations would require 6250 multiplied by 3125—19,531,250 rates for each class of freight. In the western classification there are 20 different classes. Now, multiply 19,531,250 rates to each class by 20, the number of classes, and the grand total of 390,625,000 separate rates is the enormous result. Imagine a Board of 50 Presidents or General Managers round a table and guessing unanimously and writing down 390,625,000 separate and distinct rates. If they guessed out one rate a minute (which is good guessing) for one year, working 10 hours per day including Sundays and holidays, they would have guessed 218,400, and at the same pace in 1799 years they would have completed their first tariff. So our cousins get along A1 without the clearing house, and they have the salaries of some 6000 clerks saved.

There is something painfully senseless in this imposing mass of clerks engaged in posting up the numbers of tarpaulins, wagons, and carriages, and the adjustment of demurrage accounts in the clearing house. In fact, the complication of the present Railway system is hardly credible.

## The Railway Commission Useless.

By the year 1854 the Government, to keep the Railways in check, passed an Act giving the Board of Trade power over the Railways, making the Companies liable for refusing to carry goods, or for delaying them, or overcharging, buying up the canals, ceasing to compete, and so on. In 1873 the trouble and worry had outgrown the power and ability of the Board of Trade, and Parliament passed an Act, and appointed a Railway and Canal Commission, consisting of three Commissioners (one to be a lawyer, the second to be experienced in Railway business, the third to be anything or nothing). The salary of the Commissioners to be £3000, with two assistant Commissioners at £1500 each. Over and above, the Commissioners, with the consent of the Treasury, could call in the aid of one or more assessors of engineering or other technical knowledge, and they are to be remunerated as the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Commissioners, may direct. The Commissioners may appoint officers and clerks as they think fit, with the sanction of the Treasury. The salaries and expenses of the Commissioners and assistant Commissioners, their officers and clerks, shall be paid by monies provided by Parliament. In 1888, the 1873 Commissioners were done away with, and a new Railway and Canal Commission put in its place. They are to be paid £3000 each.

One Commissioner is appointed for England, one for Scotland, and one for Ireland. They are each to be Judges of a Superior Court. In England, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord President of the Court of Session in Scotland, and the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and one of them, the Act says, shall be of experience in Railway business, and they have power to add to their number. There shall be attached to the Railway and Canal Commission such officers, clerks, and messengers, and all expenses incidental to the carrying out of this Act shall be paid out of moneys to be provided by Parliament. They, after all, have little power. Read this:—"It shall not be lawful for the Commissioners in any case to compel any Company to accept rates lower than the mileage rates which such Company may for the time being legally be charging." Yet our legal rates are so very high that the Railways can charge half the rates from Kirkcaldy that they do from Glasgow to London, and thereby prop up one industry to ruin another.

In 1891 this Commission reported that they had few cases brought before them, and the average number of days they sat was 23 per annum. In 1895 the Commission reported that from 1889 to 1895 they had sat 169 days, and could not again recommend their own existence. The Commission still, however, exists. At great expense to the country, they may practically spend what they like, if the Treasury is a little careless with them. Their average sittings are about 23 days in a year. I think the money they get is worth the work they have to do. If the Government had the Railways not a man of them would be wanted. They must cost the country at least £12,000 a year. There should not be a penny of public money spent on a private monopoly.

During some years preceding 1898, the farmers and traders agitated for an inquiry into and revision of rates, and in that year a Parliamentary Committee met (the traders were warned against it by the experts). Nevertheless the inquiry began. It lasted 130 days, 211 witnesses were examined, 43,000 questions were asked and answered, 4000 objections from 1500 objectors were considered, and 2250 tables were put in. The official minutes covered 3926 pages; the Board of Trade sat for 85 days, and the Joint Committee for 45 days. When the result came it simply astounded the traders and farmers. It was a revision intended to reduce rates, but it raised them. The Railways came off victorious all round, for of 2054 rates that went into the inquiry office, 51 came out unchanged, 867 were reduced, and 1136 increased. The traders grumbled like a bear with a sore head, but it was no use. The Great Western Railway got their

rates reduced by £80,000 and increased by £94,000, so that they made a profit of £14,000, and so did the other Companies all round.

Mr W. Field, M.P., has repeatedly told the House of Commons that they can do no good to the country through Railway Commissions owing to the Companies not overcharging their legal maximum rates. Then the case of the Chatterly Coal Co. shows the power of the Railways from another standpoint. Thinking they were illegally overcharged by the North Staffordshire Railway Co., they hauled them before the Railway Commission, and won their case. Thereafter the Railway Company flatly declined to carry the coal of the Chatterly Co. They were again hauled before the Commission, and at once ordered to resume the traffic, subject to a penalty of £50 a day. They complied with the letter of the order, but with very bad grace and as much awkwardness as possible; so to save themselves the Coal Company had to cave in to their more powerful master and servant, the Railway Company.

The effect of Railway monopoly is to give the power of levying irregular and unequal taxation on the public for individual benefit, and the public cannot forego the use of the roads. The numerous committees that have sat upon the Companies clearly show the public discontent. There were Parliamentary inquiries in 1844, 1846, 1853, 1865, 1871, 1872, 1881, 1882, 1890, 1891. One of the Committees reported as under:—

"Your Committee finds it difficult to understand fully the explanations offered by the Railway Companies, and still more difficult to justify what they do understand."

We have put on the Statute Book about 3000 Acts of Parliament to keep our Railways right, and tried to compress them into 35, but they won't lie still.

## Too Many Carriers.

There are now 125 Railway administrations, all with an army of officials. Sutton, the great parcel gatherer and deliverer of parcels, left £2,000,000 at his death. There is Pickford's, Foster's, Durtnall's, the Globe Parcel Express, Carter's, Paterson's, London Parcel Delivery Co., and others. These are all sticking like barnacles or leeches on the Railways, and sucking the blood out of them. The Government would not tolerate this for a day if they had the Railways. The Post Office takes care that no other Post Office opposes them. That is the reason we have such a splendid service. As an indication of the trouble our country is in, owing to the vast amount of contention and rivalry among the carriers.

of the goods, the Great Northern at one station in one day got 985 consignments. These amounted to 4427 packages, the total weight of which was 123 tons, 2 cwt., 2 qrs. The average per package was 62 lbs; the number of trucks used, 72; the number of destinations was 53; the average truck load, 34 cwt. A similar analysis by the London and North Western at one of their stations showed the consignments dispatched were 6201; the number of packages, 23,067; the weight, 806 tons, giving an average weight per consignment of 2 cwt. 3 qrs. 19 lbs., and per package of 88 lbs. The goods were put into 379 wagons, and destined for 720 destinations, and an average of only 2 tons, 7 cwt., 3 qrs., per wagon was attained. If the Railways were worked under one system more than likely both the lots would have gone to load the wagons, and gone to their destination by one train. There were only 929 tons in both lots, and it would likely take half a dozen engines to take them. An American engine can pick up a 4000 ton load and walk off with it.

A large proportion of the train mileage is useless; it is far in excess of the requirements of the public. Locomotives and carriages are employed on many lines in merely dragging their own dead weight, often with not more than would fill an omnibus, and some of them all but empty. The accommodation of the public is the excuse put forward by the managers, but the only test of the public requiring the accommodation is that they make use of the trains provided for them.

There are six Railways running between London and Liverpool, and it is asserted that the London and North Western have as many engines and wagons as would carry all the goods and passengers passing between the two cities. The above Railway has the shortest route and the best facilities for dealing with the traffic.

It has been stated that for the year 1890, on all the Railways north of the Thames in England and Wales, the loss on first and second class services was £325,000, and the Scotch express with the sleeping car carries its first class passengers at less per ton per mile than the rate for coal. To earn £100 from passenger traffic, the three following Railways had to spend :—

| | 1st Class. | 3rd Class. |
|---|---|---|
| London and North Western ..... | £92 | £42 |
| Great Northern ..... | £94 | £53 |
| London and Brighton ..... | £76 | £30 |

On 11th December 1903 an accident occurred about Penrith to the Scotch Express. She ran into some goods wagons that had got off the

line. The engine had seven coaches on and seventeen passengers in the train. Six of the coaches would be seated for 50 passegners each, making 300 seats in the train—17 seats for each passenger. If the passengers had all booked from Edinburgh and Glasgow to London at 33s each, that would give the Company £28. It is stated on high-class Railway authority that running the express trains costs 3s a mile. 400 miles at 3s comes to £60, so that £32 is lost on the trip. This, I submit, is pure folly and senseless waste. The three trunk Railways running from London to Scotland could do with 14 trains less each way—that is 28 trains less per day. If this is so, the saving every 24 hours would be £1680 daily; for 6 days a week it would be £10,080; for the year, £524,160.

Railways have been duplicated and triplicated, as in the case of Liverpool and Manchester, while less promising districts have been entirely neglected. The witnesses for some of the lines said they would earn £100 per week, and the witnesses for the other side said they would not earn £20. So this happy-go-lucky system has had its continuous opportunity. The whole show has been a melancholy exhibition of human greed and stupidity. In 1844, 248, and in 1845, 815 Bills were lodged with the Board of Trade, and the promoters received powers, and the public will have to pay for the lot. Every pound wasted in Parliamentary contests and excessive compensation for land comes ultimately out of the trading public.

Two Railways entering a town mean two sets of officers; double staff and a double plant for collecting and distributing goods. At Liverpool the Midland established a coal station. This added 3d per ton to the cost. This advantage the other four Companies could not allow, so they each erected a coal station and put 3d on the ton also.

Railway contention shows itself in many ways. Liverpool and Manchester have five Railways running between them, and 40 to 50 trains each way. These two cities have also five Railways to London, and between 40 and 50 trains a day each way. Birmingham has three Railways to London, with 30 trains and 36 back each day, except Sunday. Sheffield has three lines, with an average of 40 trains each way. This is surely a bountiful supply. Within one hour nine express trains leave London for Manchester and Liverpool, all restaurant trains but one.

## How the Public Suffers.

Every 24 hours about 24 trains leave London for Scotland; yet the traveller can only have a choice of five times—at 5 A.M., 10 A.M., 2 P.M.,

8 P.M., and midnight. If the Railways were under Government control one could travel from London to Glasgow or Edinburgh every hour for 16 hours ; the travelling public would be much better served, and eight trains per diem would be saved. This waste goes on to an enormous extent all over the country.

### What Contention Means.

The South Stafford pottery people were not content with only the London and North-Western carrying their goods to Liverpool. They got the Great Western to make a line, and in a year's time the rates were raised from 18s 6d to 25s. The manufacturers were astounded, and sent a deputation to Sir R. Moon. He said—"You have yourselves to blame. You wanted two Railways ; you have got them. You will have to pay for them."

### The Waste and Loss through Drumming.

The same contention—it cannot be called competition—goes on by "drumming," and a few examples of this can be given. In the town of Middlesbrough, the centre of the North of England iron trade, there are seven drummers, with seven offices and seven boys in them. The offices and salaries must cost each Company at least £250 per annum. This means £1750 a year is uselessly spent in that one town. In the town of Leicester, up till some years ago, there was one shop for selling railway tickets, that of Thomas Cook & Sons. A new Railway, the Great Central, went through Leicester, and that Railway opened a shop for the sale of tickets, putting it beside Cooks'. Instantly, the Great Northern, the Midland, and the London and North-Western opened shops, and a boy could hop on one foot from any one to any other. These shops are in the heart of the town ; they will cost in rent and taxes £200 to £250, and, reckoning the cost of wages at only £150 each, there is nearly £2000 per annum thrown away in one town. This same waste goes on in every large town in the Kingdom to much the same extent. Belfast has eight shops in the Royal Avenue—the highest rented shops in the town.

At a sale of engineering machinery in Leith on Wednesday, 16th October 1901, the North British Railway had 5 drummers, and the Caledonian Railway, 13—in all, 18 able-bodied men—walking about the same number of gentlemen buying some old second-hand turning lathes and planing machines. Asked why they should have so many men there, the answer was that a drummer was necessary from all the various districts

that buyers were likely to come from, so that they would be known and pounced on by men that knew them. Under the King not a man of the 18 would be wanted.

Take another case. During the summer of 1901 the Corporation of Bournemouth were building baths. For heating purposes a deputation was sent to Manchester to buy a boiler. No sooner was the bargain struck than a London and North-Western drummer was sent off post-haste to Bournemouth to try to get the boiler to carry over their route. But he found the Midland drummer had been there before him, and the Midland man found that the Great Western drummer had been there before him and got the job. It may be taken as nearly correct that it cost each of the Companies £2 for drumming—in all £6, to get a £10 job.

## Wasteful Rivalry.

Our towns are disfigured with the bills and advertising indulged in by the Companies in pushing their cheap trips and excursions. (It may be thought that this at anyrate is where the "healthy competition" of public bodies would score.) Take this case, then, as a sample. About four years ago the Midland Company advertised that they would run a half-day trip from Birmingham to London for 4s. The train was booked to leave New Street Station at 12.5 P.M. The London and North-Western Railway immediately issued another bill, stating that they would run a train at 11.45 and another at 12.15 from the same station, at the same fare. The Great Western Railway also put out a bill that they would run a train at 12.5 P.M. Here were four trains at the same time. Of course, none of them paid, and they had to be abandoned. Some of the Birmingham townsfolk were not satisfied with the bad spirit shown by the Companies, and a committee was appointed to wait on the Railway Companies and see if they could not be induced to run these trains alternately. In that case each of the three Companies would get an equal share of the cheap trip traffic, but they could not agree. These trains are still run occasionally, but the same senseless, stupid contention still goes on.

## Duplication of Stations in Scotland.

Another great waste arises from the duplicating of Railway Stations. In the town of Dundee there are three stations, two of them Caledonian and one North British. The latter station as it is, or slightly enlarged, would serve Dundee, if used by both Companies, much better than the

three do now. The alteration would save two sets of officials, to say nothing of the valuable land on which the stations stand. The little town of Montrose has two stations and two sets of officials, while there is hardly traffic enough for one. At Edinburgh, the Waverley Station, with its 17 platforms, is large enough for the whole traffic of the city, but the Caledonian Railway has its own station, standing partly on the top of the North British Company's rails! Yet both lines are on the same levels a mile outside Princes Street Station. At Airdrie there are two stations only 50 yards apart; Coatbridge, Whifflet, and Hamilton have also duplicate stations. At Elgin there is one platform and a station at each end of it; and the passengers have to come out of the train they come in with, and walk along the platform to the other station, and the train may just have gone out. Keith is in much the same position; so is Peebles, Annan, and Dolphington.

## Duplicate Stations in England.

Look at the dominant partner. In the Euston Road are three of the great London Terminal Stations—Euston, St Pancras, and King's Cross. All three could easily have their paassenger traffic transferred to one, and half the land they stand on could be used for other purposes. Birmingham has at New Street Station twelve platforms, each nearly a quarter of a mile long, and that could easily accommodate the Great Western, as well as the Midland and the L.N.W. Railway. The two stations are only 200 yards apart! At Wolverhampton two stations stand together with only a stone wall between them. At one time there was a doorway in the wall so that passengers could go from one to the other; but one of the Campanies built it up, and now passengers who wish to change trains from one line to the other have to walk a quarter of a mile to do so! At Leamington two stations are separated by a wooden railing only, and either could do all the work that town can give. Dudley has two stations, two stationmasters, two sets of booking officials and porters, and nothing separates the stations except air. It seems a most extraordinary piece of financial folly, but the same thing occurs at Gloucester, Cardiff, Bristol, Manchester, Leeds, Nottingham, and many other towns, too numerous to mention.

As an example of duplication run mad, the following extract from Sir Archibald Geikie's "Scotch Reminiscences" may interest:—

"Railroads have been unquestionably the most powerful agents of social change in Scotland. From the opening of the first line down to the present time, I have watched the yearly multiplication of lines, until the

existing network of them has been constructed. Had it been possible, at the beginning, to anticipate this rapid development, and to foresee the actual requirements of the various districts through which branch lines have been formed, probably the Railway map would have been rather different from what it now is. Some local lines would never have been built, or would have followed different routes from those actually chosen. The competition of the rival Companies has led to a wasteful expenditure of their capital, and to the construction of lines which either do not pay their expenses, or yield only a meagre return for the outlay disbursed upon them.

"A notable instance of the effects of this rivalry was seen in the competition of two great Companies for the construction of a line between Carnwath on the Caledonian system and Leadburn on the North British. The country through which the route was to be taken was sparsely peopled, being partly pastoral, partly agricultural, but without any considerable village. When the contest was in progress, a farmer from the district was asked to state what he knew of traffic between Carnwath and Dolphington, a small hamlet in Lanarkshire. His answer was, 'Oh, there's an auld wife that comes across the hills ance in a fortnicht wi' a basket o' ribbons; that's a' the traffic I ken o'.' The minister of Dolphington being eager to have a Railway through his parish, set himself to ascertain the number of cattle that passed along the road daily in front of his manse. He was said to have counted the same cow many times in the same day. The result of the competition was a compromise. Each Railway Company obtained powers to construct a new line, which was to run to Dolphington and there terminate. And these two lines to this hamlet of a few cottages, and not as many as 300 people, were actually constructed, and have been in operation for many years. Each of them has its terminal station at Dolphington, with stationmasters and porters. But there were not, and so far as I know there are not now, any rails connecting the two lines across the road. This diminutive village thus enjoys the proud pre-eminence of being perhaps the smallest place in the three Kingdoms which has two distinct terminal stations on each side of its road, worked by two independent and rival Companies."

## A Sensible Contrast.

There is one part of our island where duplicating stations do not exist. The North-Eastern Railway has an entire monopoly of the north-east corner of England. It has on its system many great towns, and its

stations are in the centre of each town. Newcastle, North Shields, South Shields, Sunderland, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, York, Scarborough, Leeds, are all examples. The Peases of Darlington were masters of the art of planning Railways. They did so well for the towns they served, that no other Company, do what they would, could ever get a footing in their territory, and they never will now.

## Traders' Risk Rates.

In a report of the long-standing discussion starting on July 18, 1902, and ending on March 15, 1905, between the Midland Chambers of Commerce and the four Railway Companies serving the district, regarding their owners' risk responsibilities. About the beginning of 1902 the Railway circularised the traders that they would not be responsible for goods sent at owners' risk rates unless the senders could prove that the Company's servants were guilty of gross negligence, and asked the traders to sign a document excluding the Companies from all responsibilities for owner's risk goods. The Chambers asked for a solution of the Railways' demand based upon equity between both parties. The Railways persisted in their demands to be relieved of all responsibility, and that they might right wrongs at their own discretion. But the traders can have no power to demand compensation for loss or damage. They would not be responsible for gross carelessness or negligence on the part of their servants. Goods may be lost, detained, or smashed to atoms, and if the trader is not able to prove wilful misconduct on the part of the Railway servants he can get no compensation for his goods (the strong competition compels the traders to send goods at owner's risk rates), and the Company should not in the present or future, any more than in the past, refuse to consider traders' claims on their merits. The Chambers met the managers, and they said if the Chambers would send them particulars of fifty or sixty recent cases of rejected claims they would inquire into and reply to them. This offer was accepted, and the complaints sent. The Railway Company, in their reply, said there does not appear to be any case that does not apply to the signed agreement by the trader. One of the cases was cartridges damaged by rain. They had been left out in the open wagon uncovered, but the Company would not pay anything for compensation. After a good many meetings and a deal of correspondence, the Companies wrote the Chambers, on the 16th January 1905, to send them a considerable number of recent actual cases against each Company, say fifty or sixty. Where it was considered the Company had unfairly or

unreasonably declined claims, they would all be considered. But nothing more came of it, and the result is a gross injustice to the traders.

Take, for instance, the case of the water-damaged cartridges. There is no owner's risk rate for these, but the Railway Companies will not be responsible under any considerations for the goods. The Chamber's contention is that no arrangement can be reasonable which relieves the carrier from all liability for his own or his servants' negligence. This principle has been accepted by the Legislature of the United States by the Harter Act of 1893 :—

"It shall not be lawful for the manager, agent, master, or owner of any vessel transporting merchandise or property from or between ports of the United States and foreign ports to insert in any bill of lading or shipping document any clause, covenant, or agreement whereby it, he, or they shall be relieved from liability for loss or damage arising from negligence, fault, or failure in proper loading, storage, custody, care, or proper delivery of any and all lawful merchandise or property committed to its or their charge. Any and all words or clauses of such import inserted in bills of lading or shipping receipts shall be null and void and of no effect."

This seems to leave no doubt that our traders are not as fairly treated as are their competitors in foreign countries.

In April 1904, Thompson & Shackell, Ltd., Cardiff, ordered a piano to be sent to their shop in Newport from London. It was carefully packed in mats, but it was delivered in such a shattered condition that they had to claim on the Railway Company for £8—to cover the damage. The Company replied that "the piano was not properly packed, and was only accepted by us at owners' risk, and we cannot entertain your claim." The instrument was returned to the makers to put right. They said they had never seen a piano in a worse state. The whole case work had to be remade. Thomson & Shackell, expecting trouble with the Railway Company, reduced their claim to £5—to get the matter settled. Then they were waited upon by the representatives of the various Railway Companies in Cardiff, and told that the Companies had agreed to resist any claims for payment of this class. On August the 18th, the Great Western Railway sent them a letter stating that the Company would not be responsible for pianos sent in mats, unless it could be shown that the Railway Company's servants were guilty of wilful damage to the goods. Here ends the matter, so far as Thompson & Shackell are concerned. But will the country stand aside and let the Railways do what they like with

the traders ? They are falling back upon an old Act of 1854. This Act, like many others, was pushed through without the public knowing or thinking anything about it. Wilful misconduct must be proved against the Companies' servants, a thing that is simply impossible to be done by any tradesman, as he cannot go and watch the goods in transit. It is ridiculous.

In the House of Commons on 6th June 1905, Sir A. Rollit (Islington) said he wanted to press upon the Government the necessity of appointing a Minister of Commerce and Industry. What was the Board of Trade ? The President was generally a Cabinet Minister, but there was really no Board of Trade. It had not met for half a century, and at the last meeting the Archbishop of Canterbury was the Board. The Board was an anachronism, for the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons was a member of it. Their appointed Committee had reported that the Board never met, and that its jurisdiction extended over shipping, Railways, labour disputes, etc. The time had come when this question of the Board of Trade should be seriously considered by the House.

Sir E. Strachey (Somerset) said he hoped the new Department would give due attention to preferences given by Railway Companies to one district over another, and to large over small traders, and to the anomaly of the Great Western charging 2s 7d for corn and 3s 4d for cake. Also the treatment of the owner's risk milk rates by the L. and N.-W. Railway at their Buckinghamshire station that had given rise to much complaint. He moved the reduction of the vote by £100.

Mr Dalziel (Kirkcaldy) asked if nothing could be done to stop overcrowding on the underground Railways. It was dangerous to have fifteen or twenty persons packed into a compartment of a Railway carriage.

Mr Harwood (Bolton) drew attention to the South African shipping trade. He said there was not merely a ring of shippers which charged exorbitant rates, and allowed large rebates, but if a house sent a single package by another Line, even at a time when no vessel of the ring was available, the House lost its claim to all the rebates, which are held over the heads of the traders as the sword of Damocles. He asked the Government to step in and help the traders to break down a stifling and injurious monopoly.

Mr Bonar Law (Glasgow) said the question of preferential rates to South Africa was one which the Government was anxious to deal with. But where could they begin ? and the powers of the Board of Trade were too limited to deal with the overcrowding on Railways.

Mr Warner (Lichfield) said the differential rates were seriously felt by the farmers of the country, and it was no answer to say the Board of Trade had no powers. They could investigate and endeavour to do something, instead of remaining inactive till they were stirred up from outside.

Mr Sinclair (Romford), complained that we had fallen behind the times, but we clung to the system of blundering and difficulty that accounted for the commercial distress we were in. The methods adopted for the procedure of Parliamentary powers for Railways were the most expensive in the world, and the lawyers' expenses greatly added to the Railway rates.

Mr Pirie (Aberdeen) said the risk of damage to goods in transit should fall on the carrying Companies, and not on the traders, and the Board of Trade should see to it.

Mr Hay (Shoreditch) said the owner's risk was a great hardship, and one which was shared by a great section of the community.

Mr Bonar Law said it was impossible to deal with the grievances of owner's risk without fresh legislation, and, with regard to the South African shipping rates, perhaps the Government would do something some day, but he could not explain its intentions beforehand.

The Committee divided. For the reduction, 128 ; against, 195. So the Railways and the shipping ring are quite safe.

## Railway Classification.

In the hands of the Companies and the Clearing-House the classification grew rapidly. In 1852 their enumerated articles were 748. In 1860 the number had risen to 816. In 1870 it was 1621 ; in 1880, 2373 ; and in 1886, 2753. Of these 2753 distinct items, 103 were outside the ordinary classes, the remaining 2650 were thus divided.

| | |
|---|---|
| Minerals, A. and B. | 80 |
| Special | 446 |
| Class 1 | 453 |
| ,, 2 | 500 |
| ,, 3 | 672 |
| ,, 4 | 319 |
| ,, 5 | 180 |
| Total | 2753 |

Mr Albert Spicer, London Chamber of Commerce, advocating the re-

arrangement of our goods classifications, said we had eight goods classifications, the Germans have only three. From our point of view we are at a great disadvantage. Other countries have normal mileage rates (we have nothing but maximum rates). Continental countries have a numerous amount of exceptional rates, so that they can deal with export and import goods just as they like, and they do it, to our cost.

The French Railways at their start had no fixed classification. One Railway had three goods classifications, and another had 28, and others in between. Then the Government stepped in and forced a uniform system, with six classifications.

Sir Bernard Samuelson writes—"Except iron, stone, coal, and coke, and a few other articles, the rates are so much lower in the North of Europe, which compete with us for the trade of the world, as to place our traders at a serious disadvantage." Mr Jeans says that the average ton mile rates in Belgium, Germany, and Holland are much under our own, at least 21 per cent. on an average.

Professor Hunter states that our contentious system has led to practices that are against the interests of the shareholders and the traders alike. It has given rise to an army of touts or agents whose services are of no value to the trading community, and it has led to a costly and unprofitable mode of conveying traffic, and that there was too great a transit cost between the classifications, and there was still greater difficulty in getting the Companies to put new goods into their proper classifications, or discuss these matters on level terms with the traders. They would receive complaints, in their majesty, and, at the same time, send a polite refusal. He thought the time had come when the traders should ask for something more definite. Their classifications contained over 3000 items, such as clothes pegs, and children's marbles. Wooden trunks were put in Class 4, tin or sheet iron trunks in Class 3. These, much easier damaged than the wooden ones, were carried 25 per cent. cheaper. If lamps were called lanterns, they went in Class 3 rate ; if called lamps, they were charged Class 4 rate. Hair for manufacturing purposes went in Class 2, and the same hair, for upholstering, was charged Class 3 rate. Woodwork for organs went Class 3, and woodwork for pianos was charged Class 4. He said a thorough revision of the classifications was needed from top to bottom.

Mr G. H. Wright, Birmingham, in the Associated Chambers of Commerce, London, 1905, said that the United States sent into Canada, through the Post Office, American newspapers and magazines in bulk at one half cent per pound, while from Britain the same thing cost eight cents, or sixteen

times more. Will the £52 per ton our Post Office pays the Shipping Companies have anything to do with this ?

He also gave the following rates :—

FOREIGN HARDWARE GOODS—

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| From London to Northampton, | 73 | miles, | rate | 25s 7d., | or 4.2d. | per ton | per mile. |
| Home—Birmingham to , | 49 | ,, | ,, | 22s 10d., | or 5.1d | ,, | ,, |
| Foreign—Hull to York ..... | 45 | ,, | ,, | 15s 5d , | or 4 1d | ,, | ,, |
| Home—Sheffield to ,, ..... | 48 | ,, | ,, | 20s. 10d , | or 5.2d | ,, | ,, |

CUTLERY—

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Foreign—Hull to York ..... | 45 | ,, | ,, | 15s 5d , | or 4.1d | ,, | ,, |
| Home—Sheffield to ,, ..... | 48 | ,, | ,, | 20s 10d , | or 5.2d. | ,, | ,, |
| Foreign—Hull to Leeds..... | 51 | ,, | ,, | 16s 8d , | or 3.9d | ,, | ,, |
| Home—Sheffield to ,, ..... | 43 | ,, | ,, | 18s. 0d., | or 5.0d | ,, | ,, |

PLATED GOODS—

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Foreign — From London to Northampton ..... | 73 | ,, | ,, | 28s 3d , | or 4.6d. | , | ,, |
| Home - From Birmingham to Northampton ..... | 49 | , | ,, | 24s. 9d., | or 6.0d | ,, | ,, |
| Foreign—From Hull to York... | 45 | ,, | ,, | 18s 9d , | or 5.0d | ,, | ,, |
| Home—From Sheffield to Leeds | 43 | ,, | ,, | 21s 4d , | or 5.9d | ,, | ,, |
| Foreign—From Hull to ,, | 51 | ,, | ,, | 20s 0d., | or 4.7d. | ,, | ,, |
| Home—From Sheffield to York, | 48 | ,, | ,, | 24s. 7d., | or 6.1d. | ,, | , |
| Foreign—From Hull to Sheffield | 59 | ,, | ,, | 22s. 11d., | or 4.6d. | ,, | ,, |
| Home—From Leeds to York... | 30 | ,, | ,, | 17s 6d , | or 7.7d | ,, | ,, |

## Wages and Risks.

Mr Richard Bell, M.P., writing to the "Free Trader" on railwaymen's wages, states that there are 260,000 men on our Railways receiving from 15s to 20s ; 140,000 getting from 21s to 25s ; 95,000, 26s to 30s per week. Inspectors and stationmasters (14,874) average 32s ; 25,556 engine-drivers average 38s. No confirmation is needed, of course, of the above official figures.

One remarkable feature in our Railways is the great responsibility incurred and poor wages that are paid to the signalmen. One slight mistake, in a moment of forgetfulness, may hurl a trainful of people to destruction. Their responsibility is enormous, and their wages could not well be smaller. Starting at 17s a week, the highest they can attain to is 33s, and not many of them get that length. In the higher class their work is very severe. The farther the signal is away, the heavier the pull. I have repeatedly seen the sweat running down their faces when they were at work. They need both a steady arm and a steady head, and they

deserve better wages. Before the Labour Commission, Sir R. Giffen gave the average wage for men in thirty-eight different occupations as :—Builders, £64 ; Railways, £59. It is well known that Railway porters are poorly paid, and have to depend greatly on the tips they get. It is said that one Railway, at some of its stations, pays no wages at all to its porters. They have to depend on tips for their living.

One of our leading London dailies publishes the following letters from Railwaymen :—

"A. B., a lad, and porter seven years ; signalman, seven years, and without one single black mark on his record ; appointed stationmaster at 25s per week. Out of that he has to pay 1s 3d weekly club money, and 10d to 'Hearts of Oak,' and 2s 6d yearly to Guarantee Fund, and £12 a year for house rent. On what is left he has to keep himself respectable, in the interest of the Company. After a year's working he asked for an advance, but the reply came that they could not see their way to grant it. His case is not the worst. There are stationmasters on the G.W.R. paid only 24s per week."

Another writes :—"Hundreds of men employed at the Brighton Railway Works get from 18s to 22s per week."

A rail motorman writes :—"We have to pass the same examinations as a passenger guard, deal with H.M. mailbags, luggage, and parcels ; issue tickets and collect them. At the halts *en route*, where nobody is stationed, we have to see to everything. These motors have taken the place of trams ; and all for 20s per week. Out of that I have to pay 1s 4d club money, and the remainder to pay rent and keep a wife and family."

"A grand concert will take place at the above hall on Thursday, 26th April 1906, for the benefit of Mr ——, who for the past 30 years has worked at the Iron Works, but has not been able to follow his employment for 20 months, as he has had the sad misfortune to lose his sight. Doors open at 7.30 ; concert at 8. Ticket, 1s." Had this man been a soldier, policeman, or a postman he would have received a pension.

"Central Telegraph Office.—Mr H. E. B., telegraphist, aged 49 ; length of service, 33 years ; salary, £99 2s 9d ; retiring pension, £54 9s 9d."

"Romford.—Miss B., sorting clerk, aged 35 ; length of service, 17 years ; salary, £73 0s 8d ; retiring pension, £20 13s 8d."

"Liverpool.—Mr W. B., postman, aged 60 ; length of service, 29 years ; salary, £102 12s 3d ; retiring pension, £49 11s 6d."

The friends of a lately deceased Railway guard issued the following circular :—"This list is opened on behalf of Mrs King, 10 Richard's Cot-

tages, Acton, whose husband died suddenly, 15th February 1906, leaving her with five children, the youngest two months' old. This subscription is to try and keep a most respectable family out of the workhouse."

King's wages were 25s per week ; he was in the service of the L. & N.W. Railway.

A porter in the Goods Department of the L. & S.-W. Railway gets 20s per week. The maximum wage is 17s per week, but he gets 1s per week for being second man in the goods shed, and 1s for being assistant shunter, and another 1s for being relief signalman, making 20s. He has 6s to pay for rent, leaving 14s to pay club money and keep his family on.

A signalman that has served the G. W. Railway for 29 years, and has been 25 years in the same box, gets 23s per week, and has to pay 1s 3d per week for club money.

And one brother writes as follows to another :—"My dear Walter,— . . . I have been patiently waiting for some news regarding my removal, but up to now I have not heard anything. I got a certificate from the doctor respecting the nature of Annie's illness, and a recommendation for a removal from this part of the country, and sent it in, but you can guess what the reply was—'having attention'—and I repated it again, and the reply was, I should have a better job when one fell out. Dear Walter, I feel almost done up. I have tried my utmost to do my duty and get promoted, so that I could get a living wage, but everything seems to go to the wind. I have now been in the service 13½ years, and get the normal sum of 18s per week. We have got on all right up to this last eighteen months. Now we are done any time. My chief aim has been to get Annie round to good health I have worked hard for her, and have gone to work when I should have been in bed. Each week my children get larger, and want more food to eat and more clothes to wear, but my income does not get any larger, and I am now unable to pay my way. Having got behind with my baker, I am unable to pull it up. I should have managed to have wriggled along if it had not been for Annie's illness and my having to have so many teeth out. I am sorry to say Annie don't get any better ; she can scarcely whisper some mornings when she gets up, and I am unable to pay anyone to come and wash for us now. . . . Dear Walter, if you cannot do anything don't ask any of our brothers or sisters for anything, as I am sure they have nothing to spare. I have not told them anything. I live in hopes that I shall get a job, that I shall be able to pay my way, and live a bit more comfortable. Nothing do I hate worse than owing money. I hope to hear from you soon. It is now 11 P.M. ; just going

off duty. Annie don't know anything about this letter. So good-bye, with best love and wishes.—From your loving brother, John."

On 7th January 1905, this advertisement was in the "Dundee Advertiser :—"Clerk (Railway experienced, Goods and Passengers) for Bonnybridge Central Station ; £35 to £45.—Apply, Stationmaster." This is 13s 5¾d per week, or 1s 11d per day, for an experienced clerk. The station is a joint one, belonging to the two leading Railway Companies in Scotland.

In Blue Book, No. 1999, Francis J. S. Hopwood, on 16th March 1904, says :—For the year ending 31st December 1903, the total number of accidents on our Railways was, killed, 1242 ; injured, 18,557. Of these the Campanies' servants number in killed, 455 ; injured, 3849. Of these, in connection with shunting, there appears to be killed 126, and injured, 2214. It is to be remembered that over one-fourth of the killed took place in the shunting yards, and two out of three of the injured from the same work. Automatic couplings would save at least half of them.

## What the Men Pay for their Wages.

In Blue Book, 347, Railway servants' hours of labour, 11th August 1904 :—The Board of Trade reports to the House of Commons that during the year ending 27th July 1904, they had dealt with 35 complaints of the men being worked longer than 12 hours at a spell. The report gives 17 complaints from England, 8 from Scotland, 5 from Ireland, and 3 from Wales. The greatest offender against the Act of Parliament is the North British, with 6 complaints. The Great Central, 4 ; the Irish Midland Great Western, 3 ; and the Welsh Rhondda and Swansea, 2. They all promise to do letter, but they know that the Board of Trade can do nothing to them. It seems on the face of the matter that the four Railways that pay next to no dividend are the biggest sinners in this respect. The stock of these Railways is all below par, and the workmen cannot expect better luck.

But here is a proof, if it is wanted, from the "Railway Review." A gatekeeper on the Midland and Great Northern Railway near Great Yarmouth. His wages, 15s per week.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goes on duty | August | 3rd, 6.30 | A.M., | off duty | 11.30 | P.M. |
| ,, | ,, | 4th, 7.0 | ,, | ,, | 9 40 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | 5th, 6.15 | ,, | ,, | 11.30 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | 6th, 7.0 | ,, | ,, | 9.15 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | 7th, 7.0 | ,, | ,, | 9.15 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | 8th, 6.15 | ,, | ,, | 11.15 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | 9th, 5.30 | ,, | ,, | 9.15 | ,, |

This is 110½ hours out of a possible 168. This man worked here for 1½d per hour.

Mr Channing, on the 23rd January 1891, in the House of Commons, said that the hours the men had to work on the Railways amounted to a grave scandal, and was a constant source of danger to the men and to the travelling public.

The late Sir B. Richardson, from a physician's point of view, said that engine-drivers, guards, and other such like, should not work more than 8 hours if the men were to be kept in good condition. Yet, of 27,000 drivers and firemen on fifteen chief lines, 80 per cent. were in 1890 kept at work for over 12 hours, and 14 per cent. for more than 18 hours at a stretch. Goods guards were as bad.

Sir George Findlay told the Labour Commission that porters at Euston were paid 18s a week, but he did not say how they lived on it. Sir George defended the wage system, and said that in three years salaries had increased £200,000, and if this was to go on the public would have to pay for it in increased rates and fares. But Sir George did not seem to see any distinction between wages and salaries. The great complaint is the poor wages and the domineering system that is put in force on some of our Railways, even to the straining of the law. As in December 1896, at Crewe, on the London and North-Western, a number of the skilled employees, through their Union, petitioned the Directors for a reduction of their hours from 68 to 60 a week. The Union officials were unable to make any impression on the Company, who on their side got up an inquisition, and sacked a number of the men for daring to ask 60 hours a week, and the Board of Trade had to step in to get the men reinstated, so as to stop a great strike, which might have ruined half the country. Another disastrous result of the same policy was the North British strike of 1891, which lasted six weeks, and threw nearly 100,000 persons out of work, and no end of suffering was entailed.

From the same cause, viz. (the hours of labour), the Caledonian had a serious strike in 1883. The men were working from 12 to 18 hours, and even to 30 hours at a stretch. For years efforts had been made to secure better conditions. Great trouble and loss was caused that would not have happened if the Railways were conducted as the Post Office is. A great proportion of the above trouble seemed to arise from the contention that goes on to take each other's work that lies most convenient, causing an excessive amount of goods to pass over one Company's lines to the detriment of the Railway that loses it.

The Board of Trade ordered a return of the hours worked by Railway servants during October 1903, and the result was published 11 months after. According to the return, 64,624 men worked 13 hours, 22,045 worked 14, 7976 worked 15, 2670 worked 16, 1070 worked 17, and 1120 worked 18 hours. That is almost 100,000 cases in one month. The first returns of this kind were ordered for December 1901. The answer was 216,219 cases! The next returns were ordered for December 1902, but the Board of Trade gave the Railways two months' notice. The answer this time was 75,389 cases! This surely proves that the Companies could do better if they would only try.

According to a statement which appeared a short time ago in a financial journal, "There are nearly 150,000 railwaymen who receive £1 per week or under. The average wage paid by the Railway Companies, according to particulars supplied by themselves, is only £1 2s 8d. . . . The general average weekly wage paid is nearly double that amount—namely, £2 5s."

A man named Hollings joined the North-Western Railway (Birmingham district) in 1857, being then about 18 years of age, as a platelayer at 16s per week. On this wage he maintained a wife and reared a family. In March 1903, he was injured by an engine while loading a ballast train. He was off duty till May (two months). Then he returned and worked on till October, when he got notice to quit, owing to old age. He was discharged on 31st December 1904, being then 65 years of age, and having served the Company 46½ years. Acting on advice, Hollings asked the L. & N.-W. to try and find him some light employment, and other influences were also set to work to get the Company to make some provision for him. He was informed by a letter from the General Manager, "I notice with regret that you did not make provision for your old age through the Company's pension fund." At the time the pension fund was started Hollings was five years over the maximum age for joining the pension fund, and he would have had to pay double collections for five years, and his wages being only 16s per week, he could not do it. So he had to go as thousands like him have had to do, and thousands more will go the same way after him. Then there comes a bright cloud with silver lining on it. He was a member of the A.S.R.S. They paid him so much a week as an out of work, and ultimately got him a job under the Corporation of Smethwick. He started work on a Monday morning, and died two hours after.

## The Immorality and Mis-Declarations.

In the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, 20th October 1904, the Railway Rates Committee reported that they had interviewed the managers of the three local Railway Companies, and had pointed out the injury inflicted on honest traders by the widespread existence of mis-declaring freight by unscrupulous traders, more especially by importers of foreign made goods, which gave them an advantage of 25 to 40 per cent. over the honest trader. The District Manager of the L. & N.-W. Railway, in reply, said they were determined to do all in their power to have goods honestly declared. He said they had to do with (1) the man who thinks his rate is too high, and therefore declares his goods in a lower class, which he thinks is reasonable ; (2) the man who innocently mis-declares his goods, not knowing that the action is illegal ; (3) the man who wilfully mis-declares in order to undercut his competitor. In (1) the Companies occasionally met the trader by amending the classification. (2) Were usually stopped by notifying the trader of the illegality of his action, but under (3) the Companies would undoubtedly prosecute. Since the meeting of the Committee a successful prosecution of a firm of foreign importers at London for mis-declaration of freight has taken place by the Midland Railway. It was stated during the trial that this firm has mis-declared goods in no less than 200 out of 290 cases in the last three months. Mr W. H. Edmunds, in moving the adoption of the report, said when he raised the question of mis-declaration at Euston in January, he had no idea that his remark would have produced such remarkable results. The matter had proved far more serious than was ever anticipated. During one month at Grimsby, out of the number of imported packages examined, 80 per cent. were mis-declared, and he was informed that this was not exceptional.

But a similar state of things existed at other parts. He was pleased to think that the Railway Companies would not wink at the scandal any more. (Mr Edmunds has strong and abounding faith Happy man!) He said another important matter was that of classification. The present arrangements were unfair, absurd, and exasperating. What was wanted was condensation and simplification. Great improvements in these respects could and should be made. Any one that had studied the rate book must come to the conclusion that it had been compiled with no regard to the convenience of the trading public. It must not be forgotten, however, that the gentlemen who were responsible for it had little or no practical knowledge of what they were doing, and when we realised and also remembered the atmosphere of red tape in which Railway officials were born and bred,

one began to understand how such a collection of anomalies had been compiled. The whole question should be relegated to the Midland Chambers of Commerce.

The Chairman seconded the resolution. He urged the Railway classification was unwieldy, and needed severe condensation. Mr W. Schurhaff said the Railways were far too rigorous. Their proceedings were suicidal to themselves, and detrimental to British trade. He considered it was an illegal act to open cases which were sent for shipment abroad. The Railway servants could not properly re-pack the goods, and he wanted to know who was to be recompensed for breakages and shortages. If the Companies doubted the declaration, they should send an inspector to the packing rooms, as the Government does to the breweries and distilleries. He moved an amendment, that the Committee take no further steps in the matter. Mr Sambidge supported the Committee. They had made a very proper stand. Mr Schurhaff, however, had raised an objection of great importance. There must be limitations or intimations with regard to opening cases sent by exporters. The Railways must depart from their old methods of classification. A fresh, simple classification was required. Few traders understood the present system. Mr Peterson said it would not be advisable to stultify what the Committee had done. Mr Mitchell supported, and insisted that British traders had a genuine grievance. Mr Edmunds, in reply, stated that mis-declarations were not applicable only to foreign traders. For instance, when he had hardware to rail he described it as hardware. Three Scotch traders ordered hardware to be railed as nails. "I refused, and I lost two accounts. I told Sir Frederick Harrison that if the Company did not protect the honest trader, I should proceed to send hardware as nails, and take the prosecution." Mr Schurhaff withdrew his amendment, and the resolution was unanimously adopted.

# THE AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION (1905).

Chairman—The Earl of Jersey. The Right Hon. W. S. Kenyon Slaney, M.P. ; Sir James L. Mackay, Sir Herbert Jerkyll, Mr E. G. Haygarth Brown, Sir Charles L. Owens, Mr Albred Baldwin, M.P. ; Mr George Lambert, M.P. ; Mr E. C. Stoneham, Secretary.

Mr A. W. Munro called.

The Chairman—I think you represent the Board of Agriculture ?

*A.*—Yes, I do.

*Q.*—You have been instructed to give evidence before this Commission regarding the rates and freights from Boulogne and over the South-Eastern and Chatham Railways ?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—I believe you have investigated the rate books at certain stations ?

*A.*—Yes. I have examined the rate books at Folkestone, Canterbury, Ashford, Settingbourne, Paddock, Wash, and Headcarn.

Witness then handed in the following tabular statement, setting forth the result of his inquiries:—

| | Distance Miles. | Through Rate. | Sea Freight. | Proportion of Rates for Land Carriage. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 40/ | 18/ | 26/8 |
| *Cherries conveyed by Passenger Train—* | | | | |
| Folkestone to London ... ..... | 68¾ | 36/8 | ... | ... |
| Canterbury to London ..... | 66¼ | 35/10 | ... | ... |
| Ashford to London ..... | 54 | 33/ | ... | ... |
| *Eggs by Goods Train –* | | | | |
| Boulogne to London .. ..... | ... | 20/3½ | 6/9 | 13 6½ |
| Folkestone to London ..... | ... | 25/8 | ... | ... |
| Canterbury to London ..... ..... | ... | 25/ | ... | ... |
| Ashford to London ..... | ... | 21/3 | ... | ... |
| Boulogne to Manchester ..... | ... | 45/ | 15/ | 30/ |
| Folkestone to Manchester..... | 263 | 60/ | ... | ... |
| Canterbury to Manchester ..... | 256 | 59/1 | ... | ... |
| *Potatoes by Goods Train—* | | | | |
| Boulogne to London..... | ... | 10/ | 3/4 | 6/8 |
| Wye to London ..... | 60 | 7/ | ... | ... |
| Ashford to London ..... .. | 54 | 8/7 | ... | ... |
| *Dead Poultry by Goods Train —* | | | | |
| Boulogne to London ..... | ... | 30/ | 10/ | 20/ |
| Folkestone to London ..... | ... | 25/8 | ... | ... |
| Ashford to London ..... ..... | ... | 21/10 | ... | ... |
| *Dead Poultry by Passenger Train—* | | | | |
| Boulogne to London ..... | ... | 60/ | 20/ | 40/ |
| Folkestone to London ..... | .. | 55/ | ... | ... |
| Ashford to London ..... | ... | 49/2 | ... | ... |

Continuing, witness said—The rate book at Folkestone Harbour contains the following notice:—The Company are prepared to give special reduced rates between Boulogne and London to any firm who can guarantee, say, 1200 tons per annum." There is no offer of any reduction like this to the home trader. In view of this notice the through rates may be much less than the rates shown in the rate book at Folkestone Harbour. This book also contains this (note)—"One-third of each rate Boulogne to London is for conveyance by sea, and two-thirds for conveyance by land." The majority of the home rates do not include cartage at either end, and they are nearly all from S. to S. There are three rate books at Folkestone, namely, Paris and Boulogne Quay to Folkestone Quay. Then there is the public rate book. This book is not kept posted up to date, and these mentioned in the above figures had to be gathered from the three foreign rate books. It is an extremely difficult matter finding accurately what and where the various rates are, owing to the dirty and torn conditions of the books. Portions of the leaves are missing, sheets containing alterations and additions are inserted in the wrong place. If the Company's servants had not given every facility and assistance, I should have found it an extremely difficult matter to obtain the required information. The difficulty of getting correct rates is illustrated by my inquiries for potato rates. In one instance my colleague, by inquiry and inspection of the rate books, ascertained that the rates for old potatoes in sacks from one station in London were, for two ton lots, S. to S., 9s 11d, C.R. (Company's risk), and in smaller quantities, 12s 5d. In one ton lots delivered in London markets, only 7s 4d per ton. I afterwards checked and confirmed his results. At another station in the neighbourhood I found that the rates for the same goods to London, two ton lots, S. to S., were 8s 10d per ton, C.R., and in lesser quantities, 10s, and in one ton lots delivered in London markets, only 7s 10d. Then I was informed by the Company's officials at 6 Holborn Viaduct that there were rates in operation for old potatoes in sacks from these stations to London, S. to S., only 5s 4d per ton, and for less than a ton, 6s 8d. The cause why my colleague and myself missed this lowest S. to S. rate was because they were in a loose sheet, which was not probably in the rate book examined by us. In another case the goods clerk in charge said that there were no other rates in force than those he had furnished us with, and even when I told him I knew for a fact there was a lower rate, he said it was quite a mistake on my part, for he knew of no other lower rates than he had given us. On again examining the book, I found the low rate given me at 6 Holborn

Viaduct was in the book, but out of place, and on owner's risk rate, not a Company's risk rate, as stated by the Holborn Viaduct officials.

*Q.*—It seems to have been difficult to find out what the rates were?

*A.*—Very.

*Q.*—Do you think any ordinary trader would be able to find out his rates?

*A.*—I would say it would be quite impossible.

*Q.*—Has the Board of Agriculture received any complaint from any individual regarding these rates?

*A.*—Not that I am aware of.

*Q.*—You point out on your schedule that the rate of 26s 8d for the carriage by rail of foreign cherries from Folkestone to London has to compare with 36s 8d for home cherries from Folkestone to London.

*A.*—That is so.

*Q.*—Then Canterbury to London; that rate is 35s 10d?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—You hold these figures show a distinct preference to the foreign fruit over the home fruit of 10s?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Then take Ashford to London, 54 miles, and the rate, 33s 4d; this would be still higher in proportion than the rate from Folkestone to London?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Then, eggs by goods train from Boulogne to London are 30s 5½d; this ought to leave for land carriage 20s 3½d?

*A.*—That is so.

*Q.*—Then, the carriage of eggs from Folkestone to London (home eggs) is 21s 4d; that is only a slight difference against the home eggs?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Then, from Canterbury to London the rate is 20s 10d; that is only 6½d more than the through rate?

*A.*—That is so.

*Q.*—Would you kindly point out to us some other cases?

*A.*—From Boulogne to Manchester the through rate for eggs is 63s 4d by goods train, the sea freight is 20s, and the land charge 42s, whereas from Folkestone it is 60s per ton.

*Q.*—There is a distinct difference there?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—We will take now the *potatoes* part of your schedule. I see the

through rate, Boulogne to London, is 16s 11d; the sea freight is 8s 4d, so that the balance for land charge is 8s 7d, whereas the rate from Ashford 54 miles, is 10s?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—These rates are for two tons or upwards?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—As there is a distinct statement that the rates could not be obtained at certain stations, the name ought to be mentioned, though it may have some effect on individual officials?

*A.*—I did not give the names for that reason. Sittingbourne and Headcarn are the stations.

*Q.*—Has it been suggested to you that fruit, sent at owners' risk from the Continent into England, if damaged, is paid for, while the same class of home fruit damaged in transit in this country is not paid for?

*A.*—I do not know of a specific instance, but I know there is a strong feeling in that direction.

*Q.*—Have you had a great deal to do with finding out rates for agricultural produce?

*A.*—For the last two years I have made numerous inquiries.

*Q.*—Have you found any general complaint that farmers and traders cannot ascertain what are the lowest rates from S. to S.?

*A.*—They have never expressed it personally to me; but I have had great difficulty, and I should say that, unless a man had a certain amount of experience in rate details or had been employed in a Railway Company's office, it would be extremely difficult to understand the rates.

*Q.*—Do you think there is a disposition on the part of the Railway Companies to befog the public in regard to the rates they are charging to the traders?

*A.*—I could not say that that is their intention.

*Q.*—Do you think it would be fair to say that if rates were equalised with the foreign rates the egg industry might be considerably increased in some parts of England?

*A.*—I should say so. It would then meet foreign competition on level ground.

*Q.*—Referring to rate books, is it not the case that each station has one rate book, showing all the rates for the general trading of that district?

*A.*—No; Folkestone has three books.

*Q.*—But Folkestone is a port. Can you give us an ordinary station?

*A.*—Sittingbourne; it has three books. One applies to the South

Eastern and Chatham system; the others to local stations on the South Eastern, and the third to the stations on the Chatham system.

*Q.*—You point out that there are exceptional rates. What do you mean by that?

*A.*—That they are rates lower than the class rates, or they may be higher, and, as a rule, are not entered in the rate books.

*Q.*—Have you come across any instances where the wrong rate has been charged and paid?

*A.*—That is a frequent complaint. Yes; I may safely say that I have.

*Q.*—If a trader went and asked a rate for his goods he would be told the proper rate, no doubt?

*A.*—He might. I was not always told the proper rate.

SECOND DAY, 15TH FEBRUARY, 1905.

Mr JOSHUA CORNELIUS, called and examined by the Chairman.

*Q.*—You are an Inspector of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—I understand that your Board have instructed you to give evidence here of the result of your inquiries regarding preference railway rates?

*A.*—In June last, I inquired as to the rates for carriage from Harwich to London of imported dead poultry and fresh meat, and also from some of the principal stations of the Great Eastern Railway. Taking dead poultry sent from Italy *via* Antwerp to Harwich, thence to London, through rates are quoted from a large number of Italian towns, in ten ton lots, those under ten tons to be charged as ten tons. The distance from Antwerp to Harwich is 140 miles, and freight through to London is 208 miles. The rates on the Antwerp-London route are worked out on a mileage basis, one mile on land being equal to four miles on sea. The sea and land rate, Antwerp to London, for dead poultry is 26s per ton. The land rate worked out on the above basis is 17s 2d, and the sea rate 8s 10d. Then, senders of 6000 tons per annum get a much lower rate, which works out at 11s 5d per ton for land carriage. The sea portion of this rate will be 5s 10d, making the total through rate 17s 3d. Then fresh meat is carried from Esbrjerg through to London, packed in bales, for 28s 6d per ton. The railway portion of the rate is 13s 6d, and any quantity is taken at Company's risk.

*Q.*—Now, will you give us the local rates for the same class of goods?

*A.*—Dead poultry and fresh meat are grouped together in the local rate. From Harwich to London (70 miles), under one ton, 27s 6d; under

two tons, 25s; above two tons, 21s 8d; Colchester (53½ miles), 25s, 22s 6d, 19s 2d; Witham (38¼ miles), 21s 8d, 20s, 16s 8d. These rates are at Company's risk. At some of the stations there is only one rate, the highest, so that if more than one ton were sent the highest rate would have to be paid. The methods of packing both the home and foreign meat is practically the same. For dead poultry from Italy, 13s 6d per ton is the portion for the land carriage on this side for two tons or over; home, from Harwich to London is 3s 2d more than the proportion of the through rate, and the proportion for under two tons is 6s 6d more, and under one ton is 9s more.

*Q.*—Can you give any information as to the weight of meat and poultry sent from the home stations to London?

*A.*—I could get no definite information from the Railway Company with regard to quantities.

*Q.*—I suppose you are aware that railway clerks are told, in order to protect traders getting improper information as to the business done by their competitors, that they are not to divulge information any more than a bank clerk is permitted to divulge information as regards the accounts at a bank? That is a standing instruction?

*A.*—I was not aware of that.

*Q.*—Seeing the difficulty there is for the ordinary man like myself understanding the rate books, could you suggest anything that would make it more simple and easy to understand the rate he had to pay for the service he wanted?

*A.*—I would suggest that at local stations where articles of commerce are confined to half or a dozen articles of general supply and demand, the Company should publish a list of these articles, with the rates for their carriage, to the various centres of consumption, and place it in a prominent part of the station. The traders only know at present what they are told. From these prominent rates they could find out for themselves, and they would think they were treated all alike.

THIRD DAY, 1st MARCH, 1905.

Mr JOHN HUTTON, M.P., called and examined.

Chairman—You are a Member of Parliament for a Yorkshire Division and Chairman of a County Council?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—You appear here for the Northallerton Farmers' Club?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Will you state what you think is unfair with the North Eastern Company's rates and charges?

*A.*—For instance, Newcastle to Leeds is 99 miles, and the rate for grain in 5 ton lots is 7s 6d; from Hartlepool, 6s 3d for 72 miles; from Middlesborough, 64 miles, and Stockton, 60 miles, the charge is 6s 3d; Hull, 51 miles, 6s 3d per ton. Then, from Durham to Leeds, 81 miles, for 5 ton lots of grain, the charge is 7s 6d; for 2 ton lots, 12s 6d; and from Newcastle for the same weight, 10s. We find that the Company will make a reduction from Hartlepool to Leeds for 100 ton lots only, or ship loads of possibly 9d or 10d per ton off the 5 ton quotations, but he would not give it in writing or say it officially. Others said they would have to communicate with the General Manager, who would no doubt make a reduction. I have communicated with the General Manager asking for the 100 ton special rate, and in answer he writes—"We have no exceptional rates from Hartlepool, Middlesborough, or Hull for 100 ton lots." So his officials must have been wrong. At Northallerton Station, 45 miles to Leeds, it will cost the farmer £7 16s 3d to send 25 tons of barley, and 25 tons of foreign barley from Hartlepool will go for the same money. This gives the foreign grain an advantage of £1 0s 10d over the home. I will now give you what I think is a very gross case. Yarm, 56 miles from Leeds, would have to pay £8 6s 6d for sending 125 quarters of barley, while from Middlesborough or Hartlepool, 16 miles further off, the price would be £7 16s 3d, 10s 3d less than from Yarm.

*Q.*—I suppose you must admit that a Railway Company has just as much right as any other commercial enterprise to charge lower for wholesale lots than for retail transactions?

*A.*—They are not in the ordinary sense a mercantile community. They have certain privileges granted them by Parliament on certain conditions. One of the conditions is that they are not to give one man or community of men favouring terms against another man or community of men. I think that, as traders, whether it costs the Companies more or less, we are entitled to equal consideration.

*Q.*—Then I take it that you do not consider the exigencies of competition should be admitted at all as an excuse for giving a lower rate from a port to an inland centre than from a wayside station?

*A.*—No, certainly not; I should never admit that for one moment.

Mr Robert Hayton Throp, *called and examined.*

Chairman—You represent the Holderness Agricultural Club?

*A.*—Yes, I do. With regard to grain entering Hull, I find that the Railway Company will collect the grain free of charge, whereas the farmer delivers his grain himself. Then the Railway Company, if required by the grain merchant, will provide a lighter to keep the grain as it is taken out of the ship, and they will deliver it on their own rails free of charge. In addition to that, the Companies will provide lighters to hold the grain for 14 days, and include the use of bags, and load it on their own trucks for 6d a ton. After 14 days' waiting, a charge of 3d per ton per week is made for storage, and ¼d per week for the use of the bag. This seems to me to be a case where the farmer should be taken into consideration, as he gets no similar favour at the hands of the Railway Company. As a rule, he has no provision at the small stations for warehousing his grain. Then he has the loading of his grain at the station, and he has to pay ½d for the hire of each sack, as against ¼d for the foreign grain.

*Q.*—Was that particular difference between ¼d and ½d known to the farmer?

*A.*—I could not find out that any of the farmers knew anything about it. You will see the distance from Hull to Huddersfield is 65 miles. The rate is 8s 9d per ton, or 1½d per ton per mile. Then from Driffield, our best agricultural centre, a distance of 66 miles, the rate is 10s, or 1.818d per ton per mile. The rate from Hull to Leeds, 51 miles, is 6s 3d, or 1.407d, and Driffield to Leeds, also 51 miles, 7s 6d, or 1.764d per ton per mile. This works out at about 3½d per quarter against our farmers. Then the rates for wool from Hull to Bradford, a distance of 61 miles, are 15s, or 2.950d per ton per mile. Then, Driffield to Bradford, 61 miles, rate, 20s 5d per ton, or 4.016d. From Hull to Leicester, 117 miles, 24s 6d, or 1.488d per ton per mile. Driffield to Leicester, 125 miles, 36s 7d, or 2.936d per ton per mile. Selby to Bradford, 31 miles, 14s 10d, or 5.419d. Market Leighton to Otley, 57 miles, 17s 11d, or 4.176d per ton per mile.

POTATOES, CARROTS, AND OTHER ROOTS :—

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hull to Manchester, | 91 miles ... | .....rate 10s , | or 1.318d. | per ton | per mile. |
| Hull to Sheffield, | 59 ,, | .....rate 7s. 6d., | or 1 525d. | ,, | ,, |
| Goole to Doncaster, | 18 ,, | .....rate 5s. | or 3.333d. | ,, | ,, |
| Snaith to Leeds, | 29 ,, | .....rate 6s. 1d., | or 2.514d. | ,, | ,, |

HAY AND STRAW :—

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hull to Leeds. | 51 ,, | .....rate 7s. 11d., | or 1 862d. | ,, | ,, |
| Hull to Bradford, | 61 ,, | .....rate 8s. 9d., | or 1.728d. | ,, | ,, |
| Driffield to Leeds, | 51 ,, | .....rate 9s 2d., | or 2 152d. | ,, | ,, |
| Selby to Wakefield, | 21 ,, | .....rate 5s 10d., | or 3 333d | ,, | ,, |

*Q.*—The wool rates seem to show a marked difference between the foreign and the home produce?

*A.*—Yes, they vary very much.

*Q.*—These matters have been brought before your Chamber, I suppose?

*A.*—Yes, at various times.

*Q.*—You tell us there is a difference in the rates for the use of sacks for foreign grain as compared with sacks for home grain?

*A.*—Yes, there is.

*Q.*—Who told you?

*A.*—A corn merchant in Hull.

*Q.*—Then would you be surprised to know that Sir George Gibb wrote me two days ago, and he says the charge is all the same whether to foreign importers or to home producers?

*A.*—I can only tell you that I have my information direct from one of the largest merchants in Hull, and yesterday I made further inquiry to confirm what I had previously been told, and I was again told it was a farthing per sack, and I hand you here the railway price for the hire of sacks to the home farmer.

*Q.*—I know all about that. You cannot go beyond that?

*A.*—No, I cannot; I did not get that information direct from the Railway Company. Another advantage the foreign importer gets over the home producer is that he gets his goods stored further in warehouse or lighter for 21 days free of charge, which gives him time to find the best market possible, and his goods are loaded on the trucks free by the Companies' servants, while our farmers have to load their own produce into the trucks themselves, and are allowed as short a time as possible to do it in.

Mr Earnest Fuller, called and examined.

Chairman—You represent the Nottingham Corn Association?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Give us your evidence.

*A.*—King's Lynn to Chesterfield, 99 miles, is 10s 1d for 4 ton lots. From Hillington to Chesterfield, 110 miles, the rate is 12s 6d for 4 ton lots; that makes 1s 5d over the port rate. Hull to Burton, 104½ miles, rate, 10s 9d per ton. Doncaster to Burton, rate, 8s 7d for 63½ miles. This gives the foreign grain an advantage of 3s 5d per ton over the home. Hull to Nottingham, 85 miles—rate, 9s 2d. Saltfleetly to Nottingham, 80 miles—rate, 9s 2d. Thus, Hull rate is 20 per cent. lower. I could give you 100 other cases like these.

*Q.*—You wish to point out that at present it is impossible for traders to be certain of the rate they have to pay for the carriage of grain?

*A.*—Yes, and I will show you that by this map.

*Q.*—I think this point has more reference to the question of altering home railway rates than foreign?

*A.*—I am afraid it has.

*Q.*—Then we cannot go into that point?

*A.*—No, we cannot. Personally, I have that point much more at heart than the other.

*Q.*—Do you advocate an equal mileage rate wherever it may be?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Does your Association find fault with the railway accommodation at the loading stations seeing similar accommodation is so well provided at the ports?

*A.*—No, but we say these terminals of 3s 3d per ton are unfair, as we load and unload our goods and the foreigner does not do so; but the Company's reply to that is, they must have a profit.

FOURTH DAY, 2ND MARCH, 1905.

Mr JAMES THOMSON, called and examined.

Chairman—You are a wholesale flesher at Haddington?

*A.*—Yes. In the year 1904, I killed 42,622 sheep, and they were all sent to London. In the busy season we kill from 1200 to 1300 sheep a week, and I pay about £5000 per annum for carriage.

*Q.*—Now, you want to speak to us about railway rates?

*A.*—Yes; I have been trying to get the Glasgow rate for 20 ton lots of 45s per ton. My rate to London, irrespective of quantity, is 70s per ton. The companies point out to me that the 45s rate is for wagon loads of 3 tons; but it is impossible to put 3 tons of new killed meat in a van or wagon. I have been in the habit of loading 40, 60, and up to as many as 80 sheep in the wagon, but the greatest load I have been able to put in is 2 tons 6 cwt.

*Q.*—What is the distance from Glasgow to London and Haddington to London?

*A.*—By the East Coast route from Glasgow would be about 460 miles, and Haddington is about 60 miles nearer London.

*Q.*—Have you taken any steps to get your rate altered?

*A.*—Yes; I wrote the Company a great number of letters, addressed to the General Manager, during the last three years, and, after a great deal

of correspondence, on the 15th of December I received this letter:—"With reference to yours of the 10th inst., I have now to advise you that the lowest rates we can quote for fresh meat from Haddington to London are 77s 6d per ton, Company's risk, and 70s per ton, owner's risk. You must not be aware, I think, that the rates from Glasgow are exactly the same as yours. The special rate for 20 ton lots has been cancelled some time ago."

*Q.*—They did not tell you why the 45s rate was off, did they?

*A.*—No, they gave me no reason for it. It was cancelled previous to the 15th December 1904. But I applied for it in 1902.

*Q.*—That means that you succeeded in cancelling the other men's rates without getting your own reduced?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—You want to draw our attention to another point of these rates?

*A.*—Yes; the rate from Glasgow for 3 ton loads is 53s 4d. That rate exists now.

*Q.*—That is a Company's risk rate, is it not?

*A.*—Then my Company risk rate is 77s 6d.

*Q.*—Who told you the Glasgow rate for 3 tons was 53s 4d?

*A.*—The President of the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce.

*Q.*—What is the date of his letter?

*A.*—24th February 1905.

*Q.*—I suppose home fresh meat takes up more room in a van than foreign frozen meat?

*A.*—Yes; we have to hang it so in the van that the air will blow through it to cool it, and the frozen meat keeps better by being kept solid together. I should like to mention, further, that the rate from Liverpool to London, 200 miles, is 25s per ton for foreign fresh meat, easily showing a disadvantage to the home producer of 20s per ton. Then the railway has a special rate for 500 live sheep to London and other places, but grants no reduction on dead meat no matter what the quantity may be. The rate from Wick to Edinburgh for one wagon load of live sheep is £4 10s, and for 500 sheep the wagon load is £3 10s.

*Q.*—How many live sheep would you put in a wagon?

*A.*—It depends on the size of the wagon, but the average would hold from 30 to 35 sheep. I might just mention that the rate for mutton from Perth to London is the same as from Haddington, and it is 60 miles further from London, and Aberdeen is 150 miles further away than Haddington and the rate is 2s 6d less—namely, 67s 6d per ton. In addition to my

70s rate, my consignees have to pay 4s 2d per ton for carting and toll, and that is divided between the Corporation and the Railway Companies.

*Q.*—That is, 2s 1d goes for carting and 2s 1d for the use of the market?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Do you know why the 45s rate from Glasgow was cancelled?

*A.*—No, I do not know.

*Q.*—Do you know why it was instituted?

*A.*—I believe it was to carry Canadian dead meat to London.

*Q.*—But Parliament has stopped the importation of foreign cattle into Glasgow, and consequently the rate has stopped?

*A.*—That has nothing to do with me. If it paid them to carry foreign fresh meat at 45s, surely it would pay them to carry mine 60 miles less distance at the same rate.

*Q.*—You wish to bring something before the Committee with regard to loading your meat in the wagons?

*A.*—Yes. I had a meeting with Mr Robertson of the North British last Wednesday. He said you required to load 3 tons to the wagon. I said it was impossible from the present nature of my traffic. Mr Hay and Mr Rutherford are quite well aware of that; but after I went home and thought the matter over, I went and bought a lot of bullocks, and loaded 7 wagons with 21 tons 3 cwt. of meat, 3 cwt. over the requirement.

*Q.*—Did you then get a reduction of the rate?

*A.*—No. I wrote Mr Rutherford referring him to the statement he made. I received this reply:—"Dear Sir,—Yours of the 18th *re* fresh meat, Haddington to London. At our meeting in Edinburgh on the 15th, I pointed out that, besides the condition to load 3 tons per truck, there were other conditions and circumstances which operated against the adoption of a lower rate from Haddington."

*Q.*—Did he tell you what the other conditions were?

*A.*—No; and this 3 ton load of mine gave them £10 10s per van, as against the Glasgow £6 15s van.

Mr E. J. Bullen, called and examined.

Chairman—You represent the Midland Corn and Agricultural Traders' Association, and you wish to show that the foreign farmer has a railway preference over the home farmer?

*A.*—Yes. Newark is a malting town. The foreign farmer sends his barley through Hull in 6 ton lots for 6s 8d per ton from Hull. The English farmer sending his barley to Newark over the same number of miles of

railway as from Hull has to pay 9s 7d, or about half as much again. As a rule, there is a difference in favour of the foreigner and against the Englishman of from 5 to 25 per cent for grain all over the country.

*Q.*—Can you give us any basis for the rates for barley?

*A.*—Yes. The foreign rate from Hull to Newark is 6s 8d, and the distance 76 miles. The home rate, at a penny per mile for 76 miles, is 6s 4d, and 3s 3d for terminals makes 9s 7d per ton. I think that is clear enough.

*Q.*—Who pays the Hull terminal?

*A.*—I do. When I send 6 tons of barley, which I often do, from Hull to Newark, I pay 6s 8d per ton, which covers the terminals. If you take 6 tons of barley into the station at Hull, whether it is foreign or home, I pay 6s 8d to Newark.

*Q.*—Has the English farmer any difficulty in finding out what his rates are?

*A.*—Yes. If you go to a station-master and ask what the rate is for 100 miles he will be unable to tell you. In fact, I should have great difficulty in telling you myself. For instance, the Great Northern legal rate is 1.80d for the first 20 miles, 1.50d for the next 20 miles, 1.20d for the next 50 miles, and beyond these distances 0.70d. Then there are the terminals —1s 3d at each end for leading and unloading; and a 1d at each end, covering and uncovering, in all 2s 8d. This rate is only for the G.N. system. If the goods go over other Railways other considerations arise, as each Railway has its own scale of rates.

*Q.*—Can you suggest any remedy?

*A.*—Yes; I want a uniform mileage system for foreign and home goods on the same lines as passengers are carried, say, foreign 1d per mile, and 3s 3d for terminals.

*Q.*—Have you anything else you want to bring before us?

*A.*—Yes, there is this with regard to extras. If foreign grain is sent from Hull to Sheffield, Nottingham, or any other centre, it goes at a through rate to any sub-station in these cities. But if you start an English consignment on the Great Central to be sent to the Midland Station, they want you to pay 10d per ton extra. That is to say, they penalise the home grain again, because you want to get the station nearest the miller.

*Q.*—You have mentioned the difficulty the farmer has in finding out the rates. I hope you do not suggest that any Railways have ever charged above their legal maximum?

*A.*—No; I think the maximum is so high already that they would not do

that, but the farmer suffers from ignorance. He goes to a station and says, "I have got 10 trucks of grain. They are going to several distant stations. Can you tell me what the several rates will be? The stationmaster cannot answer the question. If the rates were so much per mile, then the farmer or the dealer could tell himself.

*Q.*—How often do you come across a case of this sort?

*A.*—Very frequently. They will say no rate is in force, and then in about six weeks you will get a rate.

*Q.*—You mention in your preface the warehousing of the foreign grain. Do you mean that there is free warehousing given at Hull?

*A.*—They keep it for a long period at a very small charge. The Railways all do it to some extent. It used to be done at Sheffield and Nottingham, but the arrangements have been revised recently, else it has been the custom to warehouse foreign grain free.

*Q.*—Would that be foreign grain, and not English grain?

*A.*—No; both get the same privilege, but the Hull and Barnsley first gave 21 days for the sacks instead of 12, and the other Companies did the same. They were competing in that case.

*Q.*—Do you ever get rates charged over the maximum?

*A.*—Yes; we come across them every month. We check them, and we get the allowance made.

*Q.*—If you did not watch the rates very carefully, might you go on paying an excessive rate for a considerable time?

*A.*—Yes; if we did not spend a great deal of time over checking all our rates and charges, we would soon be put in a very awkward position.

*Q.*—You state that if your system of a simple, universal scale of rates were introduced, it would save the farmers 2s to 5s an acre on their arable land?

*A.*—Yes; that is my firm conviction.

*Q.*—You say that if the Railway Companies can warehouse and convey foreign grain from Hull to Newark for 6s 8d, they should be able to do the same for British grain where warehousing is excluded.

*A.*—Yes, I do, and one Company does it now.

*Q.*—How many Railway Companies give the 6s 8d rate to Newark?

*A.*—Five. They all concur in the rate to Newark.

FIFTH DAY, 7TH MARCH, 1905.

Mr JOHN DRYSDALE, called and examined.

The Chairman—You are President of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, and sent to represent the Highland Agricultural Society?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Will you pick out one or two of the rates to which you want to draw our special attention?

*A.*—We will take cheese. The sea-rate from Hamburgh to Leith is 20s per ton, and Hamburgh to Glasgow, *via* Leith, is 25s per ton. This shows that the foreign cheese is being carried from Leith to Glasgow for 5s per ton. Then again we have a rate from Leith Docks to Glasgow for the same article of 8s 9d per ton. Then take Kilmarnock, the centre of the cheese-making industry of Scotland. To send from Kilmarnock to Leith, a distance of 70 miles, is 18s 4d packed, and 20s 10d loose. Then Kilmarnock to Glasgow, distance 25 miles, the rate is 13s 9d. Then Glasgow to Forfar, 96 miles, 22s 6d. Then Glasgow to Aberdeen, 153 miles, 17s 6d for the exact same goods and service.

*Q.*—Would these rates be for both home and foreign cheese?

*A.*—Yes. My contention is that the foreign cheese is carried to Glasgow, *via* Leith, at an extremely low rate, Glasgow being the centre for distributing, and the South and West of Scotland cheese is charged at a very much higher rate, so that the home farmer is shut out. Then the through rate for butter from Hamburgh to Leith is 25s, and from Hamburgh to Glasgow it is 32s 6d per ton. Then from Holland to Leith, 22s 6d; and to Glasgow, 27s 6d per ton; and Denmark to Glasgow, 27s 6d per ton.

*Q.*—Have you any other rates for butter to bring before us?

*A.*—Yes; there is the ordinary rate, Leith to Glasgow, of 12s 6d per ton; the home trader has to pay this. Then with regard to eggs, the rate from Hamburgh to Leith is 25s, and to Glasgow, 30s per ton; and from Holland to Leith, 30s, and to Glasgow, 35s per ton. Then, Denmark rate is the same as Holland rate. Again, the ordinary rate from Leith to Glasgow is 12s 6d. Then, referring to market garden produce, I know it is not an uncommon thing for a wholesale dealer in the Glasgow Bazaar to order from a Leith shipping agent a ton or two of goods, and they get it conveyed for 5s per ton, if it is done within 48 hours of the ship's arrival. Then again, they buy it in the very vicinity of Portobello and Musselburgh, where that produce is very largely grown, and the home producers have to pay 8s 9d to get their goods to Glasgow. Then, taking fruit. There is a

through rate from Rotterdam to Leith of 20s for apples and pears, and for soft fruit, such as strawberries, the rate is—Rotterdam to Leith, 25s ; and to Glasgow, 30s. Then the rate from Braidwood and the Clyde Valley, which is a very large fruit and vegetable producing district (Braidwood, the farthest off station from Glasgow, is 17 miles), is 9s 2d and 7s 6d for hard fruit and vegetables, and this is against the 5s foreign Leith to Glasgow rate.

*Q.*—You are here contrasting the rate of 9s 2d and 7s 6d for 17 miles, against the rate of 8s 9d for 49 miles?

*A.*—Yes. Then foreign grain, such as Indian corn, beans, peas, and manufactured grain, is carried from Glasgow to Aberdeen or vice versa, a distance of 153 miles, at a rate of 8s 4d per ton, when such as white barley or oats is charged 10s per ton between the same points. Then from Glasgow to Perth, distance 64 miles, the rate for home grown is 9s 2d, station to station, in 4 ton lots, whereas Indian corn, beans, peas, and manufactured stuff in 4 ton lots is 7s 6d per ton. Many of my figures under this head of grain and flour are intended to bring out the anomalies existing between different districts, but I suppose you will not admit these ?

*Q.*—No, I am afraid we cannot.

*A.*—For instance, it takes 30 cwt. of oats to make one ton of oatmeal, and it costs 15s to convey 30 cwt. of oats from Aberdeen to Glasgow, and the ton of oatmeal can be sent back again to Aberdeen for 8s 4d. Then 4 tons of flour can be sent from Aberdeen to Glasgow, or vice versa, for 8s 4d per ton, and 4 tons of flour from Dunning, 50 miles less running, is 9s 7d per ton. I give this to show how the inland miller is handicapped, and his industry crushed.

*Q.*—Then you have something to tell us about rye grass seed ?

*A.*—Yes. From Leith Docks to Glasgow the rate is 8s 9d, and the rate from Grangemouth is 7s 3d, delivered in Glasgow. Then the rate from Leith to Haddington, distant 18 miles, is 10s 5d per ton, delivered. Then Leith to Hawick, 53 miles, the rate is 17s 6d delivered. Then the rate from Maybole, where the seed is largely grown, a distance of 49 miles, the very same distance as from Leith to Glasgow, is 15s 10d per ton. For 5 ton loads, Cumnock to Glasgow, 41 miles, the rate for rye seed is 14s 7d. Then Kilmarnock to Glasgow, 25 miles, the rate is 9s 2d. From these figures it will be seen that seeds coming from Continental ports have a decided preference over our own home Railway rates.

*Q.*—You next wish to deal with the carriage of hay and straw?

*A.*—From Rotterdam to Glasgow the rate is 16s 6d, and Rotterdam to Airdrie, 10 miles less running, the rate is 18s. Foreign hay from Grangemouth to Glasgow is 3s 4d, and home hay from Grangemouth is 6s 10d, station to station. The rate from Dunkirk to Glasgow is also 16s 6d. If Glasgow traders did not get these preference rates, steamers might go direct to the Clyde, but the Railway Companies do not want this, they being so largely interested in the docks at Grangemouth and Leith. Then our home farmers suffer in this way. For hand or machine pressed hay, the load is fixed at 2 tons for any Scotch destination, and 2½ tons for an English destination. Steam pressed hay, on the other hand, has no fixed weight per wagon. I have seen at Grangemouth our men labouring to put 2 tons on a truck, and the foreign hay taken out of a steamer and put on a truck with no attempt to put on the stipulated weight on the wagon. They were evidently paying on the weight of the hay or straw. This is a grievance many of the hay merchants have put before me time and again.

*Q.*—Will you now deal with the carriage of potatoes?

*A.*—Yes. I was under the impression that I would be allowed to deal with the question of dissimilarity, and want of uniformity, on our own home Railway potato rates, but I will go on to the foreign ones. The rate from Glasgow to Antwerp is 15s per ton, while the rate from Antwerp to Glasgow is 14s 3d, and the rate for new potatoes, from Glasgow to Antwerp, is 22s, and the rate from Antwerp is also 22s. What the farmer complains of is this. The price at the present time for potatoes in Fife is 30s per ton, and the Railway carriage to Glasgow is 10s per ton, so that they are paying a rate of 33 per cent. on the value of the article, while the foreigner gets his potatoes into Glasgow for 4s 3d more.

*Q.*—Your next point is home dead meat?

*A.*—Yes. Our dead meat, Glasgow to London, is 77s 6d per ton. On the other hand, foreign meat can be sent for 53s 4d. The rate for fresh dead meat, Aberdeen to London, 550 miles, is 75s per ton. Symington to London, 366 miles, for the same goods, is 77s 6d. Then from Annan and Dalnock the rate is 65s. Then, for instance, 40 average live sheep, that walk in and walk out of the ordinary truck, 131s 9d, fully the cost of the dead ones to London. This is a serious complaint. If the farmers *could* send the sheep alive they could *wait on* a favourable market, as they are dead they must be disposed of at any price.

*Q.*—What have you to tell us about wool?

*A.*—The rate for wool, foreign from Leith to Glasgow, is 12s 1d, and for home wool, 18s 9d. Then it is quite within my knowledge that many

of the rates in the rate book are what are termed carted rates, but the small farmer or trader does not understand the rate book, and I am convinced that very many of them are paying for their goods being carted, and they are carting them themselves. I am convinced, and I am satisfied, that they are often paying rates that are not correct rates. I know that it pays large commercial firms in Glasgow to keep Railway experts (that have been trained in a Railway office) to check the Railway accounts. That shows that small men, that have not the means of checking, are in many cases punished.

*Q.*—How do you know that turnips and vegetables from the ship in Leith Dock to Glasgow are 5s per ton?

*A.*—I know that from the men that buy the stuff, and tell me what they are charged.

*Q.*—Charged by whom?

*A.*—By the Shipping Company.

*Q.*—*Not* by the Railway Company?

*A.*—No.

*Q.*—Then you do not know what the Shipping Company pays the Railway?

*A.*—No. I have nothing to do with that.

*Q.*—Is a Railway Company not justified in giving foreign produce such a rate as the conditions justify?

*A.*—No, I do not agree to that, on the principle that our Companies, in asking power to build these lines, come under obligations to benefit the districts through which their Railways were taken, and they are benefiting the foreigner to our own detriment.

*Q.*—Are you aware what Mr Justice Collins said in 1895? I will read it to you.

*A.*—I would suggest that I am being taken entirely out of my sphere altogether. You forget that you are cross-questioning a plain farmer. Let me say that, rightly or wrongly, a strong impression is abroad in Scotland that there is a system of preferential rates, and I have been asked by my fellow-agriculturists to look into and make a collection of rates, and submit them to this Committee. I am not a lawyer or a Railway expert, and the matter you read is entirely foreign to me.

*Q.*—What rate have you in your mind?

*A.*—The rate for butter, Glasgow to Dunblane, 36 miles, is 11s 8d. That compares badly with 49 miles, Leith to Glasgow. Then there is the

extraordinary rate, Glasgow to Forfar, 22s 6d for 96 miles; and Glasgow to Aberdeen, 153 miles—rate, 17s 6d for butter.

*Q.*—Referring to the carriage of dressed mutton, frozen and fresh (they both need to be quickly transported), do you think that 5d is too much as an extra charge for handling a fresh sheep in opposition to a frozen sheep, that can be thrown about like a log of wood, as compared with a freshly killed sheep, that is susceptible to damage in every possible way? The fresh sheep at 70s per ton works out at .375d, and the frozen sheep at .241 per pound, making a difference of only .134d per pound?

*A.*—This is rather far-fetched.

*Q.*—Do you know any cases of farmers having been charged through their not knowing the rate more than others that did know the rate?

*A.*—Yes, I could give you one or two instances. I have two invoices discharged. One where treacle was charged under Class 1, and the other, a much longer distance for treacle, Class C.

*Q.*—Could you give a case, stating the money actually paid?

*A.*—From Bridgeton Station, Glasgow, 8 casks of treacle, weighing over 2 tons, at 7s 6d per ton. Total payment, 18s. The same Company carried treacle to Stirling, and charged it under Class C at 5s 5d per ton. Then another case where 8 casks of treacle were taken from the General Terminus to Dennyloanhead—2 ton 8 cwt., at 7s 6d per ton. I have given you these three particular cases, but I could give you a great many more.

*Q.*—On the question of rye grass seed. The Maybole rate for it is 15s 10d, in 5 ton loads?

*A.*—Yes, it is charged at the pure seed rate, but it is taken into Glasgow, and the seedsmen clean it of 20 per cent. of the rubbish in it that the Railway Company has charged this high rate on. The foreign seed is cleaned at the other end, and the farmer loads the wagons at the other end.

*Q.*—The foreign Railways, being controlled by the State, can co-operate with agriculturists in many ways which the British system cannot?

*A.*—Yes, and they do so. I had an opportunity of seeing that in Denmark last year.

*Q.*—Therefore, comparing the two systems, the British farmer suffers considerably?

*A.*—Very much indeed.

*Q.*—With regard to dead meat from Symington, could a trader get the same special rate for 20 tons, as the same trader could get in Glasgow for 20 tons?

*A.*—No.

*Q.*—Sir Charles Owens sees great simplicity in the rate book, but you don't.

*A.*—I do not.

*Q.*—You suggest a simple scale of rates placed on the station.

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Are you aware that preferential rates are illegal?

*A.*—Yes, I am aware of that.

*Q.*—Do you know that treacle, for feeding purposes, is now carried in 4 ton lots at Class C prices ?

*A.*—That may be, but here are two cases of farmers paying under Class 1 rates. They may grant the C rate if any one is 'cute enough to ask for it, but if he does not he will not get it.

## SIXTH DAY.

Mr John William Dennis called and examined.

The Chairman—You are here for the London Chamber of Commerce and the Central Chamber of Agriculture ?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—You wish to give us some evidence in regard to preferential rates ?

*A.*—Yes. The preferential rates from Boulogne to London, for ten ton lots of foreign potatoes in bags, is 10s per ton, the sea rate is 8s 4d, leaving 1s 8d for the land carriage. For home potatoes, Folkestone to London, packed in the same way, is 7s 9d. The Company have to unload and load the foreign potatoes, and pay the harbour dues, while the British farmer trucks his himself. Then French fruit, in one ton lots, Boulogne to London, is 15s per ton. British fruit, from Folkestone to London, varies from 16s to 22s 5d per ton. Then from Caen to London, potatoes or onions, is 9s per ton. The British rate from Newhaven to London, 6s 8d per ton, and the Great Northern, Hamburg to London, *via* Boston Dock, for potatoes, is 14s 2d, and of this the Shipping Company gets 6s. The Company does the discharging and loading their wagons, and pays the dock dues, whereas on British potatoes it does no loading, pays no dock dues, and charges 1s per ton more, or 9s 2d for the same quantity. Then St Malo or Haver, *via* Southampton, to London, for the like goods, in the same way, 6s 11d loaded for them. Then Antwerp, *via* Harwich, to London, for potatoes in 5 ton lots, the rate is 13s 4d, and for home potatoes, Harwich to London, for haulage only 7s 6d per ton. Our experience in this country

is that, though I am prepared to offer the Company a big bulk of traffic running into thousands of tons, they meet me and say they will not lower the rates. I have found it absolutely impossible, although I send 10,000 tons of traffic over the lines, to get the goods a farthing cheaper.

*Q.*—Do you assert that the rate from Hamburg to London is 14s 2d for potatoes ?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Do you know that the Company say they have never quoted such a rate ?

*A.*—I should meet that denial of their quotations by producing the document from their own office.

*Q.*—You are going to produce the document ?

*A.*—Yes. I have frequently paid the rate, and I undertake to produce the document.

*Q.*—You say the Railway Company unload the ship. I tell you the Railway Company deny that.

*A.*—I would not be surprised at that, but I am not prepared to accept any denial.

*Q.*—Apparently the figures are difficult to arrive at.

*A.*—They are most difficult. The ordinary farmer could not possibly obtain this information. The information I have obtained and given here with respect to Boston Dock, I venture to say, could not have been obtained by any other person in the Kingdom, who is not on a firm footing of friendship with the party that gave me the information, and which hitherto the officials of the Great Northern Company have strenuously denied. Even before Sir Herbert Tekyll, at the Board of Trade, they there absolutely denied it. I went back to my friend, and asked him if it were so, and he again said it was so, and that was the reason I said I could not accept any denial unless the actual document was put in. Now it is admitted as being correct and proved. That shows you that even after I, through private means and private friendship, had obtained this actual quotation, unless I had been absolutely certain of the bona-fides of the man from whom I got the information, I could not have persisted in reasserting it in the face of the denials of the Great Northern Railway managers before Sir Herbert Jekyll.

*Q.*—It has been said that it is an easy matter to get a complaint of preference rates before the Railway and Canal Commissioners. Have you found it so ?

*A.*—I have found it an extremely difficult matter. First of all I have

to go before the Board of Trade, as a preliminary step to the Railway Commissions. Then I meet with this from the Railway Companies, "Well, Dennis, don't you think you are running your head against a brick wall? Are you prepared to throw thousands of pounds away on litigation with us? Are you aware that it is not one Company, but three Companies, that you have to fight?" I have said to the Companies I will undertake to find the money to fight this action, but the ordinary farmer is not in a position. He is beholden to the Railways for bringing and taking away the means of his existence, and they can make it hot for him in many ways. In fact, he is at their mercy.

*Q.*—So you think that a plain man having a grievance against a Railway Company would not get his trouble settled for a few postage stamps?

*A.*—I do not think that any sane man harbours such an idea. It is perfectly well known that if you go there you have to meet the best men at the Railway Bar, and you have to put eminent counsel against them, and to do that at nominal expense is absurd.

*Q.*—I would draw your attention to the 1888 Act, section 50. In any proceedings under this Act, any party may appear before the Commissioners, either by himself in person, or by counsel or solicitor. Would you say that the words, either by himself in person, are practically of no value to the trader?

*A.*—They are of no value.

*Q.*—Do you have an idea that competition amongst Railway Companies is a thing of the past?

*A.*—It practically does not exist at all. I have given you a correct instance of three Companies combining and raising the rates. I have said this before and repeat it. I think the biggest enemies the British farmer has are the British Railway Companies.

*Q.*—If the foreign rates so affect the farmer's operations, that must also affect employment and wages.

*A.*—Undoubtedly. I can supply Dover and all the coast town markets infinitely cheaper, from farms between 150 and 250 miles inland in France, with the Railway, the sea, and transhipment thrown in, than I can bring the same goods from Spalding or Peterborough to Dover.

*Q.*—You want the home rates reduced to the level of the foreign rates.

*A.*—Yes; but I want to go farther. I wish to see an inquiry into the internal Railway rates of the Kingdom, with the view of bringing all the home rates in a line with the foreign Railway rates. (This is a big order.)

Then I should also like to see the system of classification for fruit the same as the foreign classification. They have only one classification for their goods, whereas we have several varying classifications for home fruit.

## SEVENTH DAY.

Mr Alfred Mullins called and examined.

The Chairman—You represent the Monmouthshire Chamber of Agriculture ?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Would you give us some of the rates you complain of ?

*A.*—The rate for steam pressed hay or straw, Cardiff to Birmingham, 107 miles, is 10s 6d per ton, and from Monmouth to Birmingham, 86 miles, it is 13s. Chepstow to Birmingham, 92 miles, 8s 9d. Then machine pressed hay or straw, *minimum* two tons, Cardiff to Birmingham, 17s 6d ; Monmouth to Birmingham, 14s 10d ; Chepstow to Birmingham, 16s 7d. It will be seen that there is not much wrong with the rate for home machine pressed hay or straw. But a great many of our farmers send their hay in boltings (that is, tied in bundles), and they cannot put two tons on a truck. It takes two trucks to carry the two tons of hay or straw boltings or bundles, for which the rate is 49s. Then foreign hydraulic pressed hay can be loaded two tons on the truck, for which 21s is the rate, and for a much longer distance. The trouble is to convince the ordinary farmer that he is treated fairly, when he is charged 28s extra for the use of a truck to carry the same weight of goods as his foreign competitor, and he has to load his hay or straw himself in the open station yard, while the foreigner gets all this done for him.

*Q.*—Is there much hay or straw carried from Chepstow or Monmouth ?

*A.*—No , the rate is prohibitive.

*Q.*—Your next point is the grain rates.

*A.*—Yes, grain from Cardiff to Birmingham, in 4 ton lots, is 8s 4d per ton, and from Bristol, Avonmouth, and Partishead, distance from 100 to 120 miles, the rate is 7s 8d per ton. The home charges in and around the Midlands of England are the Companies authorised charges. Forty miles from Birmingham, for grain, would be 8s 2d ; 60 miles, 10s 5d ; 80 miles, 12s 5d ; 100 miles, 14s 5d ; and 120 miles, 15s 7d per ton for 4 ton lots. This goes to show that foreign grain at Partishead, 120 miles from Birmingham, is carried for 7s 8d, against 15s 7d for the same class of goods, home produced, and travelling the same distance.

*Q.*—Do you hear complaints of this ?

*A.*—Yes, they are constantly complaining.

*Q.*—I mean, have you taken it into a court ?

*A.*—No, not to my knowledge.

*Q.*—This means that at a station on the landside of Partishead the rate would be 15s 7d, and for foreign grain at Partishead, 7s 8d ?

*A.*—Yes, that is what I mean. Then apples, Cardiff to London, 152 miles—rate, 17s 6d, in two ton lots. Then Monmouth to London, 145 miles—rate, 27s per ton, in two ton lots ; and the rate, Cardiff to Birmingham, 107 miles, is 16s 8d. From Monmouth to Birmingham, 86 miles, 18s 4d, all for two ton lots.

*Q.*—Is there a big apple trade from Monmouth to Birmingham ?

*A.*—No, it is very small. There is a great many grown in the Hereford and Ross district. They were very plentiful last year, and if the rate had been reasonable there would have been lots sent, but owing to the rate they could not be sold at any price.

*Q.*—They rotted on the ground.

*A.*—Yes, and you had to sell them for £1 per ton, or one-ninth of a penny per pound on the rail.

*Q.*—Are your apples packed in the same way as the foreign ?

*A.*—Yes, but there is no stipulation as to packing. When in two ton lots they are sent in barrels or cases. They were simply lying on the ground rotting. I saw them myself—lovely fruit.

[If the Government had the Railways the fruit would be carried at a reasonable price into districts where the apples cannot be grown. The trouble is that through the high transit rates and the greed of the distributers, the consumer has to pay in a plentiful year practically as much as in a scarce year, and he sees the papers reporting a large crop, and he waits, expecting them to become cheaper, which seldom or never happens.]

*Q.*—You have something to say about potatoes.

*A.*—Yes, Cardiff to Birmingham, for four ton lots, the rate is 10s 6d per ton. Monmouth to Birmingham, 21 miles shorter, rate 17s also for 4 ton lots. Cardiff to Swansea, 46 miles, in 4 ton lots, 5s 10d ; and from Chepstow to Aberdare, 43 miles, the rate is 8s 6d for 4 ton lots. From Cardiff to Merthyr-Tydvil, 24 miles—rate, 4s 2d. From Monmouth to Newport, 28 miles—rate, 6s 1d per ton, all for 4 ton lots.

*Q.*—Had you any difficulty in getting the rate from the various Companies ?

*A.*—None whatever.

*Q.*—Regarding apples, you say the Monmouth to London rate is 27s. Are you aware that there is a rate for 2 ton lots of 18s 4d ?

*A.*—No, I am not. If that is so, then the officials at Monmouth Station are to blame for giving me the wrong information. Here is the statement I got from them, showing 27s to London, and 18s 6d to Birmingham for lots of 2 tons, 4 tons, or smaller quantities.

*Q.*—You have another point about intermediate stations.

*A.*—Yes, I buy barley for the Cardiff Malting Company. The rate from Bristol to Chepstow, 32 miles, is 3s 6d per ton, and from Patchway to Chepstow, 26 miles, the rate is 6s 5d per ton.

*Q.*—For the same load ?

*A.*—For the same quantity.

*Q.*—For the same conditions of loading, and everything else ?

*A.*—Yes, this same thing applies along the lines, and between Gloucester and Chepstow.

*Q.*—Do the farmers in your district know about the rate for foreign produce ?

*A.*—They know very little. Indeed, I should say it would be quite the exception to find a man who knows anything about foreign rates. If they had had a man well up in them they would not have asked me to come here for them.

*Q.*—You state that the Bristol to Chepstow rate is lower than the rate from intermediate stations and Chepstow, and you know what you are stating to be facts. Would it be difficult for farmers to combine and send their produce in large quantities ?

*A.*—Yes, it would be very difficult. They would all have to thrash, lift their potatoes, press and pack hay at the same time. The thing is impossible under anything like the present conditions of farming in this country.

EIGHTH DAY, 4TH APRIL, 1905.

Mr JAMES MACKENZIE HODGE called and examined.

The Chairman—You are here to represent the County Council of Perthshire?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Will you place before the Committee what you have to say?

*A.*—I will first put the case of Blairgowrie before you. The Caledonian Railway serves this district, but the North British have running powers. The North British opened a goods depot, and we had keen rivalry, which

the fruit growers considered would help them. Then the two Companies agreed—the one to withdraw its depot from Bo'ness and the other from Blairgowrie. But I wish to state first that I went last year with thirty Scottish farmers to Denmark, and we found that their rates for carrying butter and eggs there were very much less than our rate here.

*Q.*—I am afraid I can not allow you to go into that; it is beyond our province.

*A.*—Very well, my lord, I will not proceed. I will point out the case of cheese. There is about 8000 tons per year made principally in the West of Scotland. This is about the same weight as the quantity of butter that Messrs Currie & Co., of Leith, import from Copenhagen annually. Kilmarnock is the centre of the cheese district. The distance from Leith to Glasgow is 49 miles, and the rate is 9s 9d, carted and delivered. The distance from Kilmarnock to Glasgow is 25 miles; the rate is 13s 9d, collected and delivered. Then the great vegetable district of Scotland is in the vicinity of Edinburgh. The Railway portion of the rate from the Continent, *via* Leith, to Perth or Dundee is 7s 4d—the distance to Perth, 52 miles, and to Dundee, 59; and the rate from Musselburgh—distance to Dundee, 65 miles—is 15s 5d. To Perth, 54 miles, the rate is also 15s 5d, in lots from 10 cwts. to 2 tons. In the case of foreign vegetables, weight is not mentioned. These rates are as compared with 7s 4d from Leith. The North British Company sent me an intimation that the rate, Leith Docks and Edinburgh to Dundee, for 2-ton lots, was 9s 2d station to station; and the Caledonian sent me theirs, stating that 7s 4d was the rate, station to station, for foreign vegetables. This shows a clear preference of 1s 8d.

*Q.*—Now please tell us what you have to say about the carriage of fruit?

*A.*—Yes. Take Haddington to Glasgow, distance 60 miles, for raspberries, in tubs—rate, 18s 9d per ton. From Leith Docks to Glasgow, for the same fruit—8s 9d per ton, carted in Glasgow. The rate for strawberries or raspberries from Blairgowrie to Perth, 20 miles, is 9s 2d, and to Dundee 9s 2d. Blairgowrie to Edinburgh, 68 miles—rate, 19s 2d; Blairgowrie to Perth, 20 miles, is 9s 2d, and to Dundee 9s 2d; Blairgowrie to Edinburgh, 68 miles—rate 19s 2d; Blairgowrie to Aberdeen, 78 miles—rate, 17s 6d. With the exception of 450 tons of Blairgowrie fruit sold in Scotland, the whole of it went to England in 1904—to Newcastle, Leeds, Birmingham, Liverpool, and Manchester. The average rate, goods train, is 40s. 931 tons went by goods trains, and 186 by

passenger trains, at a rate of 80s per ton. Therefore, the money paid to the Railways for Blairgowrie English traffic is £2606, and Scotland, £360—making their income from the Blairgowrie district a total of £2966. This clearly shows that, while the Leith traffic is double the Blairgowrie traffic, the income to the Railways from the Blairgowrie traffic is double the income over the Leith traffic. I will now try to deal with the Clydesdale fruit trade. Clydesdale is the largest fruit district in Scotland. They sent into Glasgow last year by goods train 1216 tons, and by passenger train 1291 tons; and into England by goods trains 1247 tons; by passenger, 127 tons—total, 3381 tons. This district produces more fruit than comes into Leith, so that if a preference is to be given for large quantities Clydesdale should get it for its 3381 tons. The distance from Dalserf to Glasgow is 17 miles. The rate for strawberries or raspberries in baskets is 9s 2d, and in tubs 7s 6d; apples, pears, and gooseberries, 6s 8d for delivery in Glasgow only. Leith Dock to Glasgow, 49 miles—raspberries and strawberries in baskets, 8s 9d; apples, in ten ton lots, 6s 8d. From Leith Docks to Perth the rate for home apples is 9s 2d, and from the same place to the same place for foreign apples is 7s 6d in ton lots, there being a clear preference of 1s 8d. For foreign cabbage, Leith Docks to Dundee, is 7s 4d, and home cabbage 10s 10d—showing a preference of 3s 6d per ton. Leith to Perth is exactly the same. New Potatoes, Leith to Dundee—foreign, 7s 4d; home, 10s 10d. Leith to Perth is the same.

*Q.*—Upon all these points there should be some explanation, you think?

*A.*—There may be an explanation, but I have never heard of it.

*Q.*—You seem to think that the Leith to Glasgow rates are unduly low?

*A.*—No, I take them as an example, and all I can say is, the Railway Companies have furnished me with these rates for the different items I have mentioned; and if they are willing to carry foreign goods at these low rates, not because there is already a trade, but in order to induce the foreigner to establish a trade in produce that he has not yet begun to export, then I think that is altogether in favour of my contention.

*Q.*—Have you gone into the carriage of new potatoes, so as to enable you to say that only a small quantity comes from the Continent?

*A.*—Speaking from my own knowledge, I should rather say there was a considerable quantity. I can give you evidence of that from one of the largest dealers in Glasgow. Messrs Thomson & Mathieson, fruit merchants, say that they have very large supplies all the year round of Dutch carrots,

onions, cabbages, cauliflowers, and potatoes. They also get large supplies from Musselburgh and Prestonpans in bags and hampers.

*Q.*—You maintain that the home fruit trade pays the Companies better than the foreign fruit trade?

*A.*—Yes; I have shown that the bulk from Blairgowrie is over 1500 tons, against the bulk from Leith Docks of 3000 tons, and the money the Railways get from Blairgowrie is double what they get from the Leith fruit.

*Q.*—You want to tell us about the difficulty of understanding the Railway rate books?

*A.*—Yes. I went to Blairgowrie Station to see the rate books. I found not one book, but many books. There was the Caledonian rate book for North British stations; then the Caledonian rate book pure and simple; there was the mineral rate book for the Caledonian, and the mineral rate book for the North British and other Railways. Then the English and Scottish traffic rates conference book, then the North Eastern Railway rate book; there was also the North of England Railway rate book, and there were other rate books that I did not examine—in all, ten or eleven rate books. It is said that these rate books are all indexed. The Caledonian rate book for Caledonian stations had no index at all, the mineral rate book had no index, and nobody could understand them who is not constantly handling them. Sometimes the rate includes cartage, and sometimes not. I got from the Caledonian goods manager in Edinburgh the rate for fruit and vegetables, and also from the North Leith goods manager. They both of them wrote me in September of last year to return their statements. The Edinburgh manager wrote as follows:—"On going over this list, I find there are several errors. Perhaps you will be good enough to return it to me for correction." The North Leith goods manager wrote:—"We have discovered that there are several errors in the rates sent you, and I will be glad if you will return the statement of rates as early as possible." Now, if this rate question was a perfectly simple one, these men would surely have known what they were doing and saying.

## NINTH DAY, 12TH APRIL, 1905.

Sir W. TOMLINSON, Bart., M.P., called and examined.

The Chairman—You are M.P. for Preston and President of the Mansion House Association on Railway and Canal Traffic?

*A.*—Yes, and our Association brought a case in 1895 before the Railway Commissioners against the London and South Western Railway for carrying

foreign hops from Southampton to London for 6s per ton, against Alton, 20s ; Andover, 30s ; Basinstoke, 19s 3d ; Bishops Waltham, 23s 5d—all shorter distances than Southampton Then the Southampton rate aws raised to 20s.

*Q.*—Then the position was righted?

*A.*—Yes, in that one case.

*Q.*—Do you consider that the Railway Company having fleets of steamers has been a benefit to the foreigners?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Do you suggest that the ships of the South Eastern and Great Eastern go to the Continent empty?

*A.*—No ; not always empty. They sometimes take coals, but coals and things of that sort are the only cargo. I do say this, of all these steamers running to all these places abroad, they will go there empty very many times. Everybody knows that.

*Q.*—Your point seems to be that, the Railways having acquired the docks and ships, they will be more under the necessity to get freights for them?

*A.*—That is so, and the different Railways will be competitors in the same market for the carrying of the goods.

*Q.*—You want to point out that, if the rate to London from one wayside station was declared preferential, that decision would have no effect on the next wayside station?

*A.*—That is so. Every case has to be tried on its own merits.

*Q.*—Have you had any experience of the cost of proceedings before the Railway Commissioners?

*A.*—Yes, I have. The Southampton case cost £2000. Speaking generally, I say that the Railway Commissioners Court is, I believe, the most costly and capricious Court we have; that it would be no use whatever for a complainant to appear personally before that Court. The Railways were represented by the very best counsel, and the complainant must be represented by equally able and experienced men.

*Q.*—Would it be fair to suggest that there has been greater expenditure by the Railway Companies on docks and harbours for the benefit of foreign trade than there has been for slaughter-houses and warehouses for the benefit of the home trade?

*A.*—Undoubtedly; it has been very large.

*Q.*—Would it be millions as compared with thousands?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Then would it be fair to say that the Railway Companies have spent millions to the advantage of the foreign producer as against thousands for the home producer?

*A.*—Yes, that would be a fair statement to make.

*Q.*—Have you ever personally examined the rate books?

*A.*—Yes; I have rate books for myself.

*Q.*—Is that because you own a station?

*A.*—Yes; and my personal experience is, when you try to find out what the cartage is, it will be 5d in one place, 6d in another, and 1s in another very likely.

*Q.*—Regarding the conciliation clauses, you seem to think they have not been much used, yet the Board of Trade, year after year, report cases to Parliament of satisfactory conclusions?

*A.*—There are a number of cases that have been satisfactorily arranged, but I do say that, when you see in the Board of Trade report such phrases as we have heard nothing more about this case, that is very often because the trader gave up the claim in disgust at the worry, expense, and trouble it would cost him.

*Q.*—Might I suggest to you that in those cases silence signified consent?

*A.*—To my knowledge, it did not always signify that.

*Q.*—Is it not natural that the farmer should accept the results of his geographical position?

*A.*—And be ruined?

Mr Edwin Clements, called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the Chairman of the Mansion House Association, and you also appear here for the Associated Chamber of Agriculture?

*A.*—That is so.

*Q.*—Will you now place before the Committee the results of your investigation of this subject?

*A.*—Yes. I hand you in a table collected within the last few days from the rate book of the Chatham and South Eastern Railway's rates per ton.

*Q.*—Are these the rates about which the Mansion House Association has complained to the Board of Trade?

*A.*—Yes; several of them are the same.

*Q.*—You have something to say about Continental risk rates?

*A.*—Yes. The condition of owner's risk is an important point, and I

have it from a salesman in Covent Garden who imports soft fruit from France that, although these goods are sent at owner's risk rates, claims for loss or damage are paid by the Railway Companies; and, on the other hand, it is well within my knowledge that the Railway Companies refuse to entertain any claim for home goods sent over their lines at owner's risk rates. They have arranged among themselves to resist all claims.

*Q.*—You have now something to say about preference?

*A.*—Yes. I am at one with Sir W. Tomlinson regarding the laying out by the Railways of vast sums of money on docks and ships to develop the Continental trade. The Railways of this country were intended to encourage internal trade, but they now own or control nearly 200 steamships, and offer the best possible facilities to the foreigner at the lowest possible price. They have spent millions on nursing the one, and very little on smothering the other.

*Q.*—You have something to say about competition?

*A.*—Yes. They do not compete with each other, because rates at competitive points are agreed upon by the Companies concerned. They do not even compete in facilities, for in many cases the number of hours and minutes they are to run their train in is arranged for them.

*Q.*—You say the rates for agricultural seeds, Calais to London, is 12s 6d. Would you be surprised to hear that the South Eastern deny that any such rates exist?

*A.*—I should not be surprised at anything the South Eastern and Chatham denied, because that is exactly what happened when the complaint was put in to the Board of Trade about these rates. They denied their accuracy, and when asked to give particulars they would not do so.

*Q.*—Do you think that figures that could not be deciphered by an ordinary individual could be deciphered by a goods clerk?

*A.*—On that point, I will read this very interesting statement from my representative:—"The condition of some of the books is most dilapidated, and the alterations so numerous that it would require something of an expert to decipher the rates and descriptions of the articles. Were these books at any other office than a Railway Company's I should call it a disgrace."

*Q.*—And yet he managed to understand them?

*A.*—He is an expert.

*Q.*—May I put this to you? A Railway Company is always anxious to get as much as it can?

*A.*—Out of the home producer.

*Q.*—Out of its business generally; and if they are taking these rates, which you consider low, they are the best they can get?

*A.*—So much the worse for the home producer; he must be overcharged.

*Q.*—Is Railway law simple at the present time?

*A.*—It is anything but simple. There is nothing simple in connection with Railway rates according to my experience.

*Q.*—So it would be rather difficult for any one person, unless he was prepared to spend a large sum of money, to take a case before the Railway Commissioners?

*A.*—I think it would be a forlorn hope.

*Q.*—If the Railways put up their rates for foreign traffic, would that traffic not go into London by foreign steamers, and the Railways, losing the revenue, might have to further raise the rates on the home produce?

*A.*—No. We have the case of the Great Eastern forcing the steamships running to London into a combine with them, and the rates are now arranged between the Railway and the ship companies.

TENTH DAY, 13TH APRIL 1905.

Mr THOMAS WIGHAM called and examined.

The Chairman—You represent the Central Associated Chambers of Agriculture?

*A.*—Yes

*Q.*—You want to bring before us the question of the rates for foreign meat?

*A.*—Yes. The rate, including delivery in Liverpool, for foreign dead meat killed in Liverpool is 25s per ton. This rate governs the whole of the rates throughout the Kingdom. Thus the farmers in the West of England and all *other* parts find themselves with 40s and 50s rates in full competition with 17s 6d from Southampton and 25s from Liverpool. The rate from Barnstaple to London, 202 miles, is for home dead meat 38s 4d for two ton lots. Let me put the case before the Committee in this way. A train runs daily with 26 vehicles from Birkenhead to London by the Great Western, 229 miles, with 65 tons of meat, at 25s a ton. That is £81 5s for the train load. Then suppose the train to cost 3s per mile; 229 miles at 3s is £34 7s. Then allow 2s per mile for the empty return train, £22 18s; total expenditure, £57 5s. This shows a clear profit on the train of £24, or 7s 4½d. Then take, for the purpose of comparison, the Barnstaple train that carries 30 tons of dead meat at 38s 4d per ton. That

amounts to £57 10s. I do not admit that this would be the full train load; it would more than likely carry other 20 tons of other goods and merchandise, so that I do not need to allow anything for the return empty train, as a loaded train would come back. This train then runs 200 miles at a cost of 3s per mile, total £30, leaving a balance to profit for what is practically a half train load, of £27 10s, or 18s 4d per ton. From these calculations I beg to submit that the Liverpool dead meat traffic does not pay better than the home traffic, and not as well.

*Q.*—Are you aware that the average earnings per goods train mile is about 6s?

*A.*—Yes, that would be about it.

*Q.*—You will admit that there is an enormous goods traffic between London and Liverpool, and from Barnstaple they are light, and it is more than likely that the trains you refer to would not run back from London empty?

*A.*—Yes; and if nothing is to be allowed for the return journey that makes my position all the stronger. It will make the profit on the Great Western 14s a ton, instead of 7s, and still be 18s 4d on the South-Western.

*Q.*—It has been put to you that a stopping train costs 50 per cent. more than a through train?

*A.*—Yes; but I do not believe that. I have heard this point argued both ways, according to its suiting the circumstances.

*Q.*—Do you think the Railway Companies are inspired by motives of philanthropy or business, or do they get as much as they can?

*A.*—There is no philanthropy in the matter. The Chairman would not tell his shareholders that was so.

*Q.*—Your next point is fruit?

*A.*—Yes. My Chamber complain of the foreign fruit traffic having every facility accorded to it in the matter of speed, punctuality, careful handling, prompt delivery, and all the details essential to fruit transit. The rates from Staplehurst, 49 miles, for Classes 1, 2, and 3, for fruit, is 10s 10d, 13s 1d, and 15s 1d, or about 3¼d per ton per mile, and the loading is done by the farmers themselves, and these rates are by goods train. Then they have to sign an owner's risk note (handing in a copy).

*Q.*—That is on the South-Eastern and Chatham?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—That is to say, he has to sign an owner's risk note, and at the same time to pay the Company's risk rate?

*A.*—Yes, that is the complaint. Then we will take apples and pears

from Boulogne to London, 15s per ton ; sea freight, 5s 4d ; land carriage, 9s 8d. Then the station accommodation at Staplehurst is of the most miserable description, and they say it is the same at nearly all the stations at which fruit is loaded, and at a distance of only about 40 miles from London the growers cannot rely on an early goods train delivery, and as their goods must be in the market in reasonable time, they are bound to send it by passenger train, and pay double the price. They also maintain that foreign traffic at owner's risk rates, in the case of damage, is paid for, and that is not so when theirs get damaged. The fact seems to be that the whole of these questions seem to be in a highly uncertain condition. That being so, I feel quite clear in my own mind that a very great many of these claims for loss and damage to foreign fruit at owner's risk are paid. For that has been my experience at the Bar.

*Q.*—Then the question of the bulk of consignments arises. You say they have large quantities of traffic at Folkestone that are conveyed in special through trains to London.

*A.*—But the local traffic is not conveyed on similar lines. Mr Maskin tells me in the season he loads two trucks a day, and other growers load a couple of trucks a day, and by the time the train gets to Paddock Ward Junction the train is a very comparable thing to the Folkestone foreign goods express. Therefore I submit there is not enough of difference in the weight of the two trains to justify the diversity in the rates for the service rendered. Then the foreigners have another advantage over our home growers. Their season is earlier. Their strawberries and cherries come in, and at first command 1s per lb. They have the market all to themselves. When our growers come in, the price is reduced to 2d or 3d per lb., and they have to pay the high rate, and get the low price. Then co-operation of the Railway Companies is much wanted. The South-Eastern and Chatham will not run their fruit trucks to any place but London. If a fruit grower in Kent wants to send his goods to Manchester or Liverpool, he has to notify the Northern Company for them. This is a great inconvenience, as he runs a great risk losing his market if the foreign trucks do not arrive in time, and they often do not.

*Q.*—I think these points are a little wide of the subject that is before the Committee.

*A.*—If it is a question of traffic coming from Naples to London, they will co-operate and do the best they can, but when they are asked to arrange with English Railways they will not do it. This system confines

the growers to the London market, and suits the local Railways, but gives the farmers only one market.

*Q.*—Could you say how the fruit is collected and delivered?

*A.*—It is at the Railway stations between 4 and 6 P.M., and it should be delivered in Covent Garden by 5 A.M. next morning, but sometimes it is not there till mid-day.

*Q.*—Do you wish to say something about the port rates?

*A.*—Yes. The South-Eastern gave me some of the express rates from Boulogne to London. The rate for butter, hothouse fruit, meat, and poultry is 60s per ton, and from Folkestone, 55s 6d. Then the rate from Hamburg to London, *via* Harwich, for bacon is 18s 4d, and the rate from Harwich to London is 17s 10d, allowing for sea carriage, 6d; from Rotterdam the rate to London is only 15s. This is 2s 10d below the home rate. The rate for hops, Antwerp to London, is 16s 6d, and the rate for the same goods, Harwich to London, is 20s 6d, or 4s more for the home than the foreign hops. I had intended to deal with the Liverpool rates, but I have not been favoured with an authentic statement of rates by the North-Western Companies. But I think that the Liverpool 25s rate for meat is the most classical preferential rate that exists in this country. It is the one they justify, and the one I have attacked.

Mr ARTHUR MUSKIN called and examined.

The Chairman—What do you feel strongly about?

*A.*—We are in a very bad position for getting our fruit to the North, say to Manchester or Liverpool. The train leaves Staplehurst at 10 o'clock, and does not get to Liverpool till 3 o'clock next afternoon, that is, 29 hours to run about 250 miles, or about 8 miles an hour. Then I can send it on to London, and arrange with the Northern Company to send vans to cart it across London to their trucks.

*Q.*—Is it a prevalent opinion among fruit growers that foreign fruit is brought in at cheaper rates than home fruit?

*A.*—Yes, and delivered quicker. I was surprised to hear just now that ours was delivered first. Our salesmen tell us just the opposite.

ELEVENTH DAY, 11TH MAY, 1905.

Mr HENRY OSBORNE KING called and examined.

The Chairman—You are a dealer in a large way in hay and straw at Wolvercote, near Oxford?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Perhaps you will enlarge a little upon that now.

*A.*—I may say that the foreign hay and straw that comes into this country is steam pressed, and can be loaded two tons on a truck. The home hay and straw is machine pressed. The home grower has to load 2½ tons on a truck. We find it almost impossible to load 2½ tons on a truck.

*Q.*—Then what happens ?

*A.*—The price for the carriage of 2½ tons is enforced, whereas the foreigner can always get his 2 tons of steam pressed hay on.

*Q.*—Will the Companies not give you wagons wherewith to hold 2½ tons?

*A.*—No.

*Q.*—How do you propose to remedy this ?

*A.*—To get the Companies to make the minimum for British 2 tons, the same as the foreign hay. There is one Company in England does that now ; the London, Brighton and South Coast take a minimum of 2 tons. If the Railways would adopt the 2 ton plan, they would only need one sheet on a truck, and one rope instead of two, and the truck would be emptied at one movement, instead of two, and released a day earlier than it is now. The carts can take 2 tons, but they cannot take 2½.

Mr Thomas Black Short called and examined.

The Chairman.—Your firm are corn millers at Berwick-on-Tweed ?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Will you proceed with your evidence?

*A.*—The rate for flour from Tweedmouth to Manchester, in 5 ton lots, is 19s 2d ; the rate from Newcastle to Manchester and Liverpool is 12s 6d. The traffic from Newcastle to Liverpool is entirely foreign.

*Q.*—What is the mileage ?

*A.*—From Tweedmouth to Manchester is 203 miles, and Liverpool to Newcastle, 159 miles. Then Newcastle to Manchester, 139 miles, the Railways charge for flour, 5 ton lots, 0.94d per ton per mile. Liverpool to Newcastle, and for the same thing, Newcastle to Manchester, 1.9d, and from Tweedmouth to Manchester, 1.13d per ton per mile.

*Q.*—Of course you know there is competition by water from Liverpool to Newcastle.

*A.*—So there is from Tweedmouth to Liverpool, *via* boat to Leith, then from Leith to Liverpool and to Manchester, carrying home grown grain.

*A.*—Yes, we are now sending out traffic round by Leith, and shipping it on to Manchester by Langlands line.

*Q.*—What does it cost that way ?

*A.*—Seventeen shillings, including dues and cartage. But it takes longer time.

TWELFTH DAY, 7TH JUNE 1905.

Mr THOMAS WAGHORN re-called and further examined.

The Chairman—You wish to direct our attention to-day chiefly to remedial measures.

*A.*—Yes. I certainly, as adviser to the agricultural trader, say that it is useless to take cases such as this Committee is inquiring into before the Board of Trade.

*Q.*—Then what objection have you to the Railway Commission ?

*A.*—My objection to the Railway Commission arises from the great cost it entails on both sides. The Railway Commission is a Court of Justice, it is a Court of Record, and all the proceedings before it have to be conducted in a formal manner, and the best counsel have to be employed to meet the solicitors of the Railway Companies. There are two points which I think make the Commission unsuitable. First in being a Court of Record. Their decisions are binding, and the Railways cannot afford to give way, even on a small point, for fear of the decision being brought up against them when another case comes on. So they must fight on from point to point.

*Q.*—Can you give us an illustration of what you mean ?

*A.*—Yes ; I have called attention to it in my book. It is the case of Smith and Forrest *v.* the London and North-Western Railway. The main point in the case was a comparatively simple one. It was a 5 per cent. increase on their rates. I suppose the amount in dispute would not be more than £30 or £40. The Commission had to ascertain whether the 5 per cent. rise was justified, and caused a vast amount of statistics to be examined, which filled 175 printed foolscap sheets of figures. The applicants put in a rebutting series of statistical tables relating to cartage rebates, and increases made for smalls in all. The Court was presented with about 300 pages of statistics to extract the materials for their decision. There is no agricultural case that could bear such a strain as that.

*Q.*—Then your objection to the Railway Commission is the cost of procedure, and the length of the proceedings ?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—Has any Committee ever reported regarding these matters ?

*A.*—Yes ; the 1882 Committee put it in this way :—"It is not to the interest of any trader to bring a Railway Company before the Commission,

because the expense is so great that the trader, even when he wins his case, will invariably sustain heavy loss, and experience has shown Railway Companies will litigate to any extent, and ruin the trader." Then Railways have so many opportunities of putting traders to inconvenience and loss by withholding facilities, that traders are afraid of the consequences of taking a Railway Company into Court and before the Railway Commission.

*Q.*—Do you think that the Commission Court is unduly expensive, seeing it has to deal with a capital of over 1200 millions of money?

*A.*—No ; I do not say anything uncomplimentary to the Court.

*Q.*—You want to differentiate the agricultural industry from every other industry, do you not ?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—You do not think the coalowners should have a Coal Railway Commission to look after their interests ?

*A.*—No. Or the brewers—no ; or the ironfounders—no ; or the brickmakers—no. Their interests are all the same, and the conditions are the same, but the produce of the land is bound to be conveyed from where the land is. These trades can be moved, and have been moved, to the sea coast, but you can't move the land.

*Q.*—Can you give us anything like the cost of taking a case before the Railway Commission?

*A.*—It might be anything between £25 and £10,000.

*Q.*—We assume in these matters the Railway Companies employ highly trained Counsel?

*A.*—Yes; they can't let a small point go against them, because other traders would immediately pounce upon them.

*Q.*—What is the Board of Trade for?

*A.*—To protect traders.

*Q.*—Why is it called the Board of Trade?

*A.*—I don't know, and I do not think anybody else knows. It originally bore the title of His Majesty's Commissioners of Woods and Forests.

## The Case for the Defendants.

THIRTEENTH DAY, 21st JUNE 1905.

Mr Robert Miller called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the General Manager of the Caledonian Railway?

*A.*—I am.

*Q.*—You are here to-day to controvert some of the statements of Mr Drysdale, of the Chamber of Agriculture, and Mr Hodge, of Blairgowrie?

*A.*—Yes; I want to point out the errors in their evidence. They say the rate from Hamburg to Leith is 20s, and to Glasgow, *via* Leith, 25s, so that the Railways only receive 5s for the 49 miles, Leith to Glasgow, and that the home trade has to pay, say 8s, for the same service. This is an entire mistake. The Shipping Companies have to pay the Railways the same price that the home traffic pays in all cases. In some cases the Shipping Companies make the same charge for the same traffic from the Continent, *via* Leith, to Glasgow, Perth, and Dundee. But this does not affect the Railway charges. Again, occasionally the shipping rate to Glasgow from the Continent is lower than it is to Leith, and the Railway Company makes no deficit. Another erroneous argument is to compare the Leith and Glasgow rate with the like distance on other parts of the Railways. In 1865 a special low rate was given from Leith and Edinburgh to Glasgow for the purposes of emerging the Edinburgh and Glasgow in the North British Railway. This is shown in the North British schedule of maximum rates. The distance from Leith to Glasgow, Stobcross Station, is 51 miles. This rate was arranged to allow Leith to compete with Grangemouth, which is only a distance of 25 miles from Glasgow. Another mistake these gentlemen made is comparing Leith Dock and Leith Town with Glasgow. The Railways do no cartage, and need no station accommodation for the Continental goods. The wagons are loaded from the ships, so that it is not fair to compare the home and foreign service. For instance, wool comes into Leith from the North of Scotland, London, and Australia, and they are all carried at the same rate. Then regarding the rate books. Some people do not know how to use an ordinary index book, but the clerks at the stations are always pleased to explain them. The Caledonian has 407 goods stations, and at each of these stations there are 14 rate books, making a total of 5698 books. These give rate information on the Caledonian, Highland, Great North of Scotland, Glasgow and South Western, North Eastern, North Western, and Ireland. Then with regard to rates. The 17s 6d for cheese, Glasgow to Aberdeen, is for cheese in boxes. Loose cheese is 32s 6d; and to Forfar (boxed), 22s 6d, and loose, 27s 11d. These Aberdeen rates are necessary to compete with the imported cheese. Then there is the complaint of butter from Glasgow to Forfar, 96 miles, 22s 6d; and Glasgow to Aberdeen, 153 miles, 17s 6d; the Leith and Glasgow rate, 10s 5d—all indicating preference. But the

Leith Dock butter trade is daily and continuous, being as much as 50 tons a day.

*Q.*—Then the Railways have nothing to do with the 5s rate from Leith to Glasgow?

*A.*—No; the Shipping Company pays in all cases the full amount of the Railway local rates.

*Q.*—Is grain, flour, or Indian corn brought largely into your ports?

*A.*—In 1904 the quantity of flour and maize brought into Aberdeen was—Maize, 10,145; and flour, 28,129 tons—all by sea. Then the imports and exports of rye grass seed in 1904 were—Imported, 7084; and exports, 7553 tons. We give a special rate for this seed of 10s 10d, and the ordinary rate is 16s 8d.

*Q.*—We suppose it pays the Railways to do so?

*A.*—Certainly; we are not in the habit of doing anything for nothing.

*Q.*—What weight do you get on a truck of foreign hay?

*A.*—We loaded to Auchterarder from Grangemouth on a wagon 72 bales, weighing 3 tons; and on a wagon to Crieff, 65 bales, weighing 2 tons 11 cwts.; and to Denny, 72 bales, weighing 2 tons 13 cwts. That should give a fair idea. Of home hay we loaded 42 bales, weighing 2 tons 1 cwt.—that is the heaviest home hay wagon we know of. Then the dead meat question is not a farmers'—it is a butchers' question.

*Q.*—Don't you think the Railway rates affect the farmer equally as much as it does the butcher?

*A.*—No; he has no more interest in the butchers' Railway rates than he has in the rates of the brewer or distiller.

*Q.*—That is your opinion?

*A.*—It is my opinion. It has been pointed out that from Symington to London, a distance of 366 miles, the rate for mutton is 77s 6d per ton, and from Annan and Dornock, 65s, while the rate for a ton of live sheep, averaging about 40—walk in and out of the truck—cost 131s 9d, or 3s 3½d per head; but they forget that the trucks have to be cleaned and whitewashed. Then we do not now carry foreign dead meat from Glasgow to London, but we carry meat from London to Glasgow. It loads about 5 tons 10 cwt. per wagon. In May 1905 we carried 559 carcasses in 3 wagons, weighing 13 tons 6 cwt. 2 qrs. 17 lbs. In the case of the fresh mutton from Symington, the average we can get in is 1 ton 3 cwt. Then it is complained that the rates from Leith Docks to Glasgow are on a lower basis than on the rest of the Railways. But that was done by Parliament at the time of the amalgamation of the Scottish Railways.

These rates were placed 40 per cent. below the rates on the other Railways. Then as regards the fish rate, Aberdeen to London is 55s; Birmingham, 55s; and to Leeds and Manchester, 50s; to Liverpool, 43s. Fish is sent by passenger train.

*Q.*—Do you allow water competition to influence you in making up your rates?

*A.*—Yes, most undoubtedly.

*Q.*—Then places that have not water competition would not be so favourably rated?

*A.* That is so. What I mean is, that if I get 12s 6d for carrying say 60 miles, and 8s 4d for 90 miles, I am making a larger profit out of the 12s 6d than out of the 8s 4d, but I am still making a profit out of both lots.

*Q.*—You have a monopoly of many of your stations?

*A.*—Speaking on the Caledonian, we do not understand monopoly; we have competition over the whole of our lines with the exception of about 100 miles.

*Q.*—With the North British and Glasgow and South Western, what is to prevent those three Companies from meeting and arranging matters in a friendly spirit?

*A.*—I do not know.

*Q.*—They do, I suppose?

*A.*—Yes, we do, certainly.

*Q.*—I suppose you arrange your rates?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—If you give a low rate say from Glasgow to Aberdeen of say 17s 6d, and a rate of say 26s for the same goods to Forfar, would you think it was unfair for the Forfar trader to ask for the Aberdeen rate to be applied to his goods?

*A.*—No, I do not think it would be unfair to ask, but I would not grant it. Take the case of Aberdeen. I cannot prevent flour from coming into Aberdeen—26,000 tons a year come in. If I refused to send the flour at these low rates, then it would go into Dundee and Glasgow, and the Railways would lose the carriage of it, and they would have to look for a profit somewhere else.

*Q.*—Then you would not give it him?

*A.*—No, certainly not.

Mr William Andrew called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the Goods Manager of the North British Railway?

*A.*—I am. I have some notes in answer to some statements made by Mr Thomson, flesher, Haddington. The rate from there to London for fresh meat is 77s 6d per ton; the average van load in summer is 15¾ cwts., and in winter 27¼ cwts. Then Mr Thomson referred to Perth as having the same rate as him, while he was 60 miles nearer to London; and from Aberdeen, 67s 6d, but this is a group rate which applies to a great part of Scotland. Then referring to the fruit trade. The small quantities we get cause a deal of extra expense. Thus, from Prestonpans Station to Hawick, 1 cwt.; Stranraer, 1 cwt.; Greenock, 8 cwt.; Falkirk, 3 cwt., Polmont, 1 cwt.; Stirling, 2 qrs.; Inverness, 1 cwt.; Ayr, 3 cwt.; and Greenock, and so on, till from that station in one day we have sent 56 wagons, and the average load of each wagon was 1 ton 9 cwt. 2 qrs. If these 56 wagons had been fully loaded we would have had 120 tons. Then the clerical work with these small parcels is very great and expensive.

*Q.*—How do you fix your rates? Are they on what the traffic will bear?

*A.*—That in some cases has its influence with us

*Q.*—Where there is competition the rates are lower?

*A.*—Sometimes, but I would not always admit that.

*Q.*—Would you sanction the right of the home producer to demand the same rate as is in existence from any port to any market over a line on which he happens to be an intermediate trader?

*A.*—No, I could not assent to that principle.

*Q.*—Now, as regards Mr Thomson's application for a 20-ton rate, is it not the fact that you would have to put it before the Railway Conference, on which every Railway Company in great Britain would be represented?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—I gather from your answer that this is a special rate given to Mr Thomson, Haddington?

*A.*—No; it is a special rate given to Haddington, Symington, and other places in the south of Scotland.

*Q.*—What is the maximum rate you can charge dead meat to London?

*A.*—I cannot give you our total powers to London. It passes over three Railways.

## FOURTEENTH DAY, 27th JUNE 1905.

Mr O. R. H. Bury called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the General Manager of the Great Northern Railway?

*A.*—Yes. Between Hull and Newark there is keen water competition,

and, even the very low rate of 6s 8d for barley by rail, we only carry a very small portion of the total traffic. The distance from Hull is 68, and from Goole 53 miles. These two ports and the water competition govern the rate. The water rate for 60 ton lots is 5s 7d. Then as regards potatoes, our rate from Boston Docks in 5 ton lots is 8s 4d, either home or foreign, but the shippers from Hamburg quote a through rate to London of 14s 4d per ton. Then out of our 8s 4d we pay the Dock Company 4d for the use of their rails.

*Q.*—Are you in favour of putting special rate-boards upon all the stations on your Railways?

*A.*—No. In England we have 20,000,000 rates now, and that would be only adding more.

*Q.*—How do you fix your special rates? Do you fix them upon the principle of as much as the traffic will bear?

*A.*—We arrange the rates among ourselves.

*Q.*—So, practically, there is no competition where there is no water traffic?

*A.*—We compete to get the traffic on the same terms, and we offer quick delivery.

*Q.*—Do not each of you spend £20,000 to £30,000 a year on canvassers, whose only duty is to secure the goods for their line?

*A.*—We must agree about rates. Our deferred shares do not get anything at all now.

*Q.*—How many rates have you?

*A.*—We have about 6,000,000, and we have thirty clerks who are always working at the rates, and these thirty clerks are generally engaged in the reduction and not in the advancement of rates.

*Q.*—Would it be a fair question to ask how many of these thirty clerks are employed at agricultural rates?

*A.*—There would be ten out of thirty.

*Q.*—Mr Miller, of the Caledonian, gave it as his opinion that Railway rates in connection with stock raising did not affect the farmer, but only the butcher. Would you say the question of the rate does affect the price at which the farmer sells his stock?

*A.*—Of course, it must.

*Q.*—Do you think that combination and co-operation among farmers would do them much good?

*A.*—I think the farmers should arrange themselves in that way, and the Railways will do all they can to help them.

*Q.*—Have you anything to do with hydraulic pressed hay?

*A.*—We buy it for our horses; and as for machine-pressed hay it is a farce to call it pressed at all, but we make no difference in the rate whether it is foreign or home hay, but the foreign hay packs better. A bale, 4 feet by 2 feet by 1½ feet, weighs 152 lbs, and an English bale, 3 feet by 2 feet by 1½ feet, weighs 60 lbs, but we charge the same rate for both.

Mr William Forbes called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the General Manager of the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway?

*A.*—Yes. Mr Dennis stated we carried potatoes from Caen to London in 5 ton lots at 9s per ton, but that rate is for 10 ton lots only, and our rate from Newhaven to London is 5s 10d, and not 6s 8d, as Mr Dennis puts it, and that is for 2 ton lots. In 1904 we carried between 20,000 and 30,000 tons of potatoes from France. These potatoes came to us at Caen from Brittany and Normandy, and their carriage by rail to Caen cost on an average 6s 6d per ton before we got them in our steamer, so that the whole freight was 15s 6d per ton. Of course, our Railway is chiefly a passenger Railway, and our average earnings per ton of goods do not exceed 6s 6d, and of that we have to pay 3s 6d for terminals to other Companies, so that we are only left with 3s for hauling the traffic and paying all the other expenses. Last year we carried over 55,000,000 passengers. We carried last year from Heathfield and Uckfield about 2000 tons of dead poultry, at the rate of 1s 6d per cwt., a distance of 45 miles. Then we have very large cement works on our Railway, and they have suffered a great deal in the past from German and other competition, and since I have been General Manager we have reduced the rate three times to help to meet this foreign competition. Then we have a very large capital invested in our steamers and docks, and, if we were prohibited from carrying these foreign goods, they would all go round by water and get to London just the same, and our unfortunate shareholders would suffer.

*Q.*—How is this dead poultry industry at Heathfield carried on?

*A.*—In the first place the young birds come from Ireland, then they are fattened and sent into the London market.

*Q.*—I expect you would be in favour of farmers combining so as to get the best possible facilities?

*A.*—There is no doubt that combination and co-operation on the

Continent has been of great value, and has really enabled foreign produce to come to London and compete with our own home produce.

*Q.*—Do you think that co-operation has been made easier on the Continent through the Railways being controlled by the State?

*A.*—I should say that would make it much more difficult.

*Q.*—Really?

*A.*—Yes; my experience of State control is that it makes it much more difficult for the trader to get what he wants.

FIFTEENTH DAY, 3RD JULY 1905.

Mr L. E. HENNELL called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the assistant Goods Manager of the Great Western Railway.

*A.*—Yes. I have come to answer some of the statements made by Mr King. He suggests that the minimum load of hay, machine pressed, should be reduced from 2½ tons to 2 tons per load, but the Railway Companies have frequently considered this, and could not see their way to adopt his suggestion of 2 tons per load. Then with regard to barley. From Bristol to Chepstow I admit that the rates are very low, owing to the water competition. Then small parcels of fruit are very awkward for the Railways. We have sometimes to send from Evesham to Aberystwyth, or even to Perth, and beyond to Inverness with 5 cwt. in a truck. We can put nothing else in, and you have got to run the truck right through, and we think that co-operation and combination among the farmers would help these small truck loads. Then with regard to the dead meat trade. From Liverpool to London that has attained enormous proportions. It amounts to from £90,000 to £100,000 per week, while the live cattle and dead meat trade combined together amounts to about £15,000,000 per annum. The meat goes in full train loads, and has done for a quarter of a century.

*Q.*—What would the rate for home dead meat be, say for a few miles short of Birkenhead?

*A.*—It would be a small quantity, and at irregular times. It would be 40s.

*Q.*—Would you be favourable to have the ordinary traders' rates put on boards at the stations, so that the farmers could see them?

*A.*—No. That would involve a multiplication of the hundreds of millions of rates already in operation on the British Railways.

*Q.*—Does it not seem like preference that the rate from Patchway to Chepstow should be 3s 5d, and the rate from Bristol to Chepstow should

be 3s 6d for the carriage of the same thing a longer distance ?

*A.*—Yes ; but there is little or no traffic from Patchway, or we would alter the rate.

*Q.*—If one has to examine these two rates, he could not help coming to the conclusion that a preference was given to Bristol.

*A.*—Yes, but that cannot be helped ; you must have class rates. We have thousands of different articles to send all over the line, and you have millions of class rates. If you further multiply these millions of rates we will not know where we are.

*Q.*—You carry foreign hay from Cardiff to Birmingham under Class C rate, and English hay at Class 3 rate, making a difference of about 60 per cent. against the English hay ?

*A.*—Probably it might be.

*Q.*—On what terms could a single farmer put three tons of hay on a truck to Birmingham ?

*A.*—You will understand that I cannot answer that, as I have not read all the 30,000,000 rates my Company have got.

*Q.*—If you raised or lowered a rate would you object to putting up a notice in the station to that end ?

*A.*—To that I may say we lower hundreds of thousands of rates in the course of the year, every year. It is the number of them that makes the trouble.

*Q.*—Is it not the fact that a low water rate by canal or steamboat forces down the Railway rates ?

*A.*—Undoubtedly we try to get the best rate we can, and the water rate rules our rate.

*Q.*—Then if canals are revived, and made good, there will probably be a further fall in Railway rates and stocks ?

*A.*—That might affect them between some points, but I don't think that would help the farmer much. It would increase what he and you object to.

Mr Walter Gardner called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the Goods Manager of the Great Eastern Railway.

*A.*—Yes. I have taken notes of some of the statements made by Mr Cornelius. He speaks of the through rate to London. The steamers are not our ships. They belong to, and are supported by, the Danish Government. They carry 50,000 to 55,000 tons of bacon per annum. We get 10s 6d per ton for carrying this traffic from Parkeston Quay to London,

and we get 7 tons of this bacon in a truck. Now I will compare this traffic with our own traffic at home. For many years we have been trying to keep alive and develop our home traffic, so we reduced our rates, and still found the traffic was falling off, and we reduced the rates again. After that second reduction our home fresh meat traffic got up to about 15,000 tons a year. Then in 1888 it fell to 12,000 tons ; in 1895 to 8000 tons ; and in 1900 to 5000 tons ; and last year it was between 6000 and 7000 tons.

*Q.*—What do you think is the cause of that ?

*A.*—The import of the foreign meat. I have told you how we can load this foreign meat into our truck. I will now give the home meat figures for a week from the whole of the Eastern Counties. The total weight was 77 tons. It was sent from 133 different stations, and loaded into 282 different trucks. There were 561 consignments or senders, and the weights of the consignments ranged from 17 lbs. to 23 cwts. 3 qrs. Of these 561 consignments, 483 were of 5 cwts. each or under, and only 3 consignments of 20 cwts. or above. This was all dead meat. You cannot compare the things that are not comparable. Land and sea transit are quite dissimilar. You might as well compare the rates of 3s or 4s per ton that are charged between New York and Liverpool as our sea and land rate.

*Q.*—Take potatoes. You convey them 120 miles by sea and 70 miles by land for 12s 6d, whereas you charge 8s 4d from Colchester, 51½ miles.

*A.*—Yes, that is right.

*Q.*—If you reduced your rates the farmer would be helped from Colchester to London on a basis of your through rates.

*A.*—It would simply mean ruin to the Railways if every figure is to be based on the lowest rate.

## SIXTEENTH DAY.

Sir GEORGE GIBB called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the General Manager of the North Eastern Railway.

*A.*—Yes ; but I do not propose to go through in detail all the numerous statements made by previous witnesses, but to deal with the rate question more on general principles. These rates are arranged by private and collective meetings of Railway experts from time to time. The public have no interest in Railway rates or in Railway carriage, but every trade that uses the Railways must know of the consultations and arrangements that take place. We do not do our business by public meeting. For the

purpose of carrying on the Railway work of this country, we have 8900 Railway stations. That does not include Scottish stations, and in England there are 70 seaports, but, of course, some of these are small. Of the £487,000,000 of imports last year, £460,000,000, or over 94 per cent., came through 13 ports. I hand in a print showing the details of that calculation. The conditions of Railway carriage to and from these ports is on a more advantageous basis that can be the case in the inland parts of the country.

*Q.*—Do you mean as regards the interest of the Companies ?

*A.*—Yes, and as regards the actual cost of carriage.

*Q.*—You have exceptional rates, these being lower than the Class rates invariably.

*A.*—Yes, where the circumstances justify the reduction.

*Q.*—Would you not rather say where the circumstances compel the reduction ?

*A.*—I say justifying or compelling. I submit that the Railways always have had power to vary their rates. Absolute uniformity would be unfair to those places and persons that are in a position to offer conditions that cannot be offered by people and places under other conditions. So we group our rates for grain from the ports that are distant 40 and up to 72 miles, at 6s 3d per ton, and this grouping makes a rate for the shortest run of .975d, and for the longest of .542d, and these rates do not amount to more than pay the cost of carriage and a reasonable return for the capital invested.

*Q.*—What is a reasonable return for capital ?

*A.*—The most that we could get on the North Eastern last year was 4.38 per cent. Then the North Eastern has to meet the competition from Hull to Leeds, a distance of 51 miles, of the Hull and Barnsley, and the Great Central from Grimsby, and the Lancashire and Yorkshire from Goole, a distance of 40 miles. Now on Mr Hutton's suggestion that the North Eastern should not be allowed to reduce the rate from Hull to Leeds, unless they reduce their grain rates over their system for similar distances, the consequence would be this :—In 1904 the North Eastern carried all together 995,000 tons of grain and flour, but in the same time we only carried 5091 tons from Hull to Leeds, or about ½ per cent. of the total grain that we carry from all stations to all places.

*Q.*—What net profit have you off this Hull to Leeds grain ? Does it give you 4.38 per cent. ?

*A.*—The result of our whole transaction gives us that. The profit on this Hull to Leeds grain is very small, but such as it is, it is net profit.

*Q.*—It appears to me you are carrying this Hull to Leeds grain at a loss.

*A.*—I do not think so. I submit on the contrary that the power of the Railway Company to reduce their rate from Hull to Leeds without reducing their other rates is a benefit all round to the Railway Company, to the trade, to the port of Hull, to Leeds, and to the consumer.

*Q.*—But not to the water carrier.

*A.*—No ; we prey on our own kind. If the Railways were restricted from carrying this foreign grain, with the object of the consumer paying more for his corn, that would enable the landowner to get more for his land.

*Q.*—Is that his only source of gain, do you think ?

*A.*—Surely I have read many most interesting speeches urging that 1s a quarter would not raise the price of corn. We are charging 6s 3d from Hull to Leeds, and water carriage is 5s 10d or less.

*A.*—Then you do not deny that the Hull to Leeds rate is lower than you would offer to the farmer the same distance from Leeds?

*A.*—That is perfectly true ; the farmer would have to pay the scale rate.

*Q.*—Then that is a preference.

*A.*—Yes, as far as it goes. It is not an undue preference.

*Q.*—What is a full train load ?

*A.*—I have known a train from Hull to Leeds carry 365 tons ; that would be 40 wagons with 9 tons in each. The gross weight of the train was 734 tons. Then regarding the Newcastle to Leeds rate for grain. That is 7s 6d per ton, but at that price we get no traffic. We only got 4 tons last year. The grain for the Midlands of England all comes to Hull. We get 1.47d for carrying the Hull to Leeds grain, and only 0.95d per ton per mile from Newcastle to Leeds. We carried from North Eastern stations to all stations in 1904, 561,728 tons of grain. That does not include flour. Of that, 295,835 tons were foreign, and 265,893 tons were home grain. From Hull we carried 182,419 tons, and from Newcastle, 86,803 tons. The home grain was carried from 467 stations, averaging 569 tons per station per annum. This shows the tremendous advantage the ports have over the roadside stations. I have here an analysis of 300 trains from various country stations serving the farmers. The average load of these 300 trains works out at 32 tons to each train. Then I have taken out four of our ordinary trains. Leaving Hull on 22nd June 1905, the average load for the four trains was 308 tons. These were specially large trains, and the average would be much less. But the cost of carrying the Hull traffic is very much less than the country traffic. Then in the month of February 1903, we carried in 4 ton lots and upwards of grain only

confined to and from stations on the North Eastern locally, excluding grain from all our ports, 12,407; to and from North Eastern ports 10,441 tons. Our charges from our home farmers' trains, £3518, or about 5s 9d per ton, and from North Eastern ports, £2703, or about 5s 2d per ton. The average distance the home grain was carried was 49.14 miles, and the average distance from ports, 47.86. The average for the home grain per ton mile, after deducting 3s for terminals, was 0.652d, and for the foreign grain, 0.546d. The foreign grain pays no terminals.

*Q.*—What do you think are the right commercial lines for a farmer?

*A.*—I undoubtedly think that combination and co-operation is the right thing for the farmers to do, so as to increase their load, and get both their imports and exports at the cheapest possible rates.

*Q.*—Will the Company help the farmer by building warehouses, so the best market may be readily got at?

*A.*—We have done it. We are now building warehouses for the purpose of enabling the farmers to send their milk from one whole district to get it Pasteurised in that building, and then sent in bulk to the consuming centres from Northallerton. We are quite willing to meet them more than half-way.

*Q.*—Are the middlemen in favour of this new movement?

*A.*—No; the middlemen would rather have competition and contention. Co-operation is not to their advantage. It would do away with them.

*Q.*—Then you are moving in the direction of warehousing the farmers' produce in the same way as you do the foreign grain?

*A.*—We take delivery of the foreign grain over the ship's side, and we have to keep it a reasonable time till a market is got for it.

*Q.*—You give a greater length of time to the importer than to the home producer?

*A.*—Yes. Because the local men do not need the time.

*Q.*—You have four classes of competition—the sea, the coasting trade, inland canals, and other Railways?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—What competition would there be at Northallerton?

*A.*—It has the advantage of a monoply, and distributing competition does not affect it.

*Q.*—You then only apply the lower rate to the competitive stations?

*A.*—That is so.

*Q.*—Is not your average train loads at 35 tons extremely small for local merchandise?

*A.*—No. Our average train load from all sources for goods trains on the North Eastern in 1904 was only 73.41 tons.

*Q.*—That is about the load of a decent sized barge on the Thames, is it not?

*A.*—Yes.

*Q.*—What is your average mineral train load?

*A.*—Last year it was 133.48 tons.

*Q.*—Have you any idea of how your income is made up?

*A.*—Yes. It is as near as possible a third from passengers, a third from goods, and a third from minerals.

*Q.*—Does a Railway exist in the first place for making interest on its shares, or for the development of the country through which it runs?

*A.*—It would not exist at all unless it could make interest for its proprietors.

*Q.*—If it were a State Railway it could.

*A.*—Yes; the State can do what it likes.

*Q.*—Therefore, it might be for the benefit of the farmers that the State should manage the Railways.

*A.*—You would then find that a change of masters would not produce an improvement in conditions.

*Q.*—May we look on the net receipts of 40 per cent., available for dividend, as being a large amount to remain in the hands of the Railway Companies?

*A.*—No; it was only sufficient to pay a dividend of 4.02 on the paid-up capital, or 3.30 if the watered capital is included.

SEVENTEENTH DAY, 11TH JULY 1905.

Mr VINCENT W. HILL called and examined.

The Chairman—You are General Manager of South-Eastern and Chatham Railway.

*A.*—Yes. I wish to point out that the principal item we carry is fruit. Taking the fruit brought by us to London. In 1904 it amounted to 50,509 tons, and out of that comes 6952 tons that come from Boulogne and Calais. That is all the fruit that comes to us from the Continent. It comes early in the year, and is over by the time the English fruit begins. Complaint has been made about cherries from the Continent. The first consignment came on May the 7th, and finished on July 9th. Then the first consignment of English cherries was on the 2nd July. Then foreign plums commenced on the 2nd July, and finished on the 3rd of September. While the English

plums commenced on the 27th of August, so that practically the foreign trade in fruit is over when the home trade begins.

*Q.*—What profit do you get from your foreign fruit traffic ?

*A.*—I really cannot tell you, but assuming that it is 10, 15, or 20 per cent., it would be a very serious matter if we had to lose it through raising our rates, say from 40s to 45s for cherries, as they would all go to London by water just the same.

*Q.*—Would you be in favour of an equal mileage rate ?

*A.*—No. Where would Cornwall be as against Somerset for market garden produce, or Scotland against Grimsby for fish ? Then eggs have been complained about, but the home eggs are not sufficient for the local demand. We carry from Calais and Boulogne to London 645 tons a year, and from Calais and Boulogne to our own stations in Kent and Surrey, 224 tons, or a total of 869 tons of foreign eggs. Then we carried from London to stations on our own lines last year no less than 2385 tons of eggs. We have no local egg trade. Then there is fault finding about the delivery of the fruit in Covent Garden Market, but the market is often glutted, and our carts cannot get in to deliver it at the proper place, and the fruit deteriorates. We often load the carts before midnight, and they do not get into the market then sometimes. We can have no interest in delaying the goods.

*Q.*—We suppose you would be in favour of the farmers combining on co-operative lines to get the best possible terms from the Railways ?

*A.*—Yes, we have reduced our rates to the lowest possible point to induce them to do that, but farmer A is jealous of farmer B, and does not want him to know where his goods go. They will not let their goods go by the same truck, if they can help it.

*Q.*—What are your profits off the foreign trade?

*A.*—I cannot tell you that, but I might mention that we pay no dividend to our ordinary shareholders, and in 1890 we paid rates amounting to £168,755, and in 1903 we were assessed for the same purpose to £296,457, and in some districts we pay 75 per cent of the whole local rates.

Mr Alfred Mally called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the Goods Manager of the London and South-Western Railway ?

*A.*—Yes. Our rate from Southampton to London, for foreign dead meat, is 17s 6d, and for home meat from Barnstaple to London, 34s 2d per ton. In 1893 the rate from Barnstaple to London was 57s 6d for the same service.

*Q.*—Has this reduction been able to maintain the trade in the Barnstaple district ?

*A.*—Yes. In 1898 we carried 817 tons ; in 1899, 760 tons ; in 1903, 768 tons; and in 1904, 915 tons. Then the whole of the home dead meat carried by us in 1904 was 7629 tons. We can get but little co-operation out of our farmers. This we have illustrated by this fact:—We recently offered a 25 per cent. reduction on strawberries if they would pack them in boxes instead of cross-handled baskets, but they would not alter their form of packing, and, of course, the Company would not reduce the rates. Then we carry manure at very low rates, and as regards milk, I can say, without hesitation, that it is carried at rates that do not cover the working expenses. If we could only get the farmers to pack, grade, and concentrate their produce so as to get it to the markets in the best possible condition, so that it could compete with the best packed foreign fruit, there would be no trouble. Then this rate question is more apparent than real. A rate of 20s per ton works out at one-ninth of a penny per lb. At 34s 2d per ton for 3 ton lots of dead meat for 210 miles. This works out at one-fifth of a penny per lb., so that the incidence of the rate can have no perceptible effect on the price of the article.

*Q.*—You have evidently come to the conclusion that the agriculturists should combine and act together, and meet their foreign competitors?

*A.*—Undoubtedly. Each man will persist in sending his own stuff separately to different salesmen. We have tried them to make up a 3 ton lot of say one ton fresh meat, one ton butter, and one ton apples. The 3rd Class rate would be charged for the truck load.

*Q.*—Is it not the fact that agricultural districts do not produce sufficient meat, butter, cheese, bacon, and eggs to supply their own local requirements ?

*A.*—We send far larger quantities of these articles from London to the country than we deliver in London from the country.

*Q.*—You say you spent £1000 in erecting additional accommodation that would not have been wanted had the farmers taken your advice.

*A.*—Yes ; we have had to increase the sidings and the number of trucks because of their method of packing in their cross-handled baskets.

Mr W. H. Macnamara called and examined.

The Chairman—You are the Secretary of the Railway and Canal Commission.

*A.*—Yes. I am here to assist the Committee regarding cases that may

be brought before the Commissioners. In my opinion the cost of bringing a case before the Commissioners is not excessive. The fee for filing and receiving an application is £1. The same fee is also payable by the defendant on filing the answer. Then the Court fee for hearing an ordinary farmer's case is £2, and the cost of the order under seal by the Court is £1. Then there is 5s for every summons, and 2s 6d for every order. The chief expense in the Court is the employment of counsel. Their fees have very much increased in recent years, and they would have to be paid something like 50 guineas a day to retain a man of known Railway ability, because he is not receiving a salary from the Government. Many of the cases brought before the Court are extremely important, and great interests are involved in them. Such cases absorb considerable expense, as they have to be gone into minutely by both sides, and they require eminent counsel to deal with them.

Q.—Would you say that an ordinary case, that would not occupy more than a day, would cost about 25 guineas?

A.—Yes.

## The Committee's Report, 4th May 1906.

The Committee sat on seventeen days and took the evidence of twenty-seven witnesses. The first twelve days were occupied in taking the evidence of two inspectors of the Board of Agriculture, and twelve witnesses representing Chambers of Agriculture and Commerce; while three witnesses represented their own interests. On the other five days we took the evidence of the other ten witnesses on behalf of the Railways.

We divide the evidence in three groups—(1) Scottish Railways, (2) north-eastern parts of England, (3) Railway Companies having termini in London.

The general tenor of the evidence given against the Railways mainly related to the rates for foreign produce, as compared with home produce; and that better accommodation was provided and more service rendered to foreign traffic, as well as quicker and more punctual delivery. Sir W. Tomlinson, M.P., said that the expenditure of vast sums by Railways on docks and steamships for the encouragement of foreign traffic was of itself a preferential treatment against home produce quite as much as the lower rates.

The Committee have difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words "preference" and "undue preference." A is a Port, C is a Market, B is an Agricultural District half-way between A and C. The

trader at B sees foreign goods in large quantities rushed at 40 miles an hour from A to C at lower rates than he can get for small quantities. He says this is preference, and that accounts for the appointment of this Committee.

This is accounted for by the Railways on the grounds of the greater bulk, more constant and regular supply, better packing, causing much less cost in attending to it. Also the undeniable fact that the competition of water transit is so severe that the rates must be as low, or lower than, the water rate to London, or they would lose the profit from it and would have to get more from the inland trader.

The Committee recognise the justification of the explanation, and cordially admit the generous offers and efforts of the great Railways to stimulate local agricultural trading which have met with very scanty recognition by the local trader. He cannot expect small, irregular, and ill-packed consignments at the same rates and facilities as are given to large, regular, and well-packed consignments.

At the same time, the Committee consider that the British agriculturist is entitled to fair and generous treatment, and he should be able to demand as a right such rates and facilities as his foreign or colonial rival. And in case of a dispute as to what is reasonable, as it might be difficult for an ordinary trader to conduct his case, the Board of Agriculture, when satisfied of its reasonableness, should take up his case against the Railways.

The view of the majority of the Committee is that preferential treatment means that they are to inquire into undue preference outside of what is sanctioned by the existing law.

Dealing with this view, the Committee find that the evidence has not established the existence of any such undue preference.

Parliament, as far back as 1854, distinctly recognised the principle of charging lower rates for traffic sent long distances and traffic in large quantities, as well as closely packed. It was on this principle that the Southampton case was settled.

The Southampton case was this. The London and South-Western Railway was carrying foreign fresh meat from Southampton to London, 76 miles (not carted), for 12s 6d per ton; and from Salisbury S. to S., 84½ miles (for dead meat), 25s 4d per ton, or 100 per cent. more. In seventeen months 10,638 tons of foreign meat, in 286 consignments, was carried, averaging 37 tons each. From Salisbury, 231 tons was sent in 825 consignments, averaging 5½ cwt. The Court held that that was not undue preference, and dismissed the case. The Railways contend that if the

loads and other things are equal the rates will be equal. The legal expenses of that case cost the promoters £2000.

The total imports into Great Britain in 1903 were £528,247,850. This trade came through 89 ports—70 in England and 19 in Scotland. But about 93 per cent. of this trade came through 15 ports, as under:—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| London | imported | £137,132,088 |
| Liverpool | ,, | 129,000,840 |
| Hull | ,, | 32,601,063 |
| Manchester | ,, | 20,279,255 |
| Harwich | ,, | 19,391,913 |
| Southampton | ,, | 15,740,195 |
| Glasgow | ,, | 14,408,658 |
| Leith | ,, | 13,787,191 |
| Bristol | ,, | 12,751,022 |
| Newhaven, | ,, | 11,349,840 |
| Folkestone, | ,, | 11,053,872 |
| Grimsby | ,, | 10,148,431 |
| Newcastle | ,, | 10,051,602 |
| Dover | ,, | 8,272,691 |
| Goole | ,, | 6,391,159 |
| | | £488,359,816 |

This shows that imports go in in full train loads and home produce in small quantities, and the Railways argue that the home traders are only entitled to similar rates under similar circumstances.

Some of the witnesses strongly advocated equal mileage rates, but the Committee agree that equal mileage rates are quite impracticable. It would prevent Railways from lowering their fares and rates to compete with both sea and canal traffic, or against other Railways' shorter routes, and the result would be no contention.

The conclusion the Committee have arrived at is that the evidence tendered has failed to show that the Railways are giving undue preference to foreign produce contrary to the intention of the existing law, and the Committee are not prepared to recommend that any further steps should be taken either by legislation or otherwise.

(Signed) JERSEY.
,, W. KENYON SLANEY.
,, JAMES L. MACKAY.
,, HERBERT JERKYLL.
,, CHAS. L. OWENS.
,, L. F. GOODAY.

# THE POST OFFICE AND THE RAILWAYS.

It has been said, and is admitted by our leading economists, that if our Railways were administered by the Government on the lines of the Post Office, and both were working into each other's hands, a very great saving in convenience and money would accrue to the country. The saving alone in the clerical work between the two great departments of the trading life of this country would be very great, and when we take into consideration the large number of men sent from the Post Offices to load and unload the King's mails, which could easily be done by the porters on the stations along with the other goods they handle, it is surely enough to make all the thinking portion of the King's subjects pause.

In 1905 and 1906 the total paid by the Post Office for the conveyance of the mails in the two islands was £1,928,115. Of this sum the Railways in England and Wales got £775,840; Scotland got £208,990; Ireland got £170,230. Of this sum the London and North-Western gets £195,795 for Railway hauling, and from Holyhead to Kingston, £105,320; making a total of £300,010.

The Great Western comes next with £143,290, then the Caledonian picks up as its share £73,287, and the Midland, £80,115, then the Great Southern and Western (Ireland), with £57,673.

The cost of mail bags, hampers, hand-carts, and carriages for the United Kingdom was £88,300. If the two systems were under one control not half of this waste would be required; the hampers and baskets would not be wanted.

It is somewhat remarkable that the London and North-Western, for carrying the mails, gets more than one-fourth of all the money that is paid to England and Wales, and one-sixth of all the money that is paid in the United Kingdom by the Post Office for the same purpose, although it has only one-eighth of the invested capital sunk in the Railways on the two Islands.

Then again, the Post Office pays the Railways £177,000 a year for the part use of their telegraph offices, poles, and wires.

Then with regard to the salaries of the Post Office officials and those

of the Railways. The salary of the Postmaster-General is £2500 per annum. It is currently reported that the L. & N.-W. Railway General Manager gets £12,000.

The highest paid postmaster in London — the South-Western district—gets £700 per annum. The General Manager of the North Eastern Railway is said to get £7500. The highest paid official in the Dublin Post Office is paid £1200.

The General Manager of the Caledonian Railway gets £5000. The highest paid official in the Edinburgh Post Office gets £1200 per annum.

The North British Railway General Manager gets £4000. Taking the total postal officials for London at 18,810, and the money that is voted by Parliament to pay them yearly, £1,933,660, or an average of £102 16s 6d; or, taking the London Post Office in a little more detail, nine men, including the Postmaster-General, get £12,710, or an average of £1412 per annum.

Nine solicitors get £7150, an average of £794 per annum, and 18 medical men pick up £4600, averaging £255 11s a year. Then the secretaries' clerks, numbering 794, get £126,200, or an average of £156 8s 5d each.

Next comes the Accountant-General's department, with 1496 employees getting £182,800, an average of £122 3s 2d. Then the Stores Department, with 809 men receiving £75,800, averaging £92 14s 1½d each. Then last, but not least, the London Postal Service Department, consisting of 15,675 men, are paid £1,524,400, an average of £97 5s 1d, or about 37s 3d weekly.

And in England in Wales, excluding London, there are 80,804 employees receiving £5,267,100, or an average of £65 1s 1d per annum. 44,142 of these are postmen or porters. They get £2,337,000, or an average of £52 1s 10½d—about £1 per week.

Twenty policemen in London get £4000, or £200 a year.

And having a peep behind the scenes in the dear old land across the Channel, we find 59 gentlemen in the Dublin Secretary's office getting £15,040, an average of £255. One solitary solicitor in the 58 gets £1000 a year. I should think the money is worth him. He has a professional clerk getting £500 a year, and he is allowed £600 a year for clerical assistance. Not bad, is it?

Then there is a medical officer (only one) getting £760 per annum, £20 less than the preceding year. He seems to get no assistance. We will not be able to understand how he pulls through.

Then in the accountant's office there are 166 clerks getting £18,320 (including 36 females), or an average of about £110 7s 3d a year.

In the stores department there are 32 men getting £2610, each averaging £85 3s per annum.

Of postmen and telegraphists, there are 1966 allowed the sum of £166,755, giving per head annually £84 2s 7d.

The total employees in the Dublin Post Office are 2223. The money they get amounts to £202,840, an average of £91 3s 2½d.

Then in Ireland, excluding Dublin, the whole postal officials number 11,786, and they get as wages or salaries the sum of £536,600, or an average of £44 13s 7d per annum.

Out of the above, 7324 are postmen and porters. They get £271,100, an average of £37,0s 3d—about 14s 2d per week.

Then next comes "cauld, calculating, puir auld Scotland." In the Secretary's office in Edinburgh there are 74 clerks receiving £12,393, averaging about £167 9s 5½d a year.

Included in the 74 is another solitary lawyer getting only £500, with a paltry £100 a year added to pay a clerk and office rent. If the Dublin lawyer is value to the country for £2100 a year, is it not another injustice to Scotland to pay her solitary lawyer only £600?

But it seems to be true that there are things in heaven and earth that no ordinary Scotsman can understand.

Then Edinburgh has included in the above 74 a medical officer getting £730 a year, and in the Accountant's office there are 141 clerks getting £18,666, or an average of £132 7s 8d.

Postmen and Telegraph Office employees number 1828, and they receive annually £150,181, averaging about £82 3s 1½d.

The total employees in Edinburgh are 2043, getting £181,240, averaging £88 14s 3d.

Then Scotland, excluding Edinburgh, has 13,068 postal officials receiving £782,700, an average of £59 17s 10d a year.

Out of this, 7722 postmen and porters get £369,500, an average of £47 17s a year, or about 18s 5d per week.

It was not my intention in going into the question of the economic relations naturally existing between the Post Office and the Railways, further than to show that the nation and the Government had nothing to fear from the amalgamation of the two great departments through which the commercial life blood of the nation circulates, but perhaps I will not be unduly annoying my readers (if I have the good luck to get any), by

pointing out a few seeming anomalies in our Post Office system in regard to the prices the Government pays for brains and labour in different parts of the nation.

Of course we may not be much wiser after studying the points of difference in payments for what seems to be the same service, as we get no explanation, and can give none. For instance, in London our Post Office has nine General Secretaries. They get an average of £1412 per annum. In Dublin there is one getting £1200 a year, and in Edinburgh another draws for his services £1200 a year.

Then the clerks in the above Secretaries' office in London. Their salaries average £161 9s 8½d per annum, and the men doing the same work in Edinburgh get £167 9s 6d, while the men in the Secretary's office in Dublin are paid £255 a year. This should surely not be another injustice to the Old Country.

Again, in London the average paid to the Post Office solicitors is £794, and in Edinburgh her solicitor, to pay a professional clerk and office rent, gets £600, while in Dublin one solicitor and one clerk, and no allowance for rent, gets £2100. This arrangement should suit the spirits across the water.

The medical doctors belonging to the London Post Office get an average of £255 11s, and the Dublin one gets £760 a year, while the Edinburgh doctor gets £730. Again the Dublin man is top dog.

In the Stores Department of the London Post Office the average salary is £93 13s 11d; the same workmen in Dublin, £85 3s, and in the Edinburgh Stores Department the poor fellows there only get £58 17s 3d a year. Ireland again comes up with her flying colours, and poor Scotland is left with nothing but her scratching post.

The average wage for postmen and porters in London is £1 13s per week. To the same class of men in Dublin is paid £1 13s 9d; and to postmen and porters in Edinburgh, £1 11s 4d per week. Pat is still to the front.

The average salary for postmen and officials in England and Wales, excluding London, is £62 18s, and for all classes in Scotland, excluding Edinburgh, £59 3s 4d, and for Ireland, excluding Dublin, £45 2s. John and Sandy get the advantage of Pat this turn.

The average wage in England and Wales, excluding London, for postmen and porters is £1 per week, and for Scotland, excluding Edinburgh, 18s 6d, and for Ireland, excluding Dublin, 14s 2d per week.

In Germany the lowest paid Post Office official gets 800 marks, or 15s 4½d per week.

Why Dublin should be paid so much, and the rest of our common country so much less, must be left to the imaginations of those who are able to unravel the Courts of London and Dublin.

There is another great advantage that all the Post Office people have, and if the Railways were amalgamated with them they would more than likely get also—that is, the superannuation fund the Government is paying this year (1904) to the Post Office laid-off servants, numbering 6296—£478,000, an average of about £76 a year. The Post Office has solved the old age pension difficulty. There is also their compassionate allowances to widows and children of men who have lost their lives in the service. Thirty-eight get £488, or an average of about £13 a year.

Mr Austen Chamberlain, Postmaster General, in his annual report to the Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, 27th July 1903, page 3, says:—"During the year the Great Western Railway Company had given notice to terminate the contract for the conveyance of the mails over their lines, and demanded £290,000, instead of the £125,000 which they were getting. I was unable to concede their request, and appealed to the Railway Commissioners, and they were awarded by the Commission £135,855. This includes the cost of the new special trains between London and Penzance. The matter is not, however, finally settled, as the Company have given notice of appeal to the Law Courts."

This appeal came up on the 1st of August 1903 before the Master of the Rolls and Lords Matthew and Cozens Hardy against the Postmaster General. The Company employed Mr Gripp, K.C.; Mr Asquith, K.C.; and Mr F. G. Thomas. For the Government, the Solicitor-General and Mr Cassery. Counsel pointed out that in 1884 the Post Office paid the Company £93,000 annually for carrying the Post Office mails.

When this contract was made in 1884, the weight of the mails carried annually was about 250 tons, so it appears that they got £371 per ton for pulling the mails along on the Railway. Their next contract was for £115,000. After working for this sum for some years, and owing to the Plymouth and Southampton mail boats causing them more work, they appealed to the Post Office for more money. A Commission was appointed, which gave them £127,630. This they were not satisfied with, and they appealed to the Lords as above. Their Counsel pointed out that the work had enormously increased. The weight of the mails had increased from 250 tons to 18,000 tons, and, on the basis of their previous contracts, they should be paid £323,000 per annum, or over £16

per ton. But after making due allowances for rebates and set-offs, the contract should be at least £290,618, or still about £15 per ton. The Company said they had to run express trains something like 240,000 train miles a year, and that the trains were run at exceptional hours, but the Lords dismissed their case, with costs. They have now got their 1905 contracts raised to £143,290—about £8 per ton—and I think they should be glad to get it. They do nothing but pull the bags and baskets along the rails. The postmen put them in the vans and take them out. The whole thing is ridiculous.

The success of the Great Western led to a more serious state of matters with the North Western. They struck work altogether, and left the American mails from the "Etruria" from Saturday morning at 7 A.M. till 2.35 A.M. on Monday, till the Post Office agreed to give them what they wanted. They are the masters of the country, not the servants. The country and the Government are nearly constantly at war or at law with the Railways, and we pay them a million a year for carrying the mails.

We are told on the best authority that to run an express train the expense is 3s per mile. 240,000 miles at 3s is £36,000. They are getting now (1905) £143,290 for running this 240,000 miles, or about 11s 11¾d per mile.

Taking the population of London as in 1904 at 4,597,110, the expense of conducting the London Postal system was 8s 4¾d per head; and the population of Edinburgh and Leith at 401,511, the same work cost them 9s 0¼d per head; and Dublin, with its suburbs, per head of the population, taking them at 379,003—10s 8½d.

Taking the two islands at 42 millions, it cost each individual 4s 11½d to earn 7s 6¾d per annum.

A Committee stated that the Railway Companies have it in their power to prevent the due transmission of the Post Office mails, and force the public to pay whatever they think fit for their conveyance.

The postal revenue for the year 1904, including the value of services rendered to other departments, was £16,274,978, an increase over the previous year of £450,584. The postal expenditure was £11,455,785, an increase of £254,663 on that of the previous year. The net profit was £4,819,193, or £458,983 more than 1903. This shows a profit of 30 per cent. on the turnover.

The telegraph revenue for the same year was £3,920,023, showing an increase over the previous year of £183,908; and

the expenditure was £4,857,518, an increase of £163,620 over the previous year. The net deficit on expenditure on telegraphs was £937,495, or £20,288 less than last year.

If allowance be made for interest on the capital of £10,867,644 paid for the stock of the old Telegraph Company, the deficit on the year 1904 would then be raised to £1,215,978.

Mr Austen Chamberlain in his budget speech in 1904 stated that the Government had paid to the old Telegraph Company seven times more than the business was worth. This means that they got nearly eleven millions for what was worth only one and a half millions.

Then the average telegram under the old Company cost 1s 5½d, and now under the present Government system the cost of the same thing averages 7.41d per message, or less than one half its previous cost.

Our parcel post for the United Kingdom in 1904 distributed 97,231,000 parcels. The average weight of each parcel was 3¼ lbs., or about 2,709,196 cwt., coming out at about 125,460 tons. The gross receipts for doing this work were £1,902,048, an average of 5.5d per parcel, or about £15 17s 6d per ton.

The Railways for hauling the parcels along their lines got from the above gross receipts, £895,369, leaving the Post Office £1,006,679 to pay for all the shipping and road contracts. All over the three Kingdoms, the Railways are getting an average of £10 per ton for hauling the parcels along their lines. The Post Office does all the rest of the work.

If the Railways did for the Post Office what they do for the general public—namely, gather in and deliver the goods—they would want £24 per ton. According to the Great Northern time table for July 1904, they carry a parcel of from 3 to 4 lbs. any distance in the United Kingdom for 6d. They don't collect, but at their parcel offices (where they have them) and at their stations, they only deliver parcels within a reasonable distance of their stations. They put their own meaning on the word reasonable distance, and they charge at the rate of about £14 per ton for the parcel, against the £10 they get from the Post Office.

The estimated weight of letters, post cards, and other articles exchanged by the United Kingdom with our Colonies and foreign countries in the year 1904 was as follows:—Despatched from the British Isles 11,535 tons through the Post Office, and imported from the Colonies and other countries through the same channel 4967 tons, making a total of mails exported and imported 16,502 tons.

For this work the Post Office paid Shipping Companies

£781,790. This works out at about £48 per ton. Not bad, is it, for carrying mail bags and parcel baskets over the seas in their ships? This enables them to carry all sorts of goods from New York and Boston to Cape Colony and Durban for 15s per ton, while they are charging about 40s from our own manufacturers at home to South Africa, and they are, as a rule, well subsidised besides.

On the 18th August 1903, Mr A. Chamberlain, Postmaster General, appointed a Committee, consisting of Sir Edward Bradford, chairman; Charles Booth, Thomas Bradrick, R. Burbidge, and Samuel Fay, to enquire into the scales of pay to Post Office servants in the various departments, such as postmen, sorters, telegraphists, etc.

In their report, issued on the 9th May 1904, they say (page 13, paragraph 60).—The difference in the maximum salaries constitute one of the most severe grievances, the present system involving a disparity of from 2s to 22s a week. It is contended that the same duties are performed, and the mental strain is the same all over the country, and that the variations in the cost of living do not justify the existing difference. They give a few illustrations, as these below, of the maximum salary per week for the same or similar work :—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Devonport | 44s. | Plymouth | 52s. |
| Birkenhead | 50s. | Liverpool | 56s. |
| Oldham | 44s. | Manchester | 56s. |
| Port Glasgow | 36s. | Greenock | 56s. |
| Irvine | 36s. | Kilmarnock | 44s. |
| Eccles | 36s. | Llandudno | 44s. |
| Camlarne | 36s. | Redruth | 40s. |
| Colwyn Bay | 36s. | | |

But even these maximum wages would compare, I think, very favourably with the maximum wages of our railwaymen. Let them see to it when they have some time to think.

## Postal Servants' Grievances.

On the vote of £2,615,509 for salaries and working expenses of the postal and telegraph services,

Sir Albert Rollit asked whether the Postmaster General could see his way to accepting the recommendations of the Bradford Commission with a view to the removal of the grievances from which postal employees in various branches had long held that they suffered. There was, he insisted, no economy in underpaid labour, and he trusted that the State, which should be a model employer, would at last redress a grievance that had been of too long standing.

Mr Lough urged the Postmaster General to give effect at once and without reserve to the recommendations of the Commission.

Mr Claude Hay blamed both parties for having acquiesced in the present unsatisfactory position of affairs with regard to wages and conditions of employment, and taunted the Liberal Party with having done nothing.

Mr Broadhurst said the hon. member had spoken as if the Post Office was a branch of the Primrose League.

Mr H. Heaton strongly urged members not to yield to pressure put upon them, or allow themselves to be intimidated by the enormous number of postal servants, whom he would like to see disfranchised.

After the usual interval, Sir J. Haslett and others continued the discussion.

Sir G. Parker said he agreed with the report, which showed that the claims of the Post Office servants were just and sound.

Lord Stanley held that all such questions as the pay of Government employees should be referred, not to the House, but to a judicial body on whom no outside influence could be brought. The Committee were asked to report as to the conditions of Post Office employment as compared with other trades. They did not do that, but took, as the basis on which to frame their report, three propositions — the number of the men, their capacity, and their contentment, and they said their discontent was so great that the Government must raise their wages. That was a direct premium on discontent. The Committee went outside the reference. The report involved a reorganisation of the whole service, and it was quite impossible to put it in operation. He quite admitted that the report had shown there were increases that would have to be given, and he proposed to go into the subject during the autumn.

Five days after the above statement by Lord Stanley, a mass meeting of the Post Office employees was held—Mr A. J. Massedale, Chairman of the Association, presiding. The Chairman explained that the meeting was called to protest against the statement of the Postmaster General that the Bradford Committee had overstepped their instructions in recommending that the men's wages should be more equalised. He said when Mr A. Chamberlain appointed the Committee they were well qualified to look into the question; yet they had the Postmaster General saying in the House of Commons that the Committee had gone beyond their powers. Mr E. J. Nevill proposed that the report of the Bradford Commission was a record and proof of the justice of the claims of the employees of the Post

Office. The resolution was seconded by Mr J. Norman, and unanimously carried.

Our new Postmaster General, Lord Stanley, seems to think that the Railways are badly wronged by having to pull the mail bags and baskets along their road at £10 a ton.

On the 10th August 1904, Sir C. Scotter, Chairman of the London and South Western, intimated to the shareholders that for some years the Post Office had been paying them £36,000 for pulling the mails. But they had now got a new arrangement by which they would get £55,410 for the next seven years. He also said that he had managed to get a reduction of their rates and taxes of £1376. The average Railway rates and taxes are about five-eights of a penny per pound on their invested capital, and the country has to keep up police, gaols, hospitals, roads, streets, and workhouses, as much or more for the protection of their propertty and the help of their workmen as any other class of the King's subjects.

Sir Edward Pemberton, presiding at the meeting of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, had also good news from the Postmaster General. They are to receive an increase of £30,000 a year for the next five years, and they are to get it without any additional expense to the Company. Their contract was raised from £31,085 to £65,060. His Lordship seems to have been a Godsend to the Railways on the southern part of the Island. Will he do as much for the northern ? He is a great blessing to them.

Lord Stanley goes on to say—I am pleased to report that the absence on sick leave of the general staff where the Department has its own medical officer has been considerably reduced, only 6 per cent. of the men and 11.7 per cent. of the women were off ill in 1904. He tells us he has 1832 medical officers mending and repairing the bodies of the Post Office workers, and the number of Post Office servants getting free medical attendance is 116,541. But he does not say a word about the number of parsons he has curing their souls. What does the Church think of this ?

The number of Post Offices in Great Britain and Ireland in 1904 was 23,068, or more than one per mile of line. The number of persons employed by the Post Office in 1904 was—Males, 72,534 ; females, 11,574—total, 84,113.

Our Railway Companies have over and over again asserted that they were not sufficiently paid for the carrying of our mails, but the Postmaster General has proved that the Companies get over four times the money paid to the ordinary mail coaches for the same service.

It was said when penny postage was proposed that people only wrote letters they were obliged to write, and so the revenue would lose heavily. Colonel Maberly, the Post Office chief of that day, declared that the revenue would not be recovered during the next forty years. He was a poor guesser The monopoly of the Post Office is a mutual co-operative concern in which every member of the community has an interest, and which every one helps to maintain in efficiency and good working order by watchful supervision. It is maintained for the general good of the community and for the public service.

When a short Act of Parliament was proposed to enable the Post Office to carry parcels of 11 lbs. and under, the Companies opposed it strongly. The promoters pointed out that only country districts would take advantage of it, and that it would not affect districts served by a Railway. The opposition was so strong and powerful that the Government had to promise to pay the Companies 11-20ths of all the money the Post Office got for parcels going over the Railways They had to find the baskets to put the parcels in, men to put the baskets in the trains, and take them out as well. This arrangement caused the Post Office to spend £500,000 on baskets, and to employ a great many more men than they otherwise needed; but with all that the Post Office commenced to carry parcels all over the island at 11 lbs. for 1s 6d, and some years ago this was reduced to 1s, and now to 11d. When the Post Office commenced to carry parcels at these rates the Railways lowered their charges for small parcels 50 to 60 per cent., and they soon began to compete with the Postmaster General in a much more expensive way.

In the town of Dudley, and in the first street you enter from the station, near the Market Place, is the L. N. W. Ry. Co.'s receiving office. A few doors further on is the G. W. Ry. Co.'s office, on the other side of the street is the Midland's, and a little further up is the Post Office. I asked a friend one morning if he could tell me how many receiving offices were in Dudley before the coming of the Parcel Post. He said, not one. We had to carry all parcels to the stations. Now, these three offices in the centre of the town cannot cost the Companies less than £600 a year, and all this is spent to oppose the Post Office in its parcel work. They are not content with the two-thirds of the income of the Parcel Post.

In Nottingham the four Companies running there have over forty parcel receiving shops, fighting the Post Office and each other. It must cost thousands of pounds in that one town, and in all large towns where there are two Railways contending the same thing is going on.

In 1891 our Postmaster General put on coaches from London to Chelmsford, and Colchester, Oxford *via* Reading, Chatham, Tunbridge Wells, Hitchin, Bedford, and Brighton, and boasted that by employing horse flesh and the roads, instead of locomotives and steel rails, he saved the country £15,000 per annum.

We were twitted with the statement that, if the Railway servants were under the Government, they would use their votes to forward their own ends, and in the House of Commons on 6th July 1905 it was suggested from both sides of the House, and supported by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that in cases where civil servants put in claims for alterations of their conditions of service, the question should be relegated to a committee of private citizens, where no political pressure could be brought to bear upon their decision, and it should be final.

Every fault or shortcoming of the State is magnified and multiplied by the hundred-eyed critics and Argus Press, and when tested is generally found to be baseless. We hear remarkably little of the defaults of the Post Office. It is not in administrative functions that men differ, but in political. The Railways are entirely administrative, as the Post Office is.

If you have looked upon the Post Office Pension Fund arrangements and results, look now upon the Railway Pension Fund deficit of £482,937. The Railway Clearing-House Pension Fund has a membership of 15,319. In 1893 they had a surplus fund of £98,115, and now, 19th December 1904, a deficit as above. The system of gathering the fund is as follows:—Each office boy, clerk, or general manager, pays 2½ per cent. off his wages or salary, whatever that may be; the Companies contribute an amount that will bring up the yield of the investment to 4 per cent. This system gave the Clearing-House Clerks' Fund an increase of over £5000 a year. At the commencement of the Pension Fund, benefits were based upon the members' whole payments into the fund. A man starting at 5s per week and ending his career at £5000 a year received superannuation on the average for his whole time as an employee.

But in 1893 the system was re-arranged, to take effect in 1897, to pay pensions on the average of the last seven years' salaries, instead of over the whole period of the service. This was opposed by a number of members in the Clearing-House as being unsound finance and unjust working. But the bosses had their way, with the result we see now.

The new system works out in this way:—The pensioner since 1897 has been getting two-thirds of his pay for the last seven years of his service. Take the case of a clerk getting £2 per week; on

retiring, his pension is £1 6s 8d. Then the case of a General Manager, his salary is £3000 a year, his pension would be two thousand a year. The result has been that the big paid men have retired as soon as ever they possibly could, and lived as long as they could see anybody else living, and the result is they have eaten up the reserve and run in debt half a million in a few years.

Now, suppose we take the £3000 men on the old system. For the first seven years of his service he got £25 a year ; the next seven, £60 ; the following seven, £200 ; then another seven at £1000 ; and for the last twelve years, making forty in all, he gets £3000 a year. The average would give him £750. This is a sensible difference from £2000, which has ruined the Society, which will cause wide-spread misery to all save the highly paid men, unless the Companies step in and guarantee the old scale instead of the present one, which seems to be an impossible undertaking.

The Actuaries, appointed to inquire into the Pension Fund upon the basis of the last seven years' arrangements, say the high pensions have naturally tempted the highly paid officials to retire young at the age of 60, so that the retiring rate has nearly increased five-fold.

The Actuaries state that the Directors of the Railways hesitate less to retire an official when they know that he has a substantial pension waiting on him, and the man himself has no objection to an easier and a pleasanter position.

Lord Claude Hamilton, the Chairman of the Fund Committee, in a circular, dated 12th December 1904, states—I cannot help admitting that I am greatly disappointed at the result of the last ten years' working as shown by the report of the Actuaries, and I deeply regret the necessity for giving effect to these present recommendations. I feel, however, that, taking all circumstances into consideration, and always bearing in mind that the Companies are contributors to the Fund, and that it is essential to its future solvency that the extra voluntary payment which they contribute should in no way be imperilled, I can but recommend the contributing members, as a wise though painful necessity, to agree to the alteration scale now recommended by the Actuaries.

Those who advocate Railway Nationalisation are constantly twitted by the man in the street with the want of ability of Government officials, that the half of them are imbeciles tied hand and foot with red tape, blundering and plundering all round them. Have they ever done anything to match the management of the Railway Clearing-House Pension Fund? Has ever

anything happened in the Post Office, or any other Government Department, to match the glaring stupidity of paying big pensions to a few highly salaried individuals, and doing the poor ones out of the small pittance they were struggling for? I think my reader will judge.

At the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce assembled in the Whitehall Rooms, Hotel Metropole, 2nd March 1905, Mr O. S. Hall, representing the Bury Chambers, moved that, in the opinion of this meeting, it is necessary in the interests of our trade, commerce, and agriculture, that inland and over-sea postage rates and regulations should be revised and simplified; that this resolution be forwarded to the Postmaster General. In support of the motion, Mr Hall said that it was possible to carry much cheaper than we at present did; that could be seen by comparing our rates with those of other countries. Germany charged for all parcels up to 11 lbs. weight, 6d, whereas we had 10 different rates up to 11 lbs. The first three rates were a little under 6d; the other seven rates average 50 per cent. over Germany, till we had to pay 1s for what the Germans were getting done for 6d. The limit with our Post Office is 11 lbs. The Post Office in Germany carries up to 1 cwt., with a scale varying according to the distance. 15 lbs. for 50 miles was 11d; 17 lbs., 20 miles, for 10d; and 21 lbs., 10 miles, for 6d. Austria-Hungary had the same rates as Germany, and they exchanged parcels as if they were the same country. Switzerland had only 3 parcel rates up to 11 lbs, charging 1½d, 2½d, and 4d, against our 3d, 8d, and 1s. For 1 lb., 6 lbs., and 11 lbs., France had only two rates up to 11 lbs., and conveyed heavier parcels. Denmark had only 3 rates against our 10, and carried for 2d, 3d, and 4d, against our 4d, 7d, and 1s. Holland had only 3 rates—3d, 4d, and 5d, as against our 4d, 8d, and 1s. In conclusion, Mr Hall advocated one or two rates up to 11 lbs., instead of ten rates; an increase in the limit of weight; and a great reduction in the charges, which were greatly out of proportion to those charged in other countries, and in many cases prohibitive, owing to forming too large a percentage of the value of the produce, and other articles, which might and could be more widely distributed. He had not exhausted the subject, but he was considerate of the time of the Chambers and trusted sufficient facts had been given to enable them to pass the resolution unanimously.

The motion was seconded by Mr H. Nuttal, President of the Manchester Chamber, and supported by Mr Wigley, *Nottingham*, and carried unanimously.

# WASTEFUL MANAGEMENT IN IRELAND.

In Ireland the Railway system has all the evils of the English system intensified. The wrong of preferential rates is greater, and the deficiencies of facilities and accommodation are scandalous. The management is the most wasteful in Europe, and the high charges for travelling result in this: that while each inhabitant of England makes an average of 25 Railway journeys yearly and Scotland 25, in Ireland the average is only 6. In Ireland there are 3000 miles of line, and no less than 303 directors, and 128 clearing house clerks to manage them—one director to every ten miles of line. They do not go without fees, and they enjoy free first-class travelling all over the country. In addition to these directors, there are 87 secretaries and 60 other highly placed officials, such as solicitors, actuaries, etc. Thus there is a director or high official for every 7½ miles of Railway line.

On the Cork and Passage Railway, which has a total length of seven miles, there is a Board of 7 directors, a secretary, and an engineer, and this example of Irish Railways is not a solitary one. The State from time to time has given grants of £5,000,000 to Irish Railways, not including the light railways of recent legislation, and it seems strange that such large grants of the taxpayers' money should be used to the disadvantage of the community. Sir George Findlay, late General Manager of L. & N. W. Ry., stated before a Commission of Inquiry on Irish Railways, that he could do all the work of the 303 Irish directors on four days of the week, and go salmon fishing on the Shannon the rest of the time.

The Hon. H. Monsell said that three intelligent men sitting in Dublin could conduct the business better and more profitably.

Belfast competes with French flaxspinners and manufacturers, but the Railways which take the Frenchman's goods from Lille to London charge only 28s 8d per ton. The Ulsterman has to pay 42s 6d. Stranorlen, Donegal,

to Belfast is 86 miles—rate, 21s 8d per ton. But from Ghent to Belfast, *via* either Goole, Hull, or Leith, the rate is only 18s 8d. A witness before the Commissioners said the Irish rates were so high that it was the practice of Irish soap-makers to ship their goods to an English port, and then have them sent back to Ireland for transit to an Irish inland town, in order to get the benefit of through English rates.

A Galway distillery bought 1000 tons of barley, grown in the valley of the Shannon, for several years. It was shipped on a canal at various points, taken to Ballinasloe, and then sent by rail to Galway. The Railway Coy. gave notice of an increase of rates on the carriage between Ballinasloe and Galway, and now the whole of that barley comes from Glasgow, and an important industry in the Shannon valley has been stifled.

English lines carry five tons bone-dust for manure 120 miles for 25s. Irish lines charge 20s for 20 miles. Sheep from Boston, Mass., are carried to Liverpool or Manchester at 2s 6d per head, but from various points of Ireland to Manchester the rate is 4s per head. It is alleged as a fact that it is cheaper to take beer from Burton to Cork than to carry Guinness' stout from Dublin to Cork. All efforts to restore the woollen industry in Ireland have been stopped by the high Railway rates. Since Belgium purchased her State Railways, rates and fares have been reduced 40 per cent.

The following interview with Deputy John L. Sayer, who has been at Billingsgate for sixty years, appeared in the *Daily News* of 28th November 1902:—

*Q.*—You are interested in Irish fisheries, I believe?

*A.*—Yes; I am doing my best to develop the Irish fish trade. God meant the fish for man, but heavy Railway charges are a great obstacle. The through rates from Donegal to London are for common fish 60s per ton, and for the best fish 100s per ton; and yet the moderates say that neither England nor Ireland have any grievance in this question of Railway rates. We wonder what a ton of tinned salmon from America would be in comparison with 100s from Donegal to London.

A ton of eggs from County Galway to London would cost 90s 10d, while a ton of eggs from any part of Denmark would only cost 24s to the same market. But a ton of eggs from Russia only cost 22s, and a ton of eggs from Normandy or Brittany to London only cost 16s 8d. One result of these rates is that the Irish egg trade has been almost entirely destroyed.

Mechanics' tools, from Liverpool to Haulbowline, Queenstown, south of Ireland, cost 40s per ton. The same goods from Liverpool to Bermuda, *via* New York, cost 22s 6d per ton.

The Irish Railways pay no passenger duty, the British pay a quarter of a million a year, yet the average Irish fare is much higher.

England's average fare is 7.86d.
Scotland's ,, ,, 8.31d.
Ireland's ,, ,, 13.2d.

THIRD CLASS FARES IN

| Miles. | | Denmark. | Russia. | Belgium. | Holland. | Sweden. | Germany. | Ireland. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 66 | ..... | 2s 5d. | 3s 0d. | 3s 3d. | 3s 4d. | 4s 0d. | 4s 5d. | 5s 5d. |
| 107 | ..... | 3s 5d. | 4s 9d. | 5s 2d. | 5s 1d. | 6s 6d. | 7s 0d. | 8s 11d. |
| 165 | ..... | 4s 4d. | 6s 5d. | 8s 2d. | 8s 2d. | 10s 5d. | 10s 8d. | 13s 9d. |

Professor Long says the whole of these figures are official, and they show the Irish fares to be the highest in Europe, and I believe them to be the highest in the world.

Mr Mareton Frewen says butter is carried over the Belgian Railways at a fraction over ½d per ton per mile. From Tralee to Cork, 83 miles, the rate is 15s 10d, or 2⅝d per ton per mile. Grain should be carried for a farthing, and coal for half a farthing per ton per mile. Coal is carried from Ohio to New York at 8 tons for a penny per mile. He says, "I am certain that every man that pays £50 a year to the Irish Railways would save at least £30 were the Irish Railways managed by a Committee in Dublin."

The average goods, mineral, and passenger rates in the three Kingdoms are as follows :—

| | Goods. | Minerals. | Passengers. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Scotland ..... | 5s 2½d. | 2s 3¼d. | 7.86d. |
| England ..... | 5s 6½d. | 2s 7½d | 8.31d. |
| Ireland ..... | 6s 8½d. | 6s 7½d. | 13.2d. |

The charge for minerals in Ireland is about 200 per cent. higher than on the bigger Island, although each mile of Railway in Britain cost £54,000, and only £12,000 in Ireland. Professor Sullivan reported to a Royal Commission that the Railway charge for sulphur ore from Avoca to Kingston, a distance of 39 miles, was 50 per cent. on the value of the sulphur.

Mr P. J. O'Connor Glym, of Guinness' Brewery, Dublin, stated that the mileage rates for porter, at 2s 4d and 2s 2d, were in England 9d and 8d.

An Irish national system of Railways would give the Government a better organised control of the country, a central point at every station for postal and telegraph purposes, and enable it to develop its resources to a degree not yet attained to.

In 1902 the Irish Railways drew, for the work they did, £3,885,962.

54 per cent. of that came from passengers' fares, and 46 per cent. from goods. This reverses, so far as I know, the Railway income of the world. Goods in all other countries pay most of their revenue.

The labour conditions are miserable. Some of the drivers are getting as little as 3s 6d, and the firemen 2s 6d per day, and shunters' wages are often not over 15s per week, while many full grown men are acting as porters at 12s per week, and again, in spite of our Railway Hours of Labour Act, many of the men are working 12, 13, and 14 hours at a stretch.

Mr W. Field, M.P., in his booklet, "Irish Railways," says we have about 3000 miles of Railways, and to manage them there are 303 directors, 97 managers and engineers, 60 auditors and solicitors, 128 clearing-house clerks, or more than one to every 5 miles of Railway. The Irish Railways pay no passenger duty, and the Government have given the Irish Railways 5 millions of money to keep down the charges. The Companies proposed to raise the rates 38 per cent. higher.

The late Mr James MacCann, M.P. for Dublin, speaking as Chairman of the Irish Canal Commissioners, said, as regards Canada and the United States, the rate is about ¼d per ton per mile. Here the rate for the same goods is 5 farthings per ton per mile. It was easier, he added, to send a Wexford plough to Roumania than to Cork.

A few samples from letters written by traders to Mr John Shawe-Taylor, Ardrahan, Co. Galway, and read before the Irish Industrial Conference, Cork, in 1905:—

From the Secretary to the Co-operative Poultry Society, Letterkenny, Co. Donegal :—"I enclose bill of carriage, 6s 11d, for a 1 cwt. box of eggs to London, showing a rate of about 138s 4d per ton. The London Army & Navy Stores can send here a 1 cwt. box of whiskey for 2s 9d, or about 55s per ton."

From Vint & Sons, Belfast :—"We, about 14 years ago, induced a farmer in the Co. Armagh to plant strawberries. From Annaghmore Station, during these years, about 1000 tons have been shipped, an average of over 70 tons a year. Four jam factories have been built. The fruit is worth from £18 to £20 per ton, and that work employs a great many people. But complaints are constantly made about the freights. The distance to Belfast is 31 miles, and the rate is 20s, about 8d per ton per mile. I hope your meeting will be able to help us."

The traders of Crossgar, Co. Down :—"We are 21 English miles by rail, and 13 Irish miles by road, from Belfast. For live fowls we pay 14s 2d, and dead, 12s per ton. Butter and eggs, 10s. We petitioned the Company

three years ago, and they returned our petition, marked 'read.'"

Mr B. O'Rourke, Inniskeen, Co. Monaghan :—"I am a miller, and buy most of my corn in Belfast. They charge me 7s 6d per ton for 64 miles, or about 1⅜d per mile per ton. They carried the same corn to Strabane, 85 miles, for 4s 5d, or ⅝d per ton per mile, and to Monaghan, 62 miles, for 5s 8d, or 1.1-10d. My present output is about 1000 tons per annum. If I could get a rate of 5s 6d per ton, I could increase my turnover to 2500 or 3000 tons. If I have to close down, the trade will go to the big millers in Glasgow or Liverpool."

Mr R. W. Henderson, Ballintoy, Co. Antrim :—"I pay 4s 11d carriage on £1 2s 11d worth of rabbits to Liverpool."

Mr F. J. O'Connor, Omagh Town Commissioners:—"If seven wagons of timber are loaded at Belfast by the sender, and unloaded at Omagh by the consignee, the value of one of the wagons of timber is taken for the carriage of the other six, and it costs as much to carry ten barrels of petroleum from Belfast to Omagh as will carry fifteen barrels from America to any part of Ireland. A wagon containing 2500 bricks, value £2 14s, loaded by the sender at Coalisland, cost 26s 5d to Omagh, a distance of 31½ miles."

Mr W. E. Jackson, Clifden, Co. Galway :—"I have one of the largest oyster beds in the Kingdom, and I supply the Royal Households. There could be a good trade done in England, but the Railway carriage kills it. For instance, I sent a light box, containing 100 oysters, to London. It cost 1s 5d. Another to Newmarket, containing 120, cost 1s 11d. Another to Bournemouth, with 200, cost 3s. We have also immense quantities of mussels on and near the beds, that, with reasonable Railway rates, could be sold in Lancashire towns, but the price will not cover the Railway charges. And with ponies and other live stock, even with the greatest care, the chances are you will make a loss through the same cause."

Mr John Neilan, Kilcolgan, Co. Galway :—"I have to complain of the Railway rates for oysters—3s 9d per cwt. My Dublin customers tell me they can buy them as cheap from France, London, or Holland, as from the West of Ireland."

The manager of the Galway Manufacturing Co. :—"Almost all our trade is in England. To send our goods there costs 1d per yard on our output, so you will see what these rates mean to a struggling business like ours."

Mr H. M'Court, secretary, Roscommon Traders' Association :—"We have to complain seriously of the Railway Company, and their servants being careless of how they treat the traders. For instance, they put bags of sugar into dirty coal wagons, and the coal dust permeates the sugar, and

lessens the value. Then another grievance is—The daily goods train, carrying goods for Roscommon, arrives at Athlone very early in the morning, and our goods are left on a siding in Athlone for twelve or fourteen hours, so that they arrive here too late in the evening for business. This means a full day's loss to the traders.'

Mr R. Macdermott, brush manufacturer, Galway:—"The rate from here to Liverpool, *via* Dublin, for brushes, is 28s 4d. The rate to Dublin only is 31s 6d per ton, if packed in cases. If sent in one dozen bundles, 38s 6d. The same goods in cases, Galway to Bristol, is 59s 8d, and tied in dozen bundles, 87s 6d. Our business suffers severely through these charges."

Mr P. J. Mannion, grocer, Castlebar :—"Goods despatched from Dublin on Tuesday evening will not be delivered before Thursday morning. This means a big loss to us on account of the perishable nature of the fruit. Ballina is a greater distance from Dublin than we are, and they get their fruit next morning."

James Crean & Co., soap manufacturers, King Street, Dublin:—"Our traveller tried to sell our goods in Cork, but the Railway charges made this impossible. The rate for soap (boxed) to Skibbereen is 52s per ton. This means 60s for a ton of soap. To Bandon, 40s (boxed), or 45s for soap. While we have to pay this, we may mention that 10s per ton is a good price for the same class of goods from Chicago to Liverpool."

O'Dea & Co., warehousemen, Stafford Street, Dublin :—"We in Dublin are suffering great inconvenience in having to cart all our goods to and from the stations. In England and Scotland the goods are all carted by the Railways free of charge. In Dublin, Cork, Limerick, etc., the traders have to do all their own carting, or employ outsiders to do it. In this way the charges are very irregular and annoying, and make the tariff on the goods very much heavier, often adding from 8s to 10s per ton. The Great Northern is an exception. They do their own carting, taking 2s per ton."

D. Heron, clothier, Londonderry:—"I have to pay the Raliway 9d for carrying a 2 lb. parcel a distance of 45 miles, and I can get a 7 lb. parcel from Leeds, over four Companies' systems, for 6d."

F. C. Stenning, Trout Breeding Beds, Innishannon, Co. Cork :—"My business is the production and sale of live trout for stocking angling waters, and I send them to all parts of Ireland. I send them at the lowest possible rate, which is owner's risk, and for every 20s worth of fish I have to pay about 8s 9d carriage. I usually send metal tanks with 100 fish in each, and the tank filled is 1½ cwt."

Dinnis & Sons, George Street, Limerick :—"We send a large number of small parcels of butter, fowl, bacon, etc., to England. We pay ½d per lb. for 24 lb. and upwards, and under this weight is ¾d. If the rate all round could be made ½d, with a minimum charge of 5d, we could greatly increase our trade."

Hugh Delany, Barriskane, Co. Tipperary:—"I have to pay 10s 11d from Dublin to Cloughjordon Station for a ton of oil or cotton cake, while a trader in Nenagh, 10 miles further on the same line, gets the same thing for 7s. This appears to me a great injustice."

A Trader (Rathoe, Clonbanin, Co. Cork) :—"The charges for milk, before the passing of the Railway Rates Bill, 1898, when the Railway Companies promised not to increase the milk rates over the charge of one penny per gallon, for 200 miles or less. For many years I sent milk from Mill Street to Dublin, 160 miles, at a penny. After the passing of the Bill the rate was increased to 1½d per gallon, which still continues."

Hewson & Co., acetylene engineers, Askeaton, Co. Limerick:—"We are manufacturers of carbide. It is principally used in the great towns as an illuminant. It is imported from Russia, Austria, Italy, Spain, and France, but principally from Scandinavia. It is imported from these countries to Dublin for 15s per ton, and to Belfast for 12s. Our Railway rate from Askeaton to Dublin is 32s, and to Belfast, *via* Dublin, about 60s. The struggle to carry on a business of this sort under present conditions is intense. We want a uniform, reasonable Railway rate to the East Coast."

Department of Agriculture, Dublin :—"We beg to draw attention to a case of immense interest to creameries all over the country. On 30th July 1904, a can of cream, containing 20 gallons, was forwarded to Wereton-in-the-Marsh ; carriage paid to destination. The cream was never delivered. We asked the Railway to trace and prove delivery, and that is fifteen months ago. We have repeatedly got the usual (matter having attention) replies. But we saw no hope of the matter being settled by doomsday. We instructed our solicitor to take proceedings for the value of the cream. At the Quarter Sessions, held in Mallow, the case came on, and was decided in favour of the Railway Company, because they had a clause in their consignment note stating that they were not responsible for owner's risk rate goods beyond the limits of their own line. They produced one of their servants to prove that they had handed the can to the servant of another Company, which means, if the cream passed over six Companys' lines, we would have to pursue one Company after another till we were ruined."

Mr D. T. P. M'Carthy, Leeson Street, Dublin :—"Marble can come

from Italy cheaper than it can be brought from Drogheda, and a ton of coal from Kilkenny to Dublin, for carriage costs 10s 4d. What chance is there for developing our country's resources ?"

Mr D. S. Keer, Belfast, showed how the tobacco trade is handicapped by the rates being from 30 to 100 per cent. more than Cross-Channel traffic, and goods from Liverpool are delivered the day after shipment, while the Irish manufactured goods are kept wandering about the country any time from one to three weeks. Then cartage is exacted at each end, and the Liverpool goods are delivered free. Below are some rates for tobacco :—

| From Limerick. | | From Liverpool. | | To |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 53s. 10d. | Not delivered. | 28s. 4d. | Delivered. | Ballymoney. |
| 65s. 8d. | ,, | 45s. 0d. | ,, | Dromore. |
| 59s. 4d. | ,, | 20s. 0d. | ,, | Lisburn |
| 43s. 3d. | ,, | 25s. 10d. | ,, | Carrickmacross. |
| 38s. 0d. | ,, | 32s. 6d. | ,, | Navan. |
| 47s. 6d. | ,, | 45s. 0d | ,, | Portadown. |
| 52s. 0d. | ,, | 25s. 10d. | , | Ardee. |
| 41s. 3d. | ,, | 32s. 6d. | ,, | Kingscourt. |
| 48s. 3d. | ,, | 45s. 0d. | ,, | Bundoran |
| 47s. 10d. | ,, | 27s. 6d. | ,, | Trew and Moy. |
| 49s. 7d. | ,, | 34s. 2d. | ,, | Coalisland. |
| 25s. 6d. | ,, | 34s. 2d. | ,, | Cookstown. |
| 43s. 11d. | ,, | 35s. 0d. | ,, | Belturbet. |
| 35s. 3d. | ,, | 31s. 8d. | ,, | Longford. |

At the annual meeting of the Irish Reform Association—the Earl of Dunraven in the chair—the following resolution was carried :—"Having regard to the prevalence of complaints regarding the administration of Railways in Ireland, and the nature of the charges for freights which are imposed, and the alleged insufficiency of the facilities for industrial and agricultural purposes which the Railways as at present managed afford, it seems to this Association that a thorough inquiry into the whole question should be made by a properly constituted body, in order to ascertain whether any adequate improvement in existing management can be effected, or whether a larger scheme, such as the purchase of Railways by the State on fair terms, and their subsequent management, either directly by the State or by means of Companies, is necessary."

# THE AMERICAN RAILWAYS.

The area of the forty-five, practically United States, is estimated at 3,622,933 square miles, and the population at about 83 millions. In 1905 the invested capital in the Railways was £2,752,734,308, or about £12,813 per mile. Their length of lines being 214,978 miles of single track; of two tracks, 15,761; 3 tracks, 1466; and 4 tracks, 1046; of sidings there were 66,492 miles. Total, all tracks, 297,073 miles. The number of shareholders holding the above stock was 327,851; the average per shareholder, £8007.

The number of men employed was :—

| | |
|---|---|
| General officers | 10,540 |
| Office clerks | 46,037 |
| Station agents | 34,918 |
| Other stationmen | 120,002 |
| Enginemen | 52,451 |
| Firemen | 55,004 |
| Guards | 39,645 |
| Other trainmen | 106,734 |
| Machinists | 46,272 |
| Carpenters | 53,646 |
| Other shopmen | 159,472 |
| Foremen | 37,609 |
| Trackmen | 289,044 |
| Switch watchmen and crossing tenders | 45,262 |
| Telegraphists | 30,425 |
| Employees, floating equipment | 7,495 |
| All labourers | 160,565 |
| Total employees | 1,296,121 |

Or an average of 6.4 per mile. The number of locomotives working was 46,743. For passenger trains, 11,252 ; goods, 27,029 ; shunting, 7610 ; not classified, 852 ; or about 0.21 per mile. Their vehicles for passenger service numbered 39,752, or 0.18 per mile. Goods and mineral vehicles, 1,758,809, or 8.20 per mile.

The earnings from operations were £421,780,679, or about £1966 per mile. The total number of passengers carried was 715,419,682, averaging 8.50 Railway trips per head of the population. The earnings from passengers were £69,133,740, or about 2s 5d per passenger ; and from mails, parcels, and other earnings, £18,721,383. Total passenger train earnings, £87,855,123. The revenue from goods was £278,754,172, and from other sources, £29,400,477. The working expenses were £261,978,216, leaving the nett earnings to divide, including £19,247,791 from other sources, £153,270,308, equal to 6.11 per cent. per annum. The taxes paid by the Railways amounted to £12,051,993. This is about 1.10d per £ on their sunk capital. The report says it is interesting to contrast this showing with the statistics of 1897, when the gross earnings averaged £1279, and the working expenses, £855 per mile of line, against the present £1976 income, and £1275 expenses.

## Average Daily Wages of Employees.

General officers get £2 5s 8½d ; other officers, £1 3s 2d ; office clerks, 9s ; station agents, 7s 4½d ; other stationmen, 6s 7½d ; engine-drivers, 15s 9d ; firemen, 9s ; conductors, 13s 2½d ; other trainmen, 8s 4d ; machinists, 9s 8d ; carpenters, 8s 7d ; other shopmen, 7s 3½d ; section firemen, 7s 1½d ; other trackmen, 5s 1½d ; switchmen, flagmen, and watchmen, 7s 3d : telegraphists and dispatchers, 8s 3d ; all other employees. 7s 3½d. This works out the average wage of the general officer at £512, and the average of the workmen at £119 a year. The average wage paid by British Railway Companies to their workmen, according to particulars supplied by themselves, is only £1 2s 8d per week, or about £59 per year. The general average weekly wage of all classes of American Railway servants is double that, namely, £2 5s 6d per week.

The average fare per passenger was 1.03d per mile.

The average ton of freight was 0.763 of one halfpenny per mile.

The average earnings of a passenger train per mile were 4s 4¾d.

The average earnings of a freight train per mile were 8s 11½d.

The average earnings per mile from all sources were 7s 4½d.

The average earnings of running a train one mile (all trains), 4s 11½d.

A British passenger train earns 4s 1d ; a goods train, 6s 8½d per mile.

The cost of running a British train (all trains), 3s 2¾d per mile.

The number of British passengers carried in 1905 was 1,197,502,000.

The number of British tons of goods carried in 1904 was 449,837,615.

The gross receipts from British Railways in 1905 were £113,549,000.

The gross working expenses of British Railways in 1904 were £69,189,000.

The nett profit of British Railways in 1904 was £42,639,000.

Percentage of nett receipts to paid up capital, 3.93 per cent.

The average fare of British passengers is 7d.

The average fare of American passengers is 2s.

The number of passengers carried in America was 715,419,682.

The number of tons of goods carried in America was 1,309,899,165.

The gross receipts of the Railways in America were £421,780,679.

The gross working expenses of the Railways in America were £279,031,165.

Nett receipts from the American Railways were £142,751,139.

Percentage of nett receipts to paid up capital was 6.11 per cent.

The invested capital in the English Railways is £65,433 per mile ; in the Scotch, £48.147 ; and in the Irish, £12,625.

The American Railways carry about 16 tons per head of the population, and the British Railways about 10½ tons per head. The average number of passengers in a British train is 41, and in an American, 49. The average British train is seated for 300 passengers.

In America the average journey of each passenger is about 29 miles.

In America the average number of tons in each goods train is 287.26.

In America the average train run is 135 miles.

In Britain the average train load is about 70 tons.

In Britain the average train run is about 40 miles.

In Britain the locomotive costs about £2500.

In Britain the passenger carriage costs about £450.

In Britain the wagon costs about £100.

## American Competition.

There are six different trunk lines between New York and Chicago, a distance of 1000 miles. Then between Chicago and St Paul, 500 miles, there are five competing lines, and between Chicago and Omaha there are four trunk lines competing.

Between Camden and Atlantic City an express runs 66½ miles an hour from start to finish, and the Empire State express does 440 miles in 8¼ hours, over 53 miles an hour from start to finish.

Mr George Daniels says it is beyond question that the American Railways furnish the best service in the world at the lowest rate of fare, and at the same time pay their workers the very highest wages on our Globe.

In March 1904, the competition between the New York and Philadelphia Railways, from Buffalo to the port of New York (distance, about 350 miles) was so keen that the rates in January 1904 were:—For corn, 5 cents per bushel; for hay, 4¾; and for barley, 4½; and oats, 4; and in the month of June, to and from the same places, the rates were cut down to 2.2 for corn and hay to 1.95, and for barley 1.7 cents per bushel.

The writer says this is as violent a cut as in the old time rate wars; but the actual loss to revenue is but small, because the volume of the grain trade has been great.

The British Railways do not fall out and cut prices; they meet in the London Clearing-house and raise them. They do not compete. No fear; they have more sense. At least they think so.

The Department of Labour and Commerce at Washington threw a strong side light on Railway rates in Europe and America. They point out that the average per ton per mile for goods and minerals in our two islands is 1.16d; in France, 0.77d; in Germany, 0.71d; in Hungary, 0.65d; in Austria, 0.58; and in the United States, 0.29 per ton per mile.

For the same quality of accommodation that the American pays 1d for, the Englishman pays 2d and the German 1.54d.

The average British workman for his day's wage can travel 35 miles; the American, 65 miles; the German, 53 miles; the Frenchman, 40 miles; the Belgian, 36 miles; and the Indian, 21 miles.

The wages of the American locomotive engineer averages 16s 8d, his fireman gets 9s 6d; the British driver gets 6s 9d, his fireman 3s 10d; the Belgian driver gets 4s 3d, and his fireman gets 3s per day.

In America the income of the Railways is divided into three parts—labour gets 40 per cent.; material, 35 per cent.; leaving to capital, 25 per cent. In Britain, labour gets 27; material, 35; and capital, 38 per cent.

Mr R. L. Wedgegood, Secretary of the North Eastern Railway, referring to his impressions of his visit to the International Railway Congress at Washington in 1905, said he travelled in one train that exceeded 90 miles an hour. This was one of the famous Atlantic fliers, and he travelled from Philadelphia to Atlantic City, 55½ miles, in 42½ minutes. He says one great point with the American Railways is that they are free from Parliamentary litigation. Their process of starting a new company and laying out the line is much simpler and cheaper.

Mr A. C. Ellis, General Manager of the Metropolitan Railway, speaking of the Washington Congress (it was a great success), and referring to the large car loads, said the nature of the traffic on the American rail-

roads lends itself to them. Their haul was longer than ours, and they were more able to make up full train loads than we were. The 50-ton freight car is common in America. This statement to the uneducated mind is somewhat remarkable.

Lieut.-Colonel Yorke, R.E. to the Board of Trade, 6th December 1902, in the Blue-book on American Railways (No. 1466), says the British use the bull-headed rail, resting in cast-iron chairs.

In America the T rail is entirely used, and is pinned to the sleepers by ordinary spikes, and they claim that their road is easier and quicker to lay, cheaper to maintain, smoother to run over, and as durable as the British type. With regard to the weight of rails, the Americans use 100 lbs. to 36 inches, with a 6 inch base resting on the sleepers.

In Britain the weight of rails per 36 inch varies from 83 to 103 lbs. Those used by the London and North Western weigh from 96 to 103 lbs; by the Great Western, from 92 to 97½d, the Great Northern, 92 lbs.; and the London and South Western use only 83 lb. rails. This system of diversity and want of uniformity is the cause of great loss to the British people. The result of these variations in weights of rails is that every steel company that goes in for rolling steel rails may have to keep a dozen sets of rolls, produced at great expense, waiting and watching for an order to turn up. The French, German, and American Railway systems have only one set of rail rolls in each mill for the purpose of competition for rail orders. It is the same for tyres for locomotives.

A greater number of sleepers or ties are used in America than in Britain. The Americans put 16 sleepers under 30 feet of rails. In Britain the number is 12 to 30 feet. The measurement of our sleepers is 9 feet long, 10 inches wide, and 5 inches deep, and they are mostly made of soft Baltic timber.

The Americans make theirs of hard wood, such as oak or chestnut, and are 8 feet long, 8 inches wide, and 7 inches deep, and they say are much stronger to stand heavy pressure than our coggly chair system. They do not place their rail joints opposite each other as we do, but mid-way between the other rail, and claim this is an advantage in steadying their train.

The ballasting in America, so far as I saw it, is as good as anything in Britain, and there is no doubt that, as a rule, Railway travelling in America is smooth and quiet.

He says the locomotives are colossal, standing 16 ft. high ; and one at the Carnegie Steel Works weighs 172 tons. Such engines have great

power, and haul trains of 800 yards and upwards with merchandise loads of from 3000 to 5000 tons. And there the bridges and tunnels are 18 feet high, with a space between the tracks of 7 feet, against 6 feet in Britain, and 14 feet 3 inch perpendicular space in our bridges and tunnels. It can, therefore, be understood that what is possible in America can never be possible in Britain till the Government gets the Railways. Their goods trucks carry from 30 to 50 tons ; ours from 5 to 10 tons.

## Automatic Couplings.

The gallant Coloned under this heading makes some remarkable statements *that I think* are not borne out by the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, published by the American Government, 17th January 1902 (which he says is a highly interesting book). On page 9 of his Blue Book, No. 1466 (price 5d, Oliver & Boyd, Edinburgh), and presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Majesty, he says :—From this American book it appears that the coupling mechanism is still far from perfect, especially in regard to the uncoupling attachments. They are too easily broken, and want strength, simplicity, and finish. (As this is a very vital question for our Railway shunters and couplers—losing their lives and limbs—I think Colonel Yorke, our Chief Inspecting Railway Officer, might have taken a few sentences from page 62 of the 15th Annual Report, from which he quotes, instead of wading through seventeen closely-printed pages of this same remarkable book, to gather up a few stray statements of recommendation from dozens of Inspectors trying to improve a new system that has worked immense good to the Railway shunters of America.) In 1893, the year the Safety Appliance Law was put in force, they had, through shunting—

| | Killed. | Injured. |
|---|---|---|
| 1893 | 433 | 11,277 |
| 1899 | 196 | 5,281 |
| 1901 | 161 | 2,082 |
| 1902 | 143 | 2,113 |
| 1903 | 158 | 1,821 |
| 1904 | 269 | 3,566 |

Our British Railways in 1904, from shunting and the movement of wagons, killed 340, injured 4333; *and we have only a little over half* the men employed the Americans have.

They have fitted 1,590,417 of their vehicles, or practically the whole

of their rolling stock, with automatic couplers. I think the fact that so many of our healthiest young men, mostly married, leave widows and orphan children behind them to be pauperised and thrown on the mercy of a cold world, should have made the gallant Colonel pause before he so coolly threw aside the American couplers.

But on page 22 Colonel Yorke states, "I was shown an ingenious device for automatically coupling the brake-pipe and the steam heating pipe, as well as the wagons, all at once"—so there is some hope for the Railway shunter yet. I must now leave this murdering subject with the British public ; they only have the power to stop it.

## Station Accommodation.

Colonel Yorke states that their waiting-room accommodation is far superior to anything we have in Britain. They have cots for babies, barber's shops, baths, smoke-rooms, etc. Writing of Boston South Station, he gives it great praise for its splendid accommodation and arrangements, far superior to anything we have in Britain. 801 trains and 68,500 passengers enter or leave it daily.

But this does not beat our Liverpool Street Station, with its 1060 trains daily, and on busy days its 179,680 passengers. Then Liverpool Street has only 18 platforms, and Boston has 28.

## Signalling Arrangements.

He visited Pittsburg. It is as black and grimy as London, but the signalling is in the most approved fashion, the points and signals being operated by the electro-pneumatic system from the signal cabin, which contains 131 levers, of which 12 are spare. A cabin such as this contains five or six men—one to watch the traffic and give directions to the men, one to attend to the telephones and keep in touch with the station staff, one to make entries in the train register of the movements of trains, and two or three at the frame itself. In Britain such a cabin would not contain more than two, or at the most, three men.

Colonel Yorke states that the Illinois Railroad have some powerful engines drawing trains with from 36 to 50 wagons. The gross weight of these trains is from 1076 to 1511 tons, and the cost to haul 10,000 tons one mile varies from one dollar 86 cents, to two dollars two cents.

The "Review of Reviews" for February 1904, says the Baldwin Company have built a locomotive weighing 450,000 lbs.—over 200 tons weight.

The Lake Shore Express locomotives are said to be the largest in the world. They weigh 173½ tons, more than 50 tons heavier than the heaviest in Britain. They cover the distance between New York and Chicago in twenty hours, including the stops, and haul a 700 ton train behind them.

Colonel Yorke states the three cities—Paris, New York, and Boston—afford an object lesson to London. They have faced the problem of urban communication in a business-like fashion, have decided what they want, have arranged for the financing of the work, and have settled the routes along which transportation is to go, before allowing the ground to be broken, instead of proceeding in a haphazard fashion, and leaving the most valuable concessions to be scrambled for by private companies. It is much to be hoped that a Commission will be appoointed to consider the congestion of the London streets, and propose a remedy. The Colonel is evidently a strong municipaliser, whatever his opinion of nationalising the Railways may be.

He says enormous sums are being spent in doing away with level crossings, and that these works are being paid for out of revenue, and not charged to capital.

## Railway Service.

He states that the best men go to the top in America.

On the 6th January 1904, under the chairmanship of Mr D. Deuchars, North British Railway, Mr N. D. Macdonald, Secretary to the Railway Officers (sent from Britain to inquire into the American system of conducting and working their Railways), lectured in Edinburgh before a crowded audience of the Railway workers. By means of more than 100 lantern slides Mr Macdonald illustrated the enormous locomotives which draw the Atlantic fliers along between Philadelphia and Atlantic City, which are booked to run 55½ miles in 60 minutes, and those between New York and Buffalo, which are booked to do 440 miles in 8¼ hours. For this service the cars weigh 760 tons. He stated that the boiler of these huge locomotives was twice the size of the largest North-Eastern engine. It was only by the use of such locomotives, drawing enormous loads, that their Railways were able to pay as they did.

Yet we are told that England is first, and the rest of the world nowhere.

At a meeting of the Dunfermline Branch of the Society of Railway

Servants on 18th September 1904, Mr John G. Muir, their Secretary, said that there were safer instruments than the coupling pole for saving men's lives and limbs, but the Company would adopt none of the appliances.

In 1899 a Royal Commission was appointed, and, after careful inquiry, reported that the lives and limbs of the men might be saved by safe methods of working. In consequence of this report, an Act was passed in 1900, giving the Board of Trade almost unlimited powers for the safety of the men, but nothing has come of it up till now. Since 1900 the Society had been pressing for either-side brakes, and now, in 1906, the Board of Trade had agreed to have trials of either-side brakes, with the view of doing something or nothing, as the mood suited the Board of Trade and the Railways. He said their next point to press forward would be automatic couplings. The Americans, by adopting either-side brakes and automatic couplers, had reduced their shunting accidents by 85 per cent. Surely this amount of life and limb was worth trying for, as they might expect just as great a saving in this country. The annual accident roll in this country on our Railways was upwards of 18,000, and in the interests of humanity something should be done.

At the same meeting, Mr Andrew Ballantyne, speaking of industrial accidents, said in 1900, 4401 persons were killed by industrial accidents. The death-rate in factories, where they had inspection before the accident, was 21 per 100,000, and on Railways, where the inspection took place after the accident, it was 117 per 100,000. He then urged the necessity of the Companies adopting such safety appliances as they saw before them, which had reduced the accidents in America by 85 per cent. Working models of these were shown in operation. For the coupling, which is an ingenious piece of mechanism, he claimed the following advantages :—It couples on the slightest contact, can be set not to couple at will, couples in motion as well as standing, picks up run-away wagons, couples perfectly with the present vehicle during the evolution period, serves as a centre buffer as well as a coupling, couples on a curve of two chains radius, saves about 6 cwt. in the weight of each wagon, in the construction of new stock will save about £7 10s per vehicle, saves fifty per cent of time in the shunting yards, and consequently a large amount of space; with it buffer tacking is impossible, it cannot uncouple by accident, a shunter can see twenty wagon lengths away whether a wagon is coupled or uncoupled—the saving of time, money, life, and limb being quite evident.

Mr John Foster Fraser, in the "Yorkshire Post," of the 16th October 1902, said, in writing on the American Railways :—When I come to con-

pare the comfort and convenience of travelling, it must be admitted the Americans have by far the best of it. Our landed corridor carriages are rabbit hutches alongside the American cars. Our seats are too narrow for comfort ; and, travelling third-class, you are huddled in a way you never are in America.

## Railway Personnel.

Mr Fraser says :—Take the matter of the supreme command of the lines. English lines are composed of Boards of Directors—titled men, often good business men, the soul of honour. Many directors know a great deal of Railway management, but they have learnt it after they have become directors. In America, such a system of management would only raise a cynical smile. The chief person on an American railroad is the President ; and his position is rather more important than that of Chairman of Directors in England. Beneath him is the first vice-president, the second vice-president, the third vice-president, etc. Take the Pennsylvania line, with its 14,354 miles of rails, the most important and best managed railroad in the world, and you will find the President and Vice-Presidents were all at one time either cleaners or firemen, drivers or clerks, in the employ of the Company ; they had risen from post to post, because they have shown their worth. The Board of Management is made up of men of striking character, who have gone through all grades until the highest position is reached. Ability is the only thing that counts. These men know all about the management of their line.

In England not infrequently the Directors are entirely at the mercy of the General Manager. His word is law. They are simply figure-heads.

Mr Fraser also states, in regard to wages :—I found that, though there is a slight tendency to decrease in the clerical staff, the tendency is upward as regards the direct workers. An engine-driver gets about 15s per day ; a fireman, 9s ; guards, 13s 6d ; a guard's assistant gets only 7s 6d ; section foremen, 7s ; yard men and labourers, 5s ; switchmen, 7s ; telegraph operators, 7s 6d.

As to hours, the normal day on various lines is ten hours , but for telegraphists and yard men it is twelve hours. He says there is great diversity in paying for overtime, owing to the system of State Laws. But the Illinois Central stands out as a notable exception by paying for Sunday labour, and all labour over ten hours a-day, time and half.

In England, he also says, it is not infrequently the practice to bring in men from other Railways to take up responsible positions. That is

hardly ever done in America. Promotion is the rule to bring enthusiasm and ambition to the working of the Railways—the American capitalists know the value of every workman, knowing he will have a good job if he is deserving of it. It is the pride of the Pennsylvania lines that its high officers once worked in the lowest ranks—a fact like this which makes every office boy feel that he may be President some day.

Mr Fraser says, that to save the cost of labour is an ever-pressing problem. But it is grappled with and partly solved. The expenditure of half a million is not reckoned if the ultimate saving of a million is sighted.

English Railways, for instance, employ five times as many men per mile as do American lines. This means that Britain, with her 22,500 miles of rails and 43,000,000 of a population, employs as many railwaymen as America does with its 210,000 miles and 84,000,000 of a population.

He also states that, within my life, the rates for carrying goods on American and English Railways were the same. Now the average cost per ton per mile in America is one-third of a penny. In Great Britain it is something over a penny per ton per mile. This means that what the American pays one penny for the Englishman pays fourpence, or four to one more than America.

In "Scribner's Magazine," No. 220, F. A. Venderlip, writing on our Railway system, says :—In England the tendency is distinctly away from States management of transportation facilities. Their Railways have always been managed by private Corporations, but they do not show superiority as compared with the State controlled roads of the Continent. The managers are beginning to wake up a little, but compared with the men who manage our Railroads, they are remarkably deficient in practical knowledge, and make a very sorry contrast, so far as application is concerned.

When it comes to handling freight, the English statistics are ludicrous. In the year 1900, the average freight train load in England was about 50 tons, that is, their train load was only equal to one of our 50 ton car loads. They are tending towards heavier equipment, but it all seems like toy equipment, when compared with our own heavy trains. A friend of mine was standing on the towering deck of the "Cedric" last summer when she came alongside the dock at Liverpool. By his side was a hugh Californian who was making his first European trip, and was full of curiosity. He looked far down from the upper deck to the little train of coaches that was waiting to carry the passengers up to London, and asked what they might be. He was told that it was the special train to

London. "Do people travel in those things here?" the big Californian said. "Why, when I was a boy I used to play with things like that." The comparison was not inapt.

In the International Railway Congress, Washington, 3rd May 1905, before 500 delegates from all the Railway countries in the world, Mr Morton expressed pleasure at the presence of so many distinguished foreigners. He said the freights in America were 40 per cent. lower, and wages 50 per cent. higher, and the cost of materials much more than in other countries This he considered a transportation triumph.

# INDIAN RAILWAYS.

From a Blue Book on the Indian Railways, published on 17th May 1905, we gather that they had 27,762 miles of Railways working, and 3126 miles under construction, making a total of 30,888 miles, or about 3½ inches per head of the population, and about 8000 more miles than we have, on our own two Islands of these Railways. The Indian Government have full financial control of about 23,000 miles, and the remainder are in the hands of guaranteed 5 per cent. shareholders in London.

The total capital invested in all the Railways in India at above date, was £241,547,677 ; about £7,820 per mile of line. The gross income for 1904 was £29,521,533. The working expenses were 45 per cent., leaving a balance of 55 per cent. to pay their sinking fund, and 5.44 per cent. on the invested capital.

The earnings per mile of Railway were £1063 ; and per train mile, 5s 6d.

The nett profit to the Government, after paying all expenses and interest on capital invested in new Railways, was £2,254,500.

But they lost 31 lacs of rupees, about £206,666, through having to pay the Bombay and Baroda Companies their guaranteed 5 per cent. But their lease is out in 1905 and 1907.

The number of men employed on the Indian Railways is 412,249, or 15 per mile, about 175,000 less than we employ on our Railways, and they work 8000 more miles of rails.

The Indian accidents in 1903 were :—Passengers killed, 142 ; injured, 448 ; servants killed, 290 ; injured, 485 ; other persons killed, 711 ; injured, 209. Total all classes killed, 1143 ; injured, 1142. This is a remarkably high death-rate among so few men.

From the commencement of the Indian Railways they were a heavy burden on the State. The British private Companies were guaranteed 5 per cent., or more in some cases, by the Indian Govermnent. From over-expensive management and other causes, some of them were never able to pay the guarantee, and the people had to be taxed to make up the deficit. But as the Government gradually obtained the management of the private Railways, and kept on building Railways of their own, things gradually began to take a turn.

In 1899 a profit was made of £76,756, after the deduction of every item that could be charged against the Railway accounts, including working expenses, interest on capital, and the interest payable to the private Companies, the annual charges for purchase of the old guaranteed lines, and all other charges whatsoever ; in 1900 the profit was £325,124 ; in 1901, £846,616 ; in 1902, £228,949 ; 1903, £860,669 ; and in 1904, £2,254,500 ; and the true commercial results are still more favourable, for they are, after setting aside the charges on lines not yet open for traffic, as well as the charges on strategetic military lines, that do not earn much, and lines constructed against famine, than by the annuity payments we are liquidating out of revenue, the cost of the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula, the Eastern Bengal, and the North-Western Railways, as well as payments under the old guarantee to the Madras and Bombay, Barado and Central, at a rate of exchange which has long been obsolete.

On the 20th March 1905, the Indian Council, consisting of 20 Councillors, to govern 300 millions of people, presided over by Baron Curzon, Viceroy and Governor-General of India, Councillor the Honourable Rai SRi Ram Bahadur said—" My Lord, I have the honour to remark the unprecedented increase in the income from Railway traffic which is a noteworthy feature in this year's finances, and it is to be hoped more effort will be directed to improve the third class passenger's condition of travelling. It is a truism that the third class passenger is the backbone of the coaching traffic, and he thinks he should not now be carried in cattle trucks, a practice which is not so uncommon as it ought to be, and it should be discontinued in India, as it has been in Burma. The reason for this diversion of goods wagons to carry third class passengers is the deficiency of third class carriages, which should now be increased, and that these wagons or carriages should have ventilators for air, and benches for the people to sit on. It seems strange that such obvious necessities should have slipped the notice of our Railway authorities, and I should have hesitated to repeat the complaint, if it had not been uttered in the first instance by those who had had actual experience behind them.

" Then the question of latrine accommodation is closely connected with the above recommendations, and I am glad to know that it is under serious consideration.

" Then again the question of refreshments for Indian passengers, including an adequate supply of water, should be seen to.

" The habits of the lower classes are no doubt a difficulty, but the

difficulty should be faced, and at the stations third class waiting rooms should be introduced, with seats, instead of the stand-up, corrugated iron sheds, where the passengers are exposed to the inclemency of the weather."

Then on the employment of Indians on the Railways, he says—"So early as 1833 the British Parliament had the magnanimity to pass Statute 3 and 4, William IV., cap. 85, as follows:—'That no native of the said territories (India), nor any natural subject of His Majesty residing therein, shall, by reason only of religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, holding, or employment under the said Government.' Then in the Royal Proclamation of 1858, issued by the late Queen Empress :—"We held ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and these obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil, and it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability, and integrity duly to discharge.

Then in 1861 and 1879, resolutions were passed on the same lines, and the reports from time to time of the Governor-Generals, of the excellence of the work done by the natives in the Civil Service Departments were worthy of all praise. But, nevertheless, the number of natives employed in these Departments is very small. Out of nine Departments we can only give the figures for the Railways. Of these getting salaries of

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| From | £14 to £20 | a month, | there are | 287 | Europeans | and | 63 | Indians. |
| ,, | £20 to £27 | ,, | ,, | 140 | ,, | ,, | 23 | ,, |
| ,, | £27 to £33 | ,, | ,, | 99 | ,, | ,, | 11 | ,, |
| ,, | £33 to £40 | ,, | ,, | 42 | ,, | ,, | 3 | ,, |
| ,, | £40 to £60 | ,, | ,, | 84 | ,, | ,, | 6 | ,, |

Then there are 119 higher posts in the Railway Department, carrying salaries ranging from £60 to £200 a month, and all these offices are exclusively held by Europeans, and the other State Departments are just as exclusively European as the Railways.

Blue-Book Report, No. 1713—Thomas Robertson, C.V.O., Government Commissioner for Indian Railways, 1903, says:—"Being asked by His Majesty's Secretary of State for India to inquire into the conducting and working of Indian Railways, I have as desired visited the United States of America, and Canada, and in this report will be embodied such of those

improvements as can, in my opinion, be adopted with advantage in India.

At the beginning of 1904 there were 26,955 miles of Railways working in India, or about 5600 more than on our two islands. Of these Railways the Government have full financial control, amounting to 22,474 miles, leaving the balance of 4481 miles partly owned by the Government and partly by Companies.

As a rule, the Railways worked by Companies are guaranteed 5 per cent. by the Government, and they divide surplus profits at 1s 10d to the rupee, while it is only worth 1s 4d. This seems to be remarkably good interest on Railway capital even in India.

The Company-conducted Railways are managed by a Board of Directors in London, and they are represented by a General Manager and the usual staff of departmental officers. The Indian Government also appoint a Director and a consulting engineer. These officials are frequently getting into cross purposes where none should be, and are a source of great irritation and trouble to both parties. The Companies complain of the high charges the Government demand for inspection and control.

In 1901 the sum paid by the Railways on this account amounted to £704,422. The Companies complain that the frequent changing of the Government engineers destroys harmonious working.

Mr Robertson says there can be no question that the administration of the Company-worked Railways have not always been as careful in their management as they might have been, but that does not seem sufficient reason for the permanent application of the brake. That a close control at one time, I think, was necessary must be admitted, but the Company's officers know their business better now, and this should lead to the slackening of the screw. This is a certain case of too many cooks spoiling the broth.

He says—"The only logical alternative is to do away with the Companies altogether. The simpler and much less costly method is to work them through a manager as State Railways." (Hear, hear.)

He further says the Railways of India should be entrusted to a small Board under the Government. This Board would relieve the Home and Indian Government of much complex work, and would very materially strengthen the hands of both. Further, the change would, I estimate, lead to a saving of £40,000 a year, and the Railways are needed for the training of army officers in Railway duties.

The salaries of the General Managers run from £2000 to £3000 per annum.

The money spent on improvements on the Indian Railways in 1902 was over 3½ million pounds. Notwithstanding this large grant, nearly all the Railways in India are much behind in up-to-date improvement. The interlocking of stations has been neglected, and there is no safe system of train signalling. Trains are still lighted with oil, and the use of automatic brakes on passenger trains is only in its infancy.

In 1901 the number of passengers carried on the Indian Railways was 194,749,000; the tons of goods, 44,142,000; the gross earnings were £22,425,266.

The average mileage opened each year is about 900, which, reckoning the cost at £8000 per mile, shows £7,200,000 spent on Indian Railways annually.

The average speed of the limited mail trains in India is 34½ miles an hour; the average speed for express is 31¼ miles an hour. The less important trains show a much lower speed. The average is about 12 miles an hour.

The average number of passengers in an Indian train are—1st class, 1.25; 2nd, 5; intermediate, 12; 3rd class, 194. The average number of passengers in a train is 212.50. These are high averages. In Britain the average is 40.

Mr Robertson says in America, over the same class of country, they run express trains at 50 to 55 miles an hour, and slow trains 30 to 35 miles.

He says with regard to 3rd class carriages they cannot be considered at all satisfactory. Seeing that the bulk of the revenue is from 3rd class, their accommodation should be much better than it is; the non-paying 1st and 2nd class appear to receive all the attention. The number of 3rd class passengers in 1901 was 170½ millions, against 9½ millions of all the other three classes. The 3rd class carriages are much over-crowded; as a rule, the amount of 3rd class stock provided by the Railways is quite inadequate, and the treatment the passengers are subjected to calls for very special attention. It is a shame.

He says:—"It has been strongly represented to me that a very extensive system of levying unauthorised charges obtains at the stations; that the native police not only interfere with the passengers in the carriages, but endeavour to prevent them from even getting their tickets at the booking office unless they are given a gratuity. That in some cases they actually take money from the passengers for the purpose of buying their tickets, and, instead of procuring them for the distance required, purchase them for a station short of destination, the passenger only finding

this out after the train has started, when no redress can be had; and that if they do not succeed by coercion or otherwise in getting money from the passengers, they intimidate and harass them in such a manner as to make them shrink from travelling by Railway at all. Complaint was also made that the subordinate station staff are given to the same practices, and if they do not get something from the pasengers they use abusive language and in other ways do all they can to molest and annoy them, and frequently resort to personal violence. It is also stated that many of the native stationmasters considerably increase their incomes by requiring traders to pay them fees before they will supply them with wagons to carry their traffic, and in other ways pursue the same policy as the police.

"I was necessarily unable, in the limited time at my disposal, and on account of my slight acquaintance with the language of the country, and the difficulty there is in India of obtaining evidence in matters of this kind, to verify these reports by personal investigation, but from the statements made to me by officers (both Railway and non-Railway), in whose veracity I have the fullest confidence, I feel satisfied there is a great deal of truth in the representations made to me. With my limited knowledge of the people it would be idle for me to attempt or suggest a complete cure. But I think the position could be mended by (a) closer supervision by the inspecting officers and station masters; (b) making the ticket checkers at the gate, when imposition is suspected, inquire of the passengers to what station they are going, and see they have their ticket for the proper station. If there has been any fraud it will then be discovered, and the offender caught."

It was at first required by law that communication should be kept between the passengers and the guard on the train. That was so for some time, but has been practically done away with now.

He points out that strong complaints were made that goods and mineral trains were very slow—on an 800 mile run the average speed is about eight miles an hour. The writer has had goods on the road between Dunfermline and Cardiff eleven days doing 400 miles. This works out at less than 1½ miles per hour; and Dunfermline to Leicester and other towns in the Midlands, a week; this works out, for 325 miles, at 1¾ miles per hour, so that our Indian fellow-subjects have not much to complain of on this point.

Passenger fares in India are:—1st Class, 1d per mile; 2nd Class, 2½ miles for a penny; and 3rd Class, 5 miles for a penny. Merchandise per ton per mile is a fraction over a halfpenny. Minerals are a fraction over a

farthing per ton per mile. English merchandise is 2d per ton per mile; and minerals are a fraction over three-farthings.

Pointing out that the rates in India should be lower, he says that the rates in America average 0.724, or three-quarters of a cent. per ton per mile; and where water competition exists, wheat is carried at a profit at 0.300 of a cent, or about one-eighth of a penny per ton per mile, and the cost of construction and working is greater in America than India.

Season and workmen's tickets are about one-eighth of a penny per mile, against about three-eights of a penny in England.

Mr Robertson says in America the loads of goods trains are as high as 4000 tons. In India the heaviest load is 1000 tons. In England we have no train load as large as either, so far as I know. In India and America the Railway conditions are very much alike.

Indian Railways are backward in their employment of bogie carriages. No other vehicle is used in America, and bogies are being adopted all over Europe. Four and six-wheel carriages should be done away with.

All new pessenger vehicles should have lavatory accommodation for all classes. Mr Robertson says:—"I have received numerous complaints of the suffering of long distance passengers from this cause."

The Indian Railways, like the German, have four classes of passengers. This greatly increases the dead weight, length, and cost of working. The average number of passengers in the different classes in each train during 1901 was:—1st Class, 1.22; 2nd Class, 4.50; 3rd Class, 9.25; 4th Class, 192.55; season tickets, 2.90; total average, 210.29. He says:—"I am disposed to think that the classes should be reduced. I would say, thank God for a slight touch of humanity and common sense."

Low carrying capacity wagons are the order of the day in India. The American high capacity bogie truck exists nowhere in that great British Protectorate. Eighty per cent. of all the goods traffic of India could and should be carried in the large bogie trucks.

The best vehicle on the Indian Railways for carrying coal has a tare of 7 tons 17 cwt. 2 qrs., and carries 16 tons, or two to one of dead weight. In America their bogies, the tare of which is 17 tons 10 cwt., carry fifty tons, or three to one of dead weight.

| | | | Tare tons. | Tons Goods. | Total tons. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| In the case of India a train with ... | 45 | wagons | 354 | 720 — | 1074 |
| In the case of America a train with | 16 | wagons | 280 | 800 — | 1080 |
| Difference in favour of America | 29 | wagons | 74 | 80 | —— |

This gives America a gain of 10 per cent. in paying load, with a deduction

of 20 per cent. in dead weight. Then America has a third advantage by having so many fewer trucks, on the principle—the nearer the load to the horse, the less the draught. Then a fourth advantage is, it will be cheaper to build 16 large wagons than 45 small ones. There is a fifth advantage. The American train would take up about 195 yards of rail space—the Indian train, 340 yards. This, either on the Railway or in the shunting yards, gives a great pull to the American system. Great Britain is in a worse position in this respect than India is.

Mr Robertson says the Railway bridges in India are much more substantially built than those in America.

In fact, America owes her present commercial position to her low freight rates, rendered possible because of her enormous train loads.

He says :—"The American automatic coupling should be adopted on the Indian Railways, because these couplings give much greater security to the shunting staff, and expedite marshalling arrangements."

It is remarkable that Colonel Yorke, in his Blue Book, published by our Government at the same time that they published Mr Robertson's, says that these American couplings are not at all likely to be adopted in Britain, as they are very defective in more ways than one. This is strong proof that our inspectors are honest. They say what they think. But they do not seem to think before they say it.

In America and on the Continent, the gauge, as in Britain, is 4 feet 8½ inches. In America the wagon is 10 feet 6 inches wide. In India the gauge is 5 feet 6 inches wide, and their wagon is only 9 feet 6 inches. Our wagon is only 8 feet 6 inches wide.

On a number of Indian Railways dust is very severe, both on the machinery and passengers. In America the lines are sprayed with mineral oil, and up to a speed of 40 or 50 miles an hour the spraying is satisfactory. The spraying is done once a year. The first year from 1500 to 2000 gallons per mile is put on, and the second year about half that quantity, and so on.

In America hopper bottom wagons are used for ballasting. They are 50 feet long, and carry 45 to 50 tons of ballast. The wagon is automatically fitted to spread the ballast any depth. The great advantage of these trucks is an enormous saving of labour, and an expeditious emptying of the train. I think England, as well as India, might take a tip here.

He recommends the centralisation of the Calcutta Railway stations, and also for London. This is a Government job. The same statements can practically be made regarding Great Britain as have been made regarding India. Only more so.

In India the length of Railway per head of the population is 3½ inches, and in the United States it is 13¾ inches, and in Britain 34 inches ; and the spending power per head in India is 11s. and in the States, £32 4s.

As an instance of the advantage of Railways in India, during the Afghan War, 1878-80, a single Railway train did with comparative ease, in one day of 16 hours, what it would have taken 2500 camels to do in a fortnight.

It is said that India and Germany are the only countries in the world that, on an all over average, pay more than 5 per cent.

The Indian Railways give employment to about 397,566 natives and about 8661 half-castes. They are all managed by about 6022 Europeans. Total, 412,249. The natives can be employed with great economy, compared with that which brings so many officials from Britain. All the native's income would be spent in India, and he would finish his career there, and not require the usual leave of absence, with final return to England.

It is not without interest to know, that in the whole of that enormous Dependancy, there is not a single native that occupies a high administrative position on the Railways.

Owing to the principle that the Indian Railways revert to the State (through a time limit), a magnificent property will ultimately come into its hands. Who is to manage them ? Are they to be leased continuously to distant Companies in Great Britain, because we cannot find a Government as able as Germany, Belgium, or our Colonies, to manage them on the spot and in the interests of the people of India, without sending their profits for the benefit of British investors, and Boards of Directors in this country ?

Before a Committee, sitting in 1884, General Strachey stated that he preferred private companies to the State, but the traffic, if worked by the State, was likely to be larger, because it was less anxious to make big profits, and more likely to reduce rates, than a Company would be. He was sure that the people would get greater advantages from the State than from the Company, but, while he would put the construction in the hands of the State, he would give the working of the Railway to a private company. He admitted that State management was very good, and there was no evidence of its being costly. What can be thought of such a witness as this ? There is no evidence given that private enterprise could work the Railways better than the State.

The authors of the various gauges which have been permitted to be laid in the countries and continents of the world were no friends to

industry, civilisation, and progress. India is in the same difficult and harrassing position as our Australian and South African Colonies are in. Their Railways have three or four gauges, which causes no end of worry and expense by transferring goods from broad gauge to narrow gauge wagons that were built by and through the stupidity of British capitalists. Perhaps wisdom is justified of her children in the long run, but it is not easy seeing it at the start.

Indian Railways have sometimes been pressed upon the attention of the Government, rather with a view to British than to Indian interests, in a country which is so poor that millions of labourers work for 2d to 4d per day, and to make any improvement on the land, the small cultivator has to pay heavy interest to the money lender. It ought to be a primary object to make the Railways as cheap and as convenient as possible.

In a leading article, the "Scotsman," of the 20th September 1902, from a report on the Indian Railways, by Mr Brereton, Secretary of the Indian Public Works Department, in his report for the year 1900, says :—It may be expected in future that the Railways will be one of the most certain and increasing sources of the State revenue. The profit from the Railways, after paying interest on invested capital and a million of pounds to the Sinking Fund to help to pay off the invested capital, was 8¾ lakhs of rupees, or about £90,000. In 1901 this profit had increased to 115½ lakhs of rupees, or nearly £1,160,000. If the redemption of stock money had been returned the profit would have stood at 204 lakhs, or £2,150,000. The Indian Railways carried 190¾ millions of passengers last year, and the gross earnings reached 1007 lakhs of rupees, or £11,170,000. The British Railways in the same year earned 106 millions, or nearly ten times the amount, and paid an average of 3½ per cent. against India's 20 per cent. In India, like all other countries, the first and second class passengers stand almost stationary ; they are almost entirely used by Europeans. The third class, used by the natives, has shown rapid and steady growth. In 1901, there were over 16,000,000 more third class passengers on the Indian Railways over the previous year. Above we point out that the Indian Railways carried in 1901, 190,750,000 passengers ; in the same year, the British Railways carried 1,144,026,490, or six times as many as India.

On 19th December 1904, the Government, after considering Mr Robertson's Blue Book recommendations, have decided to create a Board of Supervision for the Indian Railways, to be appointed for five years. This will waste more time, and make three fat jobs.

# THE GERMAN RAILWAYS.

Germany commenced to build her Railways in 1838, twenty years after England. Then, before building their lines, the Imperial Railway Board advised with the Local District Councils representing Commerce, Manufactures, Agriculture, and Forestry, and with as much advantage as possible to all concerned. Fancy a Railway Board here conferring with Town Councils, County Councils, and Chambers of Commerce. The more likely thing would be, that they would all go to London and fight each other till they were all exhausted.

The German State Railway system got its first great lift at the finish of the Franco-German war. The Government kept possession of the Alsace-Lorraine Railways, paying the French shareholders £13,000,000 for them out of the war indemnity from France. Prince Bismarck then made up his mind that the Railways of Germany, so far as he could, should be State Railways.

He then commenced to buy up private lines. No compulsion was used to the companies, but they were offered such generous terms, that they found it to be to their interest to sell to the Government.

In 1904 the invested capital in the State Railways was £430,000,000. The German Post Office carries parcels any weight up to 110 lbs., and they and all the Continental Railways carry the mails free of charge.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The nett profit | in | 1900 | was | £28,000,000. |
| ,, | ,, | 1901 | ,, | £28,000,000. |
| ,, | ,, | 1902 | ,, | £26,000,000. |
| ,, | ,, | 1903 | ,, | £27,000,000. |
| ,, | ,, | 1904 | ,, | £31,000,000. |

They work their Railways on the principle of cost of service, adding a profit for the benefit of the State, and their internal rates do not fluctuate any more than our Post Office does.

They are not at all particular whether they get the best value from trade on the Railways. In 1890 they had a good order to place for rails, and Krupps, of Essen, sent in a quotation for £7 5s per ton at the very same time they were supplying Roumania with the same rail at £5 11s 6d, and the German Government sent the order to Belgium and England.

# BRITISH AND PRUSSIAN RAILWAYS COMPARED.

# PRUSSIAN RAILWAYS.

In a Blue Book, No. 574, compiled by the Hon. Robert Collier, Attache to His Majesty's Embassy at Berlin, and presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Majesty King Edward VII. in February 1902, the hon. gentleman gives some remarkable statements regarding the Prussian Railways; and, with the reader's permission, I will try to compare the British and Prussian system of conducting and working the Railways of the two countries, with the results economically and financially obtained.

## Extent of the Prussian Railways.

The Kingdom of Prussia is contained within a radius of 134,466 square miles, and contains a population of 32,000,000. In the year 1850, the Government made and opened 54 miles of railway, on George Stephenson's 4 ft. 8½ in. gauge. By the year 1866, they had 13,000 miles working. In 1904 the length of Railways in Prussia made and making was 21,751 miles.

## Berlin the Centre.

Berlin is the hub of the Empire for the Prussian Railways. From the Capital the lines radiate out like the spokes of a wheel in all directions, with inner and outer lines crossing the spokes, so that the whole people, according to their needs, are fairly well supplied with Railways. The length of Prussia is about 880 miles, Berlin lying about equidistant between the frontiers of Belgium and Russia.

## Prussian Directors.

At the head of the Prussian Railways stands the Minister of Public Works. He controls four departments — for traffic, finance, technical matters, and administration.

Under the Minister the control over the Railways is entrusted to twenty-one Directors. These Directors are closely connected with the Head Centre, Berlin, so that men, engines, and wagons can be sent at a minute's notice to any part of their Railway system. The Hon. R. Collier says that after five years' experience the system has shown itself to be remarkably simple and expeditious.

# BRITISH RAILWAYS.

It is exceedingly difficult to make a report on British Railways, *not* from the want of material to work upon, but from the superabundance of it. The systems of working the British and Prussian Railways are diametrically opposed to each other, except that in both arrangements the locomotives run in front of the trains and on steel rails.

## Extent of the British Railways.

The two islands, composing Great Britain and Ireland, have a land surface of 120,751 square miles (or 13,712 square miles less than Prussia)—the population of about 43,000,000. Our Railways were working twenty years before the Prussians started to build theirs. In 1904 the number of miles open in Britain were 22,600.

## The Midlands of England the Centre.

The coal and iron districts of England and Scotland form the centres of our Railway systems. London has little or no effect upon the helter-skelter rush of the Railways from our coalfields. The Germans have spread their Railways all over their country. We have jammed all ours into a few districts.

## English Directors.

At the head of the English Railways is supposed to be the Board of Trade, and under it a Railway Commission appointed by the Government at a cost to the country of £12,000 a year. They are supposed to look after the interests of the people of this country, but the Railway Companies seem to be able to lock up all avenues of enquiry and action—at least they say so themselves. And on the Railway side are 3000 Directors, 80 of them in Parliament, with over 50 General Managers, with the advice of a legion of lawyers to bamboozle the traders, the Commission, and the Board of Trade.

## Economics.

In 1895 they reduced their clerical and finance centres from 86 to 21. The result is the number of clerks has been reduced, and a saving equal to about £1,000,000 a year has been obtained from this change alone.

## Railway Capital Results.

In 1854 the capital invested in Prussian Railways (638 miles) was £7,211,153, or about £11,500 per mile. In 1889 the miles open counted up to 14,754, and the capital £311,878,538, or about £22,600 a mile. In 1904 the miles opened or making was 21,751, and the capital invested was £434,604,652, or about £19,981 per mile. Mr Collier says, comparing the results of 1899 with those of 1904, it is very satisfactory to find that the improvement has not been brought about by starving the country; for rates have been reduced, wages have been increased, and the passenger service has been improved; the proportion of working expenses, too, has varied considerably in the eleven years. In 1889 it was 56 per cent.; in 1891 it had risen to 65½ per cent.; in 1904 it had fallen again to 54 per cent. The total debt of the Prussian Railways in 1899 stood at a sum equal to £434,604,659; but from the profits earned no less than £160,000,000 has been paid off since 1882. The remaining debt, he says, was £274,604,659. The entire profits of the Railways, he again says, including 1889 to 1904, were £372,654,202, shewing an average yearly profit of about £20,000,000.

## Prussian Railway Receipts.

| | *1895.* | | *1904* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Passengers | £13,695,092 | | £20,967,629 | |
| Goods | 34,860,301 | | 50,382,107 | |
| Miscellaneous | 3,415,609 | | ... ... | |
| Total Receipts | | £51,971,002 | | £71,349,736 |
| Expenditure— | | | | |
| Wages | £13,982,021 | | £20,892,668 | |
| Material | 14,515,547 | | 24,960,191 | |
| | | £28,497,568 | | £45,852,859 |
| Profit | | £23,473,434 | | £25,496,877 |

This shows an average annual earning power of about £3748 per mile of line. The number of employees on their Railways was 373,551, or 17.18 per mile; of locomotives and electric motors they had 14,030, or 0.64 per mile; the number of passenger vehicles was 32,888, or 1.51 per mile; and wagons, 303,660, or 14.42 per mile.

## Waste.

Against the German saving of a million a year for Railway clerking, we have 4000 clearing-house clerks in London and Dublin eating their own and the people's heads off, and there is not one in Prussia, nor one in our Post Office, and none would be wanted on the Railway system if the Government had the Railways.

## Railway Capital Results.

Dealing with British Railway capital is a little difficult, as we are supposed to use smooth words. We see on the other side that the Prussian Railway indebtedness is £420,000,000. According to the latest British Railway returns, the paid-up capital is £1,200,000,000. Then there is more stock that there are differences of opinion about. I would call it Watered Stock. The "Glasgow Herald" of 19th September 1900 calls it Book Manipulation Stock. The smooth-going financiers and their friends call it Nominal Stock, which, according to our dictionaries, means no stock at all, only a promise to pay if required. This stock stands in the books of the Companies at £193,497,000, making the whole stock stand at about £1,200,000,000. If this Watered Stock is admitted it brings our Railways out to have cost £54,000 per mile. The profits to the Prussian Government from their Railways have averaged £20,000,000 a year. The profit to the British Government is nil.

## British Railway Receipts.

In 1904 the receipts from the British Railway passenger traffic was £48,380,000; goods, £55,396,000; miscellaneous, £8,052,000 — total, £111,828,000. Working expenses, £69,119,000. Profit, £42,639,000. Per cent. profit on capital invested, 3¼. In 1902 the Prussian Railway made a profit of 7.28 per cent.

PRUSSIAN RAILWAYS - *(Continued).*

## Passenger Trains.

The Prussian passenger engines pull four classes of carriages, but they are by no means always found on the same train. The classes are 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th, and the percentage of travellers in 1899 was less than ½ per cent., 1st class; 10 per cent., 2nd class; 50 per cent., 3rd class; and 39½ per cent., 4th class. They have three speeds for running their trains, viz.:—The stopping trains run 25 miles an hour, carrying all the classes; the express running at 44 miles, stopping at larger stations and carrying 1st, 2nd, and 3rd classes; and the special express trains, or, what are called in France, "Nord" trains, running from Paris to St Petersburg, through Berlin, carrying 1st and 2nd classes, run at 51½ miles an hour. The Hon. R. Collier states that the Prussian trains are nearly always absolutely punctual.

## Passenger Fares.

The Germans, like the Americans and the French, have two tokens by which they reckon their trading. The Prussian mark is about equal to our shilling, and their pfenning is 1-100 part of a mark, so that about 8¼ pfenning is about equal to our penny, but I will try to deal with the subject in our own money as much as possible. Then, again, their distance measure, kilometer is 1094 yards, or about ⅝ of our mile.

| | 1st Class. | 2nd Class. | 3rd Class. | 4th Class. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The fares per mile by these express Prussian trains are..... | 1.70d | 1¼d | 0.88d | ... |
| And by ordinary or 25 mile trains... | 1½d | 1¼d | ¾d | ⅜d |

Return tickets are available for 45 days, and are ¼d per mile 4th class, and the other classes in proportion. The Post Office workers and all the civil servants, soldiers, and sailors get free passes, 2nd class. If one member of a household has taken a season ticket at the full price all the other members of the house can do the same at half the ordinary price, and not necessarily for the same journey or in the same class. This system has caused an enormous suburban traffic into the large towns. Cheap Sunday tickets are issued, and reductions are granted companies of people. Pic-nicing school children and students are allowed very low tickets. Workmen are carried in 4th class carriages at one pfenning per kilometer, or 5½ miles for one penny. The fares on the city and circle Railways, 2nd and 3rd class only, are 1¾d 2nd class and 1⅛d 3rd class, for any distance up

## Passenger Trains.

Our British engines pull three classes of carriages, but in some parts of the larger island only two classes—the 2nd class being long since discarded. About 8 per cent. of our passengers travel 1st and 2nd class, and 92 per cent. 3rd. The money taken from the 1st and 2nd is about 16 per cent., and from the 3rd, 84 per cent. Our fares vary a good deal with the various Companies in Scotland. In some parts we can travel at ½d per mile, in other parts ¾d, but in most parts 1d per mile 3rd class. In England the fare is uniformly 1d per mile. In 1904 our Post Office paid the Companies for carrying the mails £1,191,060. We have to pay for all our civil servants, all our soldiers and naval sailors. Prussia on these three or four points saves £2,000,000 a year.

The fares in Ireland are higher than in England.

## Passenger Train Service.

It is often a complaint in this country that the Prussian trains are both slow and unfrequent. The Hon. R. Collier points out that there is from Hamburg to Berlin 177½ miles, which is about equal distance from London to Liverpool and Manchester. 'Tis true, 'tis pity; and pity 'tis, 'tis true that there are 45 trains a day from London to Liverpool and Manchester, but all the Companies are running at the same minute and hour, or nearly so. Now, if you divide 45 by 5, you will find the Berlin and Hamburg people not so far out after all. Then about the speed. He says the stopping trains do 27 miles an hour; fast, 35; express, 44½; corridor express, 51¼; and their trains are almost always absolutely punctual. How many people in this country would you find to say the same for this Britain of ours? I think I may venture the statement, without much fear of contradiction, that there are hundreds of hours lost to the commercial and diplomatic life of this country every year through late trains. The best Prussian trains do the Hamburg-Berlin journey in 3 hours 32 minutes. There is not a train, so far as I know, beats this for speed. Of course, London to Manchester is 183½ miles, or six miles longer than Hamburg to Berlin, but the L. and N.-W., which takes the least time, occupies 3¾ hours, or thirteen minutes longer to run the extra six miles. Then the L. and N.-W. run a train from Liverpool to London, 193½ miles, in 4 hours, but there is no stop allowed. The Prusian train stops twice and does over 50 miles an hour. In connection with passenger traffic on our Railways, we have 66,017 vehicles or carriages.

to five stations. Fifty-six lbs. of luggage is taken free with ordinary or return tickets.

As an example of the present state of the passenger train service in Prussia at the present time, we will take the route between Berlin and Hamburg — the one with a population of 2,000,000 and the other of 1,000,000. The distance between Berlin and Hamburg is 177½ miles. The first train leaves Berlin at 6.37 A.M., and carries 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class, stopping at most of the stations; it takes five hours and four minutes to reach Hamburg at an average speed of 35 miles an hour. At 9 A.M. another express leaves with 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class, and stopping four times, takes one hour less to do the journey, or four hours and four minutes, the speed at the rate of about 44½ miles an hour, including stops. At 9.30 A.M. a stopping train leaves, carrying 4th class, and arrives in Hamburg at 4.6 P.M., or a speed of about 27 miles an hour. At 1.20 P.M. a corridor train, 1st and 2nd only, and only stopping twice on the way, reaches Hamburg in three hours and thirty-two minutes, the average speed being 50½ miles an hour, and so on during the day to all parts of the country. Since 1894 the International Sleeping Car Company's trains travel direct from Berlin to Constantinople, Munich, and the Riviera, and the "Nord" express from Paris to St Petersburg, also pass through Berlin. Large sums of money have been spent in the last ten years for rebuilding and extending stations, and a great number of small stations have been built where none were before, so as to give the people all possible facilities to get into the villages.

## Goods Traffic.

The great capacity of the wagons in comparison with ours gives Prussia a great advantage. Her wagons carry from 10 to 12½, 15, up to 30 tons each. In 1899 she had 277,000 wagons; in 1900 we had 709,200 wagons. The fact that the Prussian Government controls the whole of the wagons makes the distribution of them much easier.

## Goods Traffic.

In 1904 the British Railways had 22,195 locomotives, and 799,984 wagons, and traders' wagons, 500,000, making 1,300,000 goods wagons of all kinds. In 1899 the Prussian Railways had 277,000 wagons to do their work with; and we had, owing to our company system, about five to one they had.

PRUSSIAN RAILWAYS—*(Continued)*.

## Goods Rates—German Lines.

In 1904 the receipts from passengers, as we have seen, were about £20,967,629, while the receipts from goods and live stock amounted to £50,382,107; the total tonnage of goods over the Railways has nearly doubled in ten years. In 1889, 119,000,000 tons were carried, and in 1899 the trade had expanded to 200,000,000 tons, and the revenue from goods and cattle had expanded to 53 per cent. in 1899 over 1889. The Prussian Government have three goods rates—ordinary, special, and preferential. The ordinary and special can be got by the ordinary trader, but the preferential rate is kept up the sleeves of the 21 Directors for special occasions. The ordinary goods rate have two heads—a whole wagon load or less than a wagon load. If less than a wagon load is sent the rate is 11 pfenning per kilometer, or about 2d per ton per mile if the distance is under 32 miles; it is about 1¾d if the distance is between 32 and 65 miles; and for every additional 65 miles a reduction of one pfenning up to 300 miles; over 300 miles the rate for less than a wagon load is six pfennings, or about ¾d per ton per mile; if a whole wagon load of 10 tons is sent, ½d per ton per mile is charged for any distance. Perishable goods are sent at express speed at ordinary rates with the addition of a small dispatch fee. The above are the rates for goods which do not belong to the special rates or the preferential rates. To send two tons of merchandise 93 miles at the ordinary goods rate the total charge would be 34s, or 17s per ton, or 10¼d the cwt. To send 50 tons 124 miles at the special rate is £14, or 5s 7d per ton; then the remarkable thing, he points out, is that the special rates are not nearly so important as the preferential rates. He says, no less than 63 per cent. of the total tonnage are sent as preferential goods, against 17 per cent. under special goods, and 20 per cent. go as ordinary goods. Fresh fish from Bremen, Geestemunde, and Nardenham to Vienna is 4.5 pfennings per ton per kilometer, or about ¾d per ton per mile.

BRITISH RAILWAYS—*(Continued).*

## Goods Rates.

Our goods rates to any one not a professional expert are a puzzle. This will be easily understood when we take into consideration that we have 200,000,000 of them. They principally consist of eight classes of goods common to our country, and include all minerals of every description, fish from the sea, fowl from the barnyard, and birds from the air.

Goods carried at 1st class rates are for ale and porter, aerated waters, lead, sugar, onions, apples, pears, etc., etc.

2nd.—Hams, butter, cheese in boxes, confectionery, oranges, lemons, earthenware, preserves, tobacco, yarns, etc., etc.

3rd.—Tea, eggs, cheese (bare), drapery, heavy hardware, leather, whisky in casks, etc., etc.

4th.—Clothing, drugs, saddlery, dead meat, etc., etc.

5th.—Furniture, pictures, musical instruments, whisky in jars, furs, jewellery, clocks, etc., etc.

| | *1st.* | *2nd.* | *3rd.* | *4th.* | *5th.* | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Rates for over 3 cwt. | 9/7 | 10/10 | 12/11 | 15/2 | 17 11 | per Ton | for | 25 | Miles |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 14/2 | 16/8 | 19/2 | 22/11 | 27/1 | ,, | ,, | 50 | ,, |
| ,, ,, ,, ,, | 19/2 | 22/11 | 26/8 | 31/8 | 38/4 | ,, | ,, | 100 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 1 cwt. or under | 0/8 | 0/10 | 0/11 | 1/1 | 1/2 | ,, | ,, | 25 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 2 ,, | 1/2 | 1/3 | 1/6 | 1/9 | 2/ | ,, | ,, | 25 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 3 ,, | 1/6 | 1/9 | 2/ | 2 5 | 2/9 | ,, | ,, | 25 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 1 ,, | 0/11 | 1/1 | 1/5 | 1/9 | 2/ | ,, | ,, | 50 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 2 ,, | 1 7 | 1/10 | 2/1 | 2/6 | 2/11 | ,, | ,, | 50 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 3 ,, | 2/1 | 2/7 | 3/ | 3/6 | 4/2 | ,, | ,, | 50 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 1 ,, | 1/5 | 1/9 | 1/11 | 2/3 | 2 7 | ,, | ,, | 100 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 2 ,, | 2/1 | 2/6 | 2/10 | 3/4 | 4/ | ,, | ,, | 100 | ,, |
| ,, ,, 3 ,, | 3/ | 3/6 | 4/1 | 4/10 | 5/10 | ,, | ,, | 100 | ,, |

Perishable goods such as fish, fruit, and vegetables are sent over the German Railways very cheap. It is the very reverse here. I have a bill lying before me from H. Burrow & Co., Billingsgate, London, stating that 13s 4d of the price of four barrels of crabs from a fisherman in Crail, Fifeshire, is for porterage, carriage, and commission. The four barrels would weigh about two cwt.

PRUSSIAN RAILWAYS—*(Continued).*

## German Rates for Live Stock.

Live animals may be paid for either according to number or according to floor space occupied. To take some examples. To dispatch 11 oxen a distance of 25 miles the whole freight is 22s 7d, or about 2s 0½d per head; to send a wagon load of animals, other than horses, 93 miles, the wagon having a floor space of 236 square feet, the total charge will be very nearly £3 12s 0½d.

BRITISH RAILWAYS—(*Continued*).

## Live Stock—Cattle.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ½ | Wagon, | consisting of one to four oxen, | | 9s 9d | for 25 miles. | | |
| 1 | ,, | ,, | five to eight | ,, | 14s 1d | | ,, |
| ½ | ,, | ,, | upwards sheep, | | 8s 10d | | ,, |
| 1 | ,, | ,, | ,, | ,, | 12s 8d | | ,, |
| ½ | ,, | ,, | ,, | oxen, | 18s 5d | 50 | ,, |
| 1 | ,, | ,, | ,, | ,, | 27s 1d | | ,, |
| ½ | ,, | ,, | ,, | sheep, | 16s 4d | | ,, |
| 1 | ,, | ,, | ,, | ,, | 24s 0d | | ,, |
| ½ | ,, | ,, | ,, | oxen, | 33s 2d | 100 | ,, |
| 1 | ,, | ,, | ,, | ,, | 49s 3d | | ,, |
| ½ | ,, | ,, | ,, | sheep, | 31s 7d | | ,, |
| 1 | ,, | ,, | ,, | ,, | 46s 10d | | ,, |

What is remarkable in this Live Stock Table is this point, that for 25 miles or under, the price is 9s 9d; for 100 miles or under it is just about four times more, while there is only one loading and unloading. In Germany the system seems to be just reversed; for long distances the rates seem to be very much more reduced.

In the matter of passenger accommodation, the German second-class carriages are more comfortable than our first. The second-class long journey carriages are provided with a lavatory, and "many," says Hole, "who would in England, France, Belgium, or Italy ride first-class, are content with the second-class German." The German Railways always manage the system of refreshments better than we do. Soup, tea, coffee, and lemonade, good and at moderate prices, are generally obtainable there, and rarely here.

Taking all the State Railways of the German Confederacy together, the Berlin correspondent of the "Times" showed that for the ten years ending 1890-91, there had been an increase of 22 per cent. in the mileage, of 41 per cent. in the receipts, and of 23 per cent. in the net revenue, as compared with 10 per cent., 20 per cent., and 15 per cent. respectively for the corresponding period in England. He also showed that while the German lines earned an average rental during that period of 4.86 per cent., the English earned 4.10 or .76 per cent. less. And all this, be it remembered, after giving rates and charges that are in most cases incomparably cheaper than under the system of private ownership in this country.

Though the conditions of employment of most classes of German workers are considerably worse than in the case of similar classes in England, the State Railway servant is certainly better off than our English Railway workers. It will be seen that not only are the Prussian wages better than here, but large allowances are made for houses, and every workman and his widow and orphans are entitled to pensions as Civil servants!

## Prussian Railway Servants.

In 1904 the number of persons employed on the Railways was 373,551 of whom 145,000 were classed as officials, and 233,551 as workmen. Owing to shorter hours, the number of men per mile has slightly increased, but the free introduction of mechanical appliances has enabled a greater volume of traffic to be conducted per head than before. After five years' service, satisfactorily performed, an official becomes definite, and is irremovable except for bad conduct. Officials receive their salaries quarterly in advance, and continue to draw their pay when absent through illness or any other sufficient cause. For purposes of salary the officials are divided into thirty groups; to each of the groups a different rate of pay is given. At the head comes a president of a directorate, who receives £550 a year, with a free house, or £75 in lieu of it. Thus, the highest paid man is worth £625 a year. Then, for example, a first-class stationmaster receives £120 a year the first three years, and £145 for the next three years, then £170 for the third three years, and £190 for the fourth, and after that £210, at which he stands. A fireman has to pass through six three-year periods, starting with £50, £55, £59, £63, £67, £71, up to £75 a year. A driver starts with £60, and rises in the same way to £110; a guard starts at £60, and rises to £90; a signalman, £60 to £80; a shunter, £45 to £70; a goods guard, £45 to £60. The lowest pay of any of the servants, that of a ganger or night watchman, is £35 to £50 a year. Besides their regular pay and other allowances, the men that are married either have free houses or get so much a year for rent, according to their class; thus, the highest official gets £75 and the lowest £3.

BRITISH RAILWAYS—*(Continued).*

## British Railway Servants.

In 1904 the number of men employed on our Railways was 581,000. On the Prussian Railways they do their work with 180,000 fewer men. How is this? The Prussian servant seems to have a much firmer tenure of office than our men, when we remember the case of the North-Western men a few years ago where the Government had to step in and arrange matters and get the men back to their work. The most and best of the Prussian men receive their salaries quarterly and in advance—think of that, Oh! reader—and continue to draw their full pay when off ill, or from any other sufficient cause. The highest pay of the Prussian officials (and there are 21 of them) is equal to £550, with a free house, or £75 added for the same—this makes him a total salary of £625 per annum. How does this compare with our system? We have 51 or more General Managers. It is said that one of our General Managers gets £33 per day, £231 per week, or £12,000 a year. The salary of the General Manager of one of our little Scottish lines is £5000 a year, or £94 10s a week, just £13 15s a day; and another was getting £11 a day, £77 a week, or £4000 a year. And then we should not run away with the idea that the £12,000 man is overpaid, for, according to the business done, three of the Southern Railways do an average of three times the business that the two best Scottish Railways do. A first-class stationmaster in Prussia gets from £120 to £210 a year, with a free house; a locomotive fireman is paid from £50 up to £75 a year, with a free house; a driver starts with £60 and gets to £110 with free house, and so on. The lowest pay of any of the Prussian servants a watchman or ganger, is equal to from 13s 6d to 19s 6d, with free house. This watchman's wage compares very favourably with our station porters, not to mention the question of free houses.

Suppose we compare a few of the salaries of principal Postmasters with the salaries of the Railway General Managers. The Postmaster or Controller of the London office gets £1034 and may rise to £1200; the same official in Dublin gets £683, and may rise to £700; in Edinburgh he gets £550, and may rise to £700 also. The Postmasters of Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham each get £800 per annum; Bristol, Leeds, and Newcastle, £700; Bradford, Hull, Nottingham, Belfast, and Cardiff, £600 each; and so on down according to the population and business done.

Then the average pay of a Postmaster (excluding sub-post offices) in England and Wales is £278; in Scotland under the same rule, £200; and in Ireland under like conditions, £184 10s.

PRUSSIAN RAILWAYS—*(Continued)*.

## Hours of Work.

1. Station Staff.—In cases where the work is severe and continuous, stationmasters, shunters, signalmen, etc., the regular day is eight hours, and not exceeding ten hours in any case. If the work is of an ordinary nature, the regular day may be twelve hours, but not to exceed fourteen.

2. Permanent Way Staff.—The regular day is not to be more than fourteen hours.

3. Train Staff.—The monthly average day must not exceed eleven hours. No trainman is allowed to work longer than sixteen hours, and there must be intervals of cessation, and, if possible, a longer rest must be given after.

4. Locomotive Staff.—The monthly average day is not to exceed ten hours, or eleven if the conditions are easy. No single man may exceed sixteen hours; but in no case are the men to spend more than ten hours on the locomotive. When engaged in continuous shunting the normal day is eight hours and the extreme limit ten hours. The time for getting the locomotive ready and putting her away all counts as part of the working day.

Every official must have at least two whole days' (of full twenty-four hours) rest a month, except those whose duties are very light, who may get only one. Between two periods of work pauses of at least eight hours must take place with all locomotive and signal officials; no man may be engaged on night work more than seven nights running. Care must be taken to provide men who have to pass the night away from home with good lodgings, baths, and opportunities for getting food, and with good literature.

BRITISH RAILWAYS—*(Continued).*

## Hours of Work.

I must leave this very much with the British public, including the Railway servants. This question is always with us. It comes up in the strikes, in Letters to the Editor, Royal Commissions and Board of Trade inquiries, debates in the House of Commons, and I have tried to deal with it. But the Railway servants themselves will be able to see where the difference lies in the Prussian system and ours. The Board of Trade returns for 1893 give the wages of the workers (excluding stationmasters, managers, clerical staff, etc.), viz.:—

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9,891 | Men received over | | | 40/ | per week. |
| 6,508 | ,, | from | 35/ to | 40/ | ,, |
| 15,045 | ,, | ,, | 30/ to | 35/ | ,, |
| 38,414 | ,, | ,, | 25/ to | 30/ | ,, |
| 111,086 | ,, | ,, | 15/ to | 20 | ,, |
| 6,595 | ,, | ,, | 10/ to | 15 | ,, |
| 24 | ,, | ,, | ... ... | 10/ | ,, |

Again, Mr Giffen shows that railwaymen compare most unfavourably with other industries. He says the average annual wage of all our workers is £64 per annum—building trades, £73; merchant seamen, £65; hospital employees, £61; lunatic asylum employees, £60; railwaymen, £60.

Another authority on Railway workers' wages says that 150,000 of the men get less than 20s a week; that over 350,000 get an average of 22s 8d; that, including the top 200,000, the whole average is 45s per week. A great deal of evidence was given before the Labour Commission, when it was shown that many railwaymen were working for 70 hours a week for 14s.

In 1891, Mr Channing moved in the House of Commons that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the hours of labour on Railways. The Committee was appointed, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was chairman of it. Sir Michael gave dozens of instances, of which the following are average specimens:—

A B (on the North British Railway)—A fireman worked each fortnight, during the last eight months, 174, 174, 156, 186, 193, 188, 193, 254, 168, 193, 190, 192, 198, 155, 167, 194 hours, giving an average of 15½ hours per day.

B C—An engine-driver worked for four fortnights prior to the strike, 202, 186, 204, 172; an average of 15 hours 55 minutes.

On the Caledonian line, drivers and guards worked weeks of 90 hours and 5 minutes, 88 hours and 51 minutes, 91 hours and 35 minutes. On the Great Western, one man's average for three months was 77 hours per week.

## Workmen.

Workmen consist of platelayers, labourers in the repairing shops, and the lower grades of various classes of Railway servants designated assistant, such as assistant brakesmen, assistant shunters, etc. This class of men are not engaged if they have reached the age of 35 years. Workmen are paid fortnightly for work already done, and can at any time be dismissed with a fortnight's notice. They receive no house rent allowance.

## Dwelling-Houses.

The Prussian Government had up till 1899 built 33,410 houses for their workmen on the Railways. The Hon. R. Collier does not give us any idea of the value of them. But suppose we put them at £200 each, the Prussian Government has £6,682,000 in houses, and the workman has an average of £8 more a year added to his salary.

## Worskhops.

Everywhere evidences are seen of the thought and trouble that is taken to provide for the comfort of the workmen. At frequent intervals throughout the shops are washing basins, with hot and cold water, and hot-plates where the men can keep their food warm, and they have excellent bathrooms and shower baths, with swimming baths, etc. All the shops in winter are heated by steam. A constant number of eighty apprentices receive their training there at the age of fourteen, and after they have passed school examinations they go through a four years' course of training till they are eighteen years. They are set to do work of a most practical kind. A gang of them, under direction of two older men, will do practically all the repairs to a locomotive. They pass two hours a week learning machine drawing, and every year have to produce a finished working drawing of some part of a machine, and also to construct entirely by themselves some piece of machinery, such, for instance, as a lock and a key in the first year and a locomotive whistle in the fourth.

About 30 men at Stourbridge worked weeks of from 70 to 90½ hours. On the Lancashire and Yorkshire, specially long days were worked—17¼, 19½, 21, 20¾, 22¾ hours. In 1895, on our Railways there were 481 men killed, and 13,930 injured.

## Workmen.

The workmen in Prussia seem to be very much on the same lines as all our Railway servants here. They are paid fortnightly after the work is done, and can be dismissed after a fortnight's warning, and they receive no house rent.

## Dwelling-Houses.

Dwelling-houses for our Railway workmen do not, practically, exist. Prussia has spent nearly £7,000,000 on them.

## Workshops.

I must again leave this to the railwaymen themselves; they know best as to the fitness and amenities of the workshops.

PRUSSIAN RAILWAYS—*(Continued)*

## Carriages.

The corridor trains that travel over most of the main lines have extremely handsome carriages running on two four-wheel bogies. The 1st and 2nd class compartments are 6 feet 4 inches wide, and 6 feet 8 inches long. The 3rd class compartments are 6 feet 8 inches wide, and 5 feet 3 inches long. The 1st class compartments are intended to hold four persons; the 2nd, six; and the 3rd class, eight. There are doors at either end of the carriage, but none at the sides. This arrangement enables the carriage to be more equally filled, and the passengers going out or coming in at the next station better accommodated; and the sides of the carriage being solid have much more resisting power from buckling in case of a pitch in. The carriages are heated in winter by steam, either from the engine or from a special boiler carried on the train. Most of the day express trains have a dining car, where an excellent meal may be had at a reasonable price, and on the night expresses there are sleeping carriages.

The following is a list of some of the fastest runs in Prussia:—

| | Distance. | Booked Time. | Average Speed per Hour. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Miles | Minutes. | Miles. |
| Hamburgh to Wittenberge ..... | 98¾ | 113 | 52.4 |
| Wittenberge to Berlin ..... | 78¾ | 91 | 51.9 |
| Berlin to Wittenberge ..... | 78¾ | 91 | 51.9 |
| Wittenberge to Hagenow..... ..... | 40½ | 47 | 51.7 |
| Hagenow to Hamburg (Klosterthor) .. | 58½ | 68 | 51.6 |
| Hamburg to Hagenow ... . ..... | 58¼ | 68 | 51 4 |
| Wittenberge to Hamburg (Klosterthor) | 99 | 116 | 51.2 |
| Wittenberge to Spandau ..... | 71½ | 85 | 50.1 |
| Berlin to Halle ... . ..... | 100¼ | 120 | 50.1 |
| Halle to Berlin ..... | 100¼ | 120 | 50.1 |

BRITISH RAILWAYS—*(Continued).*

## Carriages.

The width of the 3rd class British compartment is about 90 inch. Measured lengthwise, that of the Great Western Railway is 65 inch, and the length and breadth of the North British is 90 by 70 inch. The Prussian is two inches narrower than the Great Western, but it only carries eight passengers.

# FURTHER COMPARISONS.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The average train load in Britain (of goods) is only..... | | | | 70 | tons. |
| ,, | ,, | Belgium | ,, | ..... 96 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | France | ,, | ..... 121 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | Germany | ,, | ..... 132 | ,, |
| ,, | ,, | United States, A. | | ..... 204 | ,, |

"Fifteen years ago the Pennsylvania Railroad of America was badly pushed to make a rate of nearly seven-tenths of a cent. per ton per mile pay its expenses, charges, and dividend; now it is earning a ten per cent. dividend with a rate of under five-tenths of a cent. per ton per mile. In 1894 the New York Central had difficulty in making an average rate of .74 cent per ton per mile pay; last year it earned a larger profit with an average rate of .59 cent per ton mile. These improved results have been attained by loading trains more heavily and thus saving fuel, wages, and material."

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| In Germany a | fourth-class | passenger pays | .32 | pence per mile. |
| ,, | third-class | ,, | .65 | ,, |
| ,, | second-class | ,, | .97 | ,, |
| ,, | first-class | ,, | 1.26 | ,, |

In Hungary a person can travel 400 miles for 8s; while in England the charge for the same distance is 32s 11d (third class), and 40s (first class.

So the Germans carry their pasengers for less money, and then they get more profits out of them than our profit-hunting Railways manage to do.

The returns just issued by the German Government for 1904 show that after all expenses were met, the Chancellor of the Exchequer netted from these Railways no less than £31,200,000, available for fighting in Europe or anywhere else. The profit has been doubled in two years.

## The Experience of British-Australian Colonies.

One curious feature of the Railways in our Colonies is that they have no directors. We put 48 in the House of Lords and 35 in the House of Commons to enable them to govern the empire as well as attend to the business of working the Railways.

The Right Hon. R. I. Seddon, Premier of New Zealand, said in London during the Jubilee year that the Colony of New Zealand in 1898 had 2014 miles of Railway. The gross revenue was £1,183,041. The working expenses were £756,866. Profit was £431,435. These Railways are managed by a Minister of State. The wages paid were:—Navvies, 7s 2d; concrete men, 7s 2d; fencers, 7s 5d; bushmen, 7s 7d; platelayers, 7s 10d; painters, 8s 3d; carpenters, 8s 8d; tunnelmen, 9s 10d; and drivers, 12s per day.

In New South Wales the Government subsidised the Railways with £141,656, and they were taken over thirteen years ago. In 1898 their total earnings from the Railways and tramways were £3,493,829. The total expenditure, £1,978,464, showing a nett profit of £1,515,365 on the year's working.

Their Railways have cost about 33½ millions, and are estimated to be worth 40 millions.

In 1901, the profit from the New Zealand Railways was £750,000, and the Victoria profit was £1,353,000. The Railways in Australia cost £26 18s 4d per head of the population.

In proportion to population Australia is the best served in Railway mileage of any country in the world. Here are some comparative figures:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| West Australia ..... | 1 Mile of Railway to | | 96 | Population. |
| Australia ..... | 1 | ,, | 339 | ,, |
| America ..... | 1 | ,, | 350 | ,, |
| Germany ..... | 1 | ,, | 1800 | ,, |
| Great Britain ..... | 1 | ,, | 1888 | ,, |

Female members of a family are allowed to travel at half-price, and so are children up to 16 (instead of 12 as here). Again, University students and school-pupils travelling first-class are charged half-fares; second-class passengers if under 16 years, quarter-fares; if over 16, half-fares. And passengers are permitted to break the journey.

In 1896, 2386 miles of Railway had been opened at a cost of £17,347,780, or £7024 per mile. The gross earnings were £1,052,024, and the working expenses £644,362, leaving £407,662 nett profit, or 2.66 per cent. on capital. The gross earnings per train-mile were 4s 7d, and the working expenses 2s 8½d.

The construction by private Companies of the Australian Railways was a complete failure, and Colonial Governments had to take them over.

They have 4 gauges in Australia—5 feet 3 inches, 4 feet 8½ inches, 3 feet 6 inches, and 2 feet 6 inches. This will be a cause of great expense to them.

The Year Book observes that the Railways of Australia represent the assets for their National Debt, and would realise, if they were to be disposed of, the full amount of their national liability.

A striking illustration of the jealousy with which the colonists view their valuable possessions was given in 1882. Sir Thomas MacIlwraith, one of the Colonial Premiers, and his Government entered into proposals with a British Syndicate proposing to give them a large track of country through which to build a Railway. As soon as the arrangement leaked out, the indignation of the colonists burst out, and the Government was compelled to resign—was badly beaten. The Syndicate was severely snubbed and sent home, and no other attempt has been made on the same lines since.

Australia has abolished the contract system, and that has caused no increase of cost. They have adopted what is called the co-operative contract system, in which small gangs or parties of men take the work, and divide the money according to their own arangement. This is thought to be an advantage to both sides, as each man sees that the other does his duty.

In Australia they reduced the train mileage by 800,000 miles per annum. They amalgamated offices, concentrated the work, abolished unnecessary correspondence and clerical labour to the extent of £70,000 per annum. This is in accordance with the recommendation of Sir R. Hamilton. He says the train service is needlessly great, and should be reduced. That where a Railway does not give a return of £300 per mile per year, the train service should be restricted to four trains per day each way.

From Adelaide to Melbourne is 509 miles; Melbourne to Sydney, 576 miles; Sydney to Brisbane, 723—total, 1808 miles; but to do this journey you have to pass over three gauges. New South Wales gauge is 4 feet 8½ inches; Queensland, 3 feet 6 inches; South Australia, 5 feet 3 inches and 3 feet 6 inches; Victoria, 5 feet 3 inches; Western Australia, 3 feet 6 inches; New Zealand, 3 feet 6 inches.

Great Britain has one mile of Railway to each six square miles of land, and Australia one mile to each 394 square miles of land. Throughout Australia the railways, tramways, telegraphs, and telephones are the property of the State.

## New South Wales State Railways.

In 1904 the income from these Railways was £3,436,413; tramways, £802,985—total earnings, £4,239,398. Working expenses—Railways, £2,258,940; tramways, £673,625—total working expenses, £2,932,565, or 65.74 of the revenue. Balance left, £1,306,833. The number of miles open for traffic, 30th June 1904 was 3281, and the invested capital was £42,288,517, or about £12,888 18s per mile. During the year they added about 312 miles to their Railways and tramways. The revenue for the year shows an increase of £121,520, and the expenditure a decrease of £7359, the result being an improvement of £128,879 over the previous year. They had an increase of pasengers amounting to 1,408,551, and in goods of 60,518 tons. The passengers carried were 33,792,689 during the year, and not a life was lost, and the 3rd class mileage rate was considerably reduced, and the rates on small parcels of goods lowered.

## Western Australian Railways.

From the report by W. J. George, General Director of the Government Railways in Western Australia, 1904, he says—In the year 1879 we had 35 miles of Railways, over which we carried 1037 passengers and 1651 tons of goods. The money lost that year amounted to £727. Our invested capital at that time was £152,741, or about £4364 per mile. The Colony lost money steadily from 1879 till in 1890 the loss was £6527 that year. We got the turn in 1891, when the profit was £498. In that year we had 203 miles of rails, and carried 277,997 passengers and 96,498 tons of goods. We have made a profit ever since. In 1904 we had 1535 miles of Railways, and our invested capital is £8,955,929, or about £5834 per mile. We carried 10,225,976 passengers and 2,281,764 tons of goods. Our total earnings were £1,588,084, or 8s 11d per train mile. The working expenses cost £1,179,624, or 5s 1½d per train mile. The balance of £407,461 to pay interest at 3½ per cent. and sinking fund took £296,679, leaving a clear balance to profit of £110,782.

Locomotives in 1904 were 329, about one to every five miles of rails. Passenger coaches and vans, 396; goods vehicles in traffic, 5632—total vehicles, 6028, or about four for every mile of rails.

The average number of persons employed was 5616, or about four per mile. The rate of wages the men get is—The Chief Traffic Manager, £1000 a year; the average of the salaried men is about £250; the wage earners

get from 1s 6d to 26s per day. One inspector of electric light gets 20s per day, and one prentice boy 1s 6d. Apprentices rise from that to 6s a day. Labourers range from 7s to 10s per day; platelayers from 8s 6d to 12s 6d; repairers from 8s to 9s; cleaners, 6s to 7s 6d; porters, 6s 6d to 10s; shunters, 7s 6d to 9s 6d; turners, 9s 6d to 12s 6d; signalmen, 7s to 11s 6d; firemen, 8s to 10s; drivers, 11s to 15s; guards, 8s 6d to 12s. These figures may be taken as a fair average of what pertains in the rest of our Australian and New Zealand Colonies.

The yearly salaries and the daily wages are all paid for on an 8-hours day's work.

For passengers they have only two classes—1st and 2nd. 1st class is as near as may be the same as ours. 2nd class is a penny a mile. Their excursion fares average about ½d per mile for 2nd class. The Fresh Air League gets children to the coast for less than ¼d per mile.

Some interesting statements come out regarding their coal supply. He says, in testing the quality of our Newcastle coal and their own native coal, it was proved that a much larger quantity of their native coal was required to do the same amount of work that our Newcastle coal could do, and at present the contract price would be less than our native coal could be bought for. The present price for native coal in wagons at the pits is 10s 6d per ton, and for Newcastle coal at Freemantle the price is 15s 4d per ton. We consumed last year of Newcastle coal 40,815 tons, and of our own coal 115,514 tons. We have made many reductions to freight charges during the year, and our rates are practically the same as in the other Australian Colonies.

## Egyptian Railway.

In Blue Book 2409, Earl Cromer (to Lord Lansdowne, 15th March, 1905) says in 1882 a serious revolt took place in Egypt. After the cessation of that serious trouble, a new and bright era in the history of Egypt set in, and it more so shone out when, after twenty-five years' of dual interference through Anglo-French relations, an agreement was signed on April the 8th, 1904, to allow the British influence to predominate in Egypt and legalised in the face of the world. By the action of the British Government, the debt of Egypt on the 1st of January, 1905, was £101,275,340. £8,917,280 was held by the Debt Commissioners and Ministry of Finance, leaving £92,358,060 in the hands of the public. In 1904, £911,580 was paid off the above total. Writing of fiscal reform, he

says—"We have taken 40 per cent. off the salt duty, and lowered the postal, telegraph, and railway rates. We have removed all the fisherman's lock-tolls on the Nile. The result of this has been, while in 1898, 15,867 boats passed through the Delta Barrage, in 1903 no less than 35,732 boats passed over the same spot, and in 1904 the number had increased to 41,740. Formerly forty watchmen had to be employed, now six is quite sufficient for the work. The Nile is entirely free. The fees for the registration of land sales have been reduced from five to two per cent., and general taxation has been remitted to the extent of about £1,600,000." He goes on to say that in spite of some acknowledged defects in the existing system, broadly speaking the people are very lightly taxed, thus fulfilling our original expectation. In 1883, the first year of British occupation, the revenue was under £9,000,000, in 1890 it exceeded £10,000,000, in 1897 it was over £11,000,000, in 1901 it got over £12,000,000, and in 1904 the revenue reached the figure of £13,906,000.

For reasons to which I have frequently alluded before, the Egyptian railways have failed to keep pace with the increasing traffic. A Commission has recently gone into this question, and has recommended that capital to the extent of £3,000,000 be spent upon railways, and it is probable that this outlay will be more rapidly and directly remunerative to the Government than any expenditure they have made in any other direction.

When the Nile Navigation dues were abolished, it was argued that the railways would be seriously affected by the cheap river traffic. But this fear has not been realised. Although the rates were reduced, the average per ton for goods in 1903 was 8s, and in 1904 it was 7s 5d, a decrease of 7d. But the railway revenue continues rising.

On the 31st December, 1904, the invested capital was about £14,500,000, in 1534 miles of lines, or about £9452 per mile. They employed 17,207 men, or about 11.22 per mile. The gross earnings were £2,668,296, or about £1739 per mile. They had 488 locomotives, or about 0.30 per mile. Total passenger vehicles, 887, or 0.57 per mile of goods and mineral wagons, 8166, or 5.32 per mile. The total goods and minerals carried was 3,529,559 tons, or about 2.281 tons per mile. The total passengers carried was 17,724,922, or 11.561 per mile. The working expenses were £1,369,916, and the gross profit £1,298,380.

In 1903 the gross profits were £1,063,792; and in 1904, £1,298,380; a net increase of £234,588. The working expenses were, in 1903, 54.15 per cent. of the gross earnings; and 52.25 per cent. in 1904. About £400,000 was spent on carriages and wagons, improving the stations, &c.; and

£12,000 on workmen's dwellings. The railway contracts issued in 1904 to the following eleven countries were as follows:—

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Britain, for fuel ,rails, sleepers, chairs, coaches, locomotives, signalling appliances, and stationery, amounting to..... | | | £494,469 |
| Belgium got contracts for wagons, bridge, and roof work..... | | | 164,915 |
| France | ,, | ,, | locomotives and bridges..... ..... 48,000 |
| Germany | ,, | ,, | wheels, axles, and tyres..... 29,711 |
| United States | | ,, | oil ..... ..... 17,690 |
| Egypt | ,, | ,, | miscellaneous .... ..... 16,810 |
| Turkey | ,, | ,, | timber ..... ..... 11,200 |
| Austria Hungary | | ,, | timber and wagons..... 9,868 |
| Sweden | ,, | ,, | timber ..... .... ... 4,770 |
| Italy | ,, | ,, | stone ..... 3,330 |
| Russia | ,, | ,, | oil . ..... ..... ..... 2,350 |
| | | | Total.. ..... £803,035 |

Lord Cromer, on page 37, complains of the radical defects of the Egyptian Railway system, and says that now that the Egyptian Government has a free hand, through the agreement with France, he hopes it will not be long till the wrongs are righted. But he does not indicate as to what the trouble is. He says the bulk of the Provincial Police only get 20s 6d a month, and the ordinary wage of the Fellah in many parts of Upper Egypt is 1s per day.

Eight gentlemen were appointed to the Egyptian Civil Service last year—five from Cambridge and three from Oxford. Three started on salaries of £246, and one on a salary of £270 12s. Four were sent to the Soudan on salaries of £430 10s a year. He writes strongly in favour of raising the pay of the police from 20s 6d per month to about 28s, giving as a reason that food has greatly risen. Nineteen years ago, mutton was 5d—it is now 10d per lb.; and beef, 2½d—now 7½d; wheat, 6s 2d per cordel—now £1 9s 9d; and house rent has gone up 150 per cent.

He also writes as strongly in favour of raising the pay of the higher officials. He says to suppose that the higher officals are well paid is fallacious. Value applies more generally in the case of the higher than in the subordinate servants. At present the annual salary of the Egyptian official is about £75. Lord Cromer wants to bring it up to £83.

There are about 2500 officials that are entitled to pensions according to their agreement.

The salaries of the foreign directors average £2050 each, and the

Egpytian directors average £1650. The mechanical engineer gets £1435, and the engineer of the line gets £1230; traffic manager, £1052; goods manager, £922; auditor, £861; principal medical officer, £861. For five medical assistants, £820 each, and three more get £697 each; 14 officials get £554 each; 14 others get £467 each; 20 others get £406 each, and 35 more get £344 each. Stationmasters start at £50 a year, and may rise to £336; engine-drivers start at £74, and may get to £246; clerks start at £30 15s, and may get to £75; ordinary labourers, such as porters, platelayers, brakesmen, and signalmen, get 1s per day, but in some districts 10d; they may rise to 1s 8d per day.

Passenger fares—1st class for 100 miles, 14s 6½d, or 1¾d per mile; 2nd class for 100 miles, 7s 3d, or ⅞d per mile; 3rd class for 100 miles, 3s 8½d, or ⅜d per mile; and a third class passenger can travel 710 miles for 16s 6d.

Fancy goods for 100 miles is £2 8s 8d, or 5⅞d per ton per mile; flour, in 7½ ton lots, for 100 miles, 8s 10½d, or 1.6 per ton per mile; coal, in 10 ton loads, for 100 miles, 6s, or ¾d per ton per mile; over these distances the rate diminishes. Coal is carried 710 miles for 18s 5½d, or 0.31 per ton per mile.

The average salary of the 2500 men entitled to pensions is about £121 18s 1d. Then there are 13.500 workmen who are not entitled to any after consideration; their average pay is £37 12s 11d per annum, or about 14s 6d per week.

## South African Railways.

The report of the General Manager of the Natal Government Railways for the year ending 31st December 1903 states that the total revenue for the year amounted to £2,561,551, as against £2,046,116 for the previous year—an increase of 25.19 per cent. as compared with 1902, and this after a reduction of fares and rates of £100,000 calculated upon the charges made in 1903.

The working expenditure for 1903 amounted to £1,547,248, and for additions and improvements, £243,859. Total expenditure out of revenue for the year 1903 was £1,791,107, leaving the net revenue of £770,443 to divide on a sunk capital of £10,543,179, giving a dividend of £7 6s 2d per cent., as against £6 12s 0¼d the previous year.

This very satisfactory result shown in the above is mainly due to the introduction of a more powerful type of locomotive and the increased carrying capacity of the bogie wagon. This surely is only another proof that we should go and do likewise.

Again, on 25th April 1904, our Colonial Secretary stated to an inter-

viewer that negotiations were proceeding for the amalgamation of the South African Railways, and, if practicable, would be of enormous value to the Colonies concerned.

On 1st August 1903, a new regulation Government time-table was issued, giving all the particulars of travelling from Cape Town to Bulowayo. On page 9 it is intimated that 1st, 2nd, and 3rd class return tickets will be issued every Saturday till Monday at single fare for the double journey, and by the afternoon trains on all week days. All men in uniform in the service of the State or police, half the ordinary fare; also ministers of religion and missionaries, their wives and children; profesional nurses are all allowed to travel for half fare. Commercial travellers can travel 1st class with a 2nd class ticket. The 3rd class fare over all the South African Railways is one penny per mile, with a deduction of 20 per cent. on 1st and 2nd class return tickets. Workmen's contract tickets, 3rd class, weekly, 9d for one mile; three miles, 1s; six miles, 1s 9d; twenty-five miles, 5s.

The rates for milk and cream, 1 to 25 miles, ½d per gallon; 26 to 50, 1d per gallon; 51 to 100, 1½d per gallon; 101 to 200, 2d per gallon. Empties returned free. Rates for fruit, butter, eggs, vegetables, for 26 to 50 lbs. packed in packages, 1 to 50 miles, 4d; 51 to 250 miles, 1s; 251 to 500 miles, 1s 6d; for 51 lbs. to 100, from 1 to 50 miles, 6d; 51 to 250 miles, 1s 6d; 251 to 500 miles, 2s; from 100 to 500 lbs. for 50 miles is 1s 3d per cwt.; for 100 miles, 2s 4d; for 150, 3s 6d; for 5 cwt. and over for 25 miles, 9d; 50 miles, 1s; 100 miles, 1s 9d; 150 miles or over, 2s 8d per cwt. So that our South African fellow-subjects pay 2s 8d for what costs our Irish neighbours 4s.

The Railways are all owned and operated by the State, and have given good results, both financially and in developing the country; but there is a great drawback in too slow travelling in the 3 feet 6 inches gauge, which will some day cause them a deal of expense and trouble to alter.

The General Manager of the Cape Government Railways said it was a great mistake to make the Railways 3 feet 6 inches instead of 4 feet 8½ inches, as they could have bought the larger engines and wagons almost as cheap as the smaller and the lighter ones. The Government puts on a duty on imported coal of 2s per ton, and charges 3d per ton per mile for carrying it, while their own coal is carried for ¾d per ton per mile.

The Uganda Railway is doing well. In 1903 it was worked at a loss of £60,000, and in 1904 a deficit of £45,000 was expected, but a telegram from the General Manager states that a profit has been made of £2766.

## The Belgian Railways.

It is now seventy years since King Leopold commenced to build the Belgian Railways. These Railways have been a great success in every respect—in cheapness of rates, in efficiency of service, and as an investment of public monies. While up to 1904 the State lines had cost about 50 millions, or about £19,500 per mile, they had earned a clear profit of about £80,000,000 that had been put to the common good, and this, too, is the smallest part of their gains. The Government have always treated the question of earning a profit as a means of lowering rates and fares and increasing facilities for trading. They began by reducing their Railway rates in 1856, and in 8 years the effect of this was to increase their traffic 106 per cent., and the income 49 per cent. From 1870 to 1885 the gross income increased 168 per cent. If we take into consideration their profits and low rates and fares in comparison with ours, the Belgian Railways have paid themselves three times over since they were made, and they have never paid anything for carrying the mails, for which we pay a million a year, nor are the traders and the farmers troubled with the practice which mars our British system of differential rates, and the complete publicity secured by State ownership has prevented the unfairness of secret rebates through special contracts; and, in spite of the low rates and fares, the State lines still earn a handsome profit.

In 1894 the gross income was £6,118,996, while the working expenditure was £3,461,499—thus leaving a net profit of 4.46 per cent. on cost of construction and 4.45 per cent. on capital. Sir H. Barrow, in an official report, ventures the opinion that it is certain that if their Railways had been managed solely as a commercial enterprise they would not have proved such a stimulus of national prosperity.

## Workmen's Trains on the Continent.

Our Foreign Office, on the 1st of June 1901, published a 27-page pamphlet, and distributed it to all the members of our Houses of Lords and Commons. It gives all the rates and charges for workmen's trains in a radius of 25 miles of the great towns in Belgium, France, and Germany. I can only afford to give a few cases. For instance, in Belgium, any person can buy a third class ticket available for six return or double journeys a week, 7 miles out, for 3s 3d, or 6½d for the double journey of 14 miles. For workmen, over the same distance, with the same trains, the

six days' return ticket costs 1s 1½d, or 2¼d a double journey of 16 miles. In France, workmen's tickets are somewhat less than in Belgium, and seem to be issued daily. For 9 miles out the return journey is 1s 1d for 6 days, or 2¼d for the double journey of 18 miles. These tickets are also available by all persons with a yearly income of 2000 francs or under, or about 33s per week of our money. They are all supposed to be asistants, not employers, and persons can break the journey on the road with these tickets. Germany is working much on the same system, and the above will, I hope, illustrate the situation in all the three countries on the Continent that we have to contend with for the trade of the world.

The travelling public here have to pay fares enormously in excess of those charged on the Continent. In some cases five or six times as much.

Those Companies that profess to make a point of catering for the sons of toil do not consider it any scandal to have sixteen or seventeen in a compartment that is seated for ten.

## Mr Bartlett's Report on Light Railways to the Congress at Washington.

In 1905 Belgium made great advances in light Railways for supporting its main roads. The Government have 2104 miles of these light tracks to support the 2846 miles of heavy roads, and the above does not include the municipal or suburban tramways, which run a considerable distance out into the country districts.

Holland has about 800 of light tramways.

France has about 6152 miles of light tramways and 24,420 miles of heavy Railways. He says light Railways in Britain are of little account due to the small development of them.

In Blue Book 3325, by Sir Brooke Boothby, our Consul at Brussels, on the Belgian State Railways, February 1905, says:—The Budget statement for 1905 shows that the progress of the Belgium commercial prosperity, so remarkable in recent years, continues as uninterruptedly as ever, notwithstanding the rapid growth of revenue, there is no indication that the people are overtaxed. The National Debt, when compared with all other European countries, is small, especially when it is taken into account that the entire Railway and canal systems, with the exception of a few unimportant lines, belong to the Government. Their National Debt on the 1st of January 1904 was £119,547,270, and they reckon their Railways to be worth £100,000,000, and, suppose we give them credit for their canals being worth

£20,000,000, they are really the only civilised nation in the world that is solvent. On their National Debt they pay 3 per cent.

| | |
|---|---|
| The Government railway receipts for 1904 were..... | £9,260,000 |
| ,, ,, telegraphs and telephones for 1904... | 444,000 |
| ,, ,, Post Office for 1904..... | 748,543 |
| Total,..... | £10,452,543 |
| The total expenditure to earn the above is..... | 7,028,588 |
| Profit to the State,..... | £3,423,956 |

And this result is attained after carrying a passenger 3rd class five days and five nights over the whole of the Belgian Railways for 9s 3d. The length of these Railways is nearly 3600 miles, and Mr James M'Nally, the American Consul there, writing to his Government on December 8, 1904, says he has been much impressed by the cheapness, efficiency, and comfort of the Belgian lines.

Workmen's contract tickets for six days, one journey in and out each day—

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| For | 3 | Miles, or in all | 36 | Miles..... | 0s. | 9½d. | per Week. |
| ,, | 6 | ,, ,, | 72 | ,, ..... | 1s. | 0d. | ,, |
| ,, | 12 | ,, ,, | 144 | ,, ..... | 1s. | 2½d. | ,, |
| ,, | 24 | ,, ,, | 288 | ,, ..... | 1s. | 7½d. | ,, |
| ,, | 31 | ,, ,, | 372 | ,, ..... | 1s. | 9¾d. | ,, |
| ,, | 62 | ,, ,, | 744 | ,, ..... | 2s. | 6½d. | ,, |

Thus, the daily return fare for 31 miles is less than 3¾d.

Antwerp in 1903 rose to the third highest position of the world's great ports. Cotton bales are carried in 10 ton lots from Antwerp to Ghent for 3s 7¼d per ton. A Railway passenger is allowed 55 lbs. weight of luggage free in the compartment with him, and in the van (same train) he can take 2 cwt. for about ⅞ of a penny per mile. The tariff for passengers and merchandise is lower in Belgium than in any other part of Europe. In 1902 the profit from the Railways was £398,668, and in 1903, £957,080.

The members of Parliament have all free passes over the Railways, as our own Railway directors have. Voters, also, going to poll their votes travel free.

Ordinary or commercial travellers for a third class 31-mile return ticket pay 2s 5¼d, or a little under ½d per mile. Then special workmen's tickets were introduced in 1870 to induce workers to come to the manufacturers in the cities, and the system came to stay. In 1870, 14,223 cheap weekly tickets were issued. In 1890, 1,188,415; and 1901, 4,412,723 were sold. As a result, nearly 100,000 workers, out of a total of 900,000 em-

ployed in the town, continue to live in the country and cultivate a patch of ground, and enjoy the advantages of country life.

## London and Brussels—A Contrast.

Professor Vandervelde says:—"Nothing surprises the traveller who goes from London to Brussels more than the contrast between the solitary stretches of pasture in Kent and the animated landscapes in the neighbourhood of Belgian towns. Enter Hesbaye or Flanders from whatever side one may, the country is everywhere thickly strewn with white, red-roofed houses, some of them standing alone, others lying close together in populous villages. If, however, one spends a day in one of the villages—I mean one of those in which there is no local industry—one hardly sees a grown-up workman in the place, and almost believes that the population consists almost entirely of old people and children. But in the evening quite a different picture is seen. We find ourselves, for example, some twelve or thirteen miles from Brussels at a small Railway station in Brabant, say Rixensast, Genval, or La Hulpe. A train of inordinate length, consisting almost entirely of third-class carriages, runs in. From the rapidly-opened doors stream crowds of workmen, in dusty, dirty clothes, who cover all the platform as they rush to the doors, apparently in feverish eagerness to be the first to reach home, where supper awaits them."

I would direct attention to these small details, because the question of cheap fares is intimately connected with the cultivating of the land and the health and stamina of the people.

## The French Railways.

The French Government, about the year 1840, commenced to buy land and build their Railways. They made roads and put down the rails. They then leased them to Companies for 99 years at 4 per cent. on the invested capital, the Companies to find the rolling stock, stations, and all other accommodation, and after the Government got their 4 per cent., and the Company got 4 per cent., whatever surplus is over is divided equally between the Government and the Companies. All the money the Government have invested in the Railways is paid by 3 per cent. consuls, so that they have a clear gain of 1 per cent. to start with. Then they draw £6,000,000 a year in the shape of taxes from the Railways, and they claim another saving of £3,600,000 through having the mails carried free, and the free use of the telegraph poles and wires, and very cheap transit of military and naval stores and troops, as well as their civil servants, and finally, by

1950, the whole of the 26,000 miles of Railways, and all their belongings, will fall into the hands of the State—value for £700,000,000. The Government has always given the Minister of Public Works the right to fix, raise, or lower classification rates or fares that may seem to him just and right. France has three special rates—one for export, another for imports, and the third is for sending goods cheaply into their neighbouring countries on the Continent, such as Belgium, Germany, Austria, Russia, etc.

Wine is carried from Epernay to Boulogne for export, 229 miles, for 18s per ton, or 0.94d per mile. The same wine for home consumption for the same distance would be 39s 10d, or 2.09d per mile. For small lots of wine, Paris to London, the French Railways get 12s 9d, and the English Railways, 32s 10½d; and for one ton lots, Paris to London, French get 12s 1½d, and English, 26s 6d.

## The Austrian Zone System.

An English traveller breaks out into admiration at being able to travel from Salzburg to Vienna, Pressburg, Budapesth, on to Fiume, 750 miles, for 21s, or ⅜ of a penny per mile. Who, he asks, are the beneficent Railway directors who have so arranged to make easy the summer wanderings of myself and crowds of others who travel?

The Austrian Zone system was adopted in 1890. Mr Blundell Maple, M.P., said it was the most unlikely country in Europe to adopt a zone system. The people were poor and scattered over a large territory, and not likely to respond quickly; yet the traffic increased enormously. In the previous ten months, the earnings, which were less than 7½ million florins, rose to 9 millions under the zone system at the reduced fares. The Government had prepared for a deficit on their Railways, instead of which there was a profit.

| Zone No. | Distance in Miles. | 1st Class. | | 2nd Class | | 3rd Class. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | S. | D. | S. | D. | S. | D. |
| 1 | 1 to 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | 6 ,, 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 |
| 3 | 12 ,, 18 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 4 | 18 ,, 24 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 8 |
| 5 | 24 ,, 30 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 10 |
| 6 | 30 ,, 39 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 39 ,, 48 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 8 | 48 ,, 60 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 9 | 60 ,, 75 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| 10 | 75 ,, 90 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 11 | 90 ,, 105 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 12 | 105 ,, 120 | 12 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| 13 | 120 ,, 150 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0 |

The success of the zone system has been so great that it is now applied to goods traffic also.

The Austrian Government thought that articles of subsistence should be carried to the markets at rates far more moderate than had hitherto prevailed. The officials stated that in Hungary the population per head made less than one journey by rail per annum. In Austria, 2 journeys; in Germany, 5; and in Britain, 25.

In the first twelve months of the zone system the increase in the number of passengers carried amounted to 7,771,467, or 136.7 per cent. over the previous year; and the total receipts rose from £785,334 to £954,347. It was like finding a small gold mine for the Government.

A comparison with a few typical English third class fares will serve best to bring out the remarkable cheapness of the Austrian and Hungarian fares:—

| From | To | Distance | Fares. | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | English | | Austria. | | Hungary | |
| | | *Miles.* | *s.* | *d.* | *s.* | *d.* | *s.* | *d* |
| London | Richmond | 9¾ | 0 | 9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| ,, | Gravesend | 24 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ,, | Brighton | 51 | 4 | 2½ | 2 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| ,, | Birminghan | 113 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| ,, | York | 188 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| ,, | Manchester | 183½ | 15 | 5½ | 7 | 6 | 8 | 0 |
| ,, | Edinburgh | 400 | 32 | 8 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 0 |
| ,, | Glasgow | 401½ | 33 | 0 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 0 |

The cost of carrying a passenger for one mile on our Indian Railways is one-eighteenth of a penny; and a passenger is caried 5 miles for one penny. The average distance travelled by a passenger in India is 61 miles.

Austria-Hungary has 23,638 miles of main systems and 3730 miles of light Railways. This does not include local or provincial tramways, of which there are another 4327 miles—making a total of 31,695. Russia is also pushing on light Railways, as they are good feeders to the main lines. These Railways are mostly built or *guaranteed* by the State.

The official representatives of the British Government speak in quite enthusiastic terms about the success of the experiment. And so important is such testimony that there need be no apology for a lengthy extract from the report of Consul Faber to Lord Salisbury *re* rates charged and speeds of our trains:—

He says—"Our much-vaunted 'Parliamentary' sinks into insignificance in the face of such achievements as those of M. de Baross. When it

is considered that you can travel from one end of the country to the other, not by a slow 'parliamentary,' but first-class and by express, at a rate of a penny and one-third a mile, and third class at one-half that price, and that even these low rates are further reduced by 15 to 20 per cent. by means of circular tickets; when it is further considered that this has been achieved without a decrease in the receipts, without the necessity of large investments for rolling stock, and that the large increase of passengers has been carried without loss to the State, it is needless to affirm that M. de Baross has every reason to feel proud of the result. . . . M. de Baross has thus offered to his countrymen the stimulus of cheapness for travelling purposes in an unprecedented degree, in order by this means to overcome their aversion, and this has been effected, as it appears, with unparralleled success, such as is likely to induce other countries to follow suit, which they can the more readily do after having profited by the experience gained by Hungary, in what was to her a leap in the dark. Cheapness, such as is offered by excursion trains in England, will not bear comparison with the scheme of M. de Baross."

## The Swiss Railways.

On 1st January 1901, through a referendum vote, Swiss people decided in favour of nationalising their whole Railway system, which has been constructed at a cost of £45,000,000, and which was earning about 3½ per cent. on capital invested and 3½ per cent. on cost of construction.

After five years' working, the Swiss are thoroughly satisfied with their transaction. They say their Railway service is far more efficient than it was. Ten per cent. more trains are run, passenger fares and goods freights have been reduced, many new stations have been built, and the permanent way is in much better condition.

The gain through unification has been very great. Simplicity of working has led to economy, and economy has earned good profits, which have easily paid interest on the bonds and provided a sinking fund, as well as paid for considerable improvements which private Companies would have charged to capital.

## A Cloud of Witnesses.

On 28th November 1905, Sir Howard Vincent, M.P., in a long letter to the "Sheffield Daily Telegraph," said the three Companies serving Sheffield gave us daily thirty-seven trains to London, and thirty-eight from London to Sheffield, in all 75 trains every 24 hours, and 43 of them are

restaurant trains; but a great many of them are run at the same time, or within a few minutes of each other, so that the public get no advantage from the abundance provided for them, and the trains are running three parts empty. He says—"I have brought this matter before the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce, and it hopes the Press will do what it can to educate the public to the waste that is going on, and the views of yourself and your readers will be of the utmost importance to elucidate the difficulty."

Fifteen trains a day might be saved, or about 5000 a year, between London and Sheffield alone, and that means reduced expenses, causing more freights and greater advantages to employees, etc.

The above letter of Sir Howard's caused one of the "Telegraph's" London correspondents to interview some of the Railway officials at King's Cross and St Pancras, but there they would say nothing about it, but at Marylebone they were more communicative.

He was told that Sir Howard's proposals were not new. The Great Central had brought the same or similar proposals for Manchester. The official view is that Sir Howard's suggestions were impracticable. How could his improved train service be carried out? Which line was to have the best hours to start and run in? And what would happen if all the Companies wanted to run at the same time? There might be something in the Pulling suggestion, but there were lots of difficulties in the way to obstruct Sir Howard's proposal.

On the 7th December 1905, an important case was brought before the Railway and Canal Commission by the Federated Fruit and Potato Association against the Great Northern, Great Eastern, and Midland Railways. The applicants were farmers, merchants, and traders, and they complained that the rate for potatoes by the three Companies were unreasonable and unfair. Up to the year 1884, the Great Northern had the Railway monopoly of the district, and their charge for potatoes in 4 ton lots to London was 9s 2d per ton. That year the Great Eastern got powers to come into the district, and the rate was lowered to 7s 2d for 4 ton lots. In 1878 the Midland also came in. The 7s 2d rate held the field till 1903, or for nineteen years. Then the three Companies found that they were breaking the law by giving an undue preference to that District, so they all agreed to raise the rates again to 9s 2d. The learned judges were satisfied that the 7s 2d rate was an undue preference against the rest of the country, and that the 9s 2d rate was a perfectly justifiable charge, and the application would be dismissed. This is another clear case of too many cooks spoiling the broth.

Mr John Paterson, in the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, on 20th April, 1903, stated that—

| | | | | | | | | | *Distance.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| The Rate for | Heavy | Drapery | ..... | Perth | to | London, | was | 40/ | 450 |
| ,, | ,, | ,, | ..... | Bridge-of-Allan | ,, | ,, | ,, | 40/ | 430 |
| ,, | ,, | ,, | ..... | Kirkcaldy | ,, | ,, | ,, | 36/8 | 425 |
| ,, | ,, | ,, | ..... | Dunfermline | ,, | ,, | ,, | 40/ | 420 |
| ,, | ,, | ,, | ..... | Glasgow | ,, | ,, | ,, | 72/6 | 400 |
| ,, | ,, | Naisburgh, near Harrogate, | | | ,, | ,, | ,, | 46/8 | 200 |
| ,, | ,, | ,, | ..... | Barnsley | ,, | ,, | , | 40/ | 170 |
| ,, | ,, | ,, | ..... | Nottingham | ,, | ,, | ,, | 40/ | 120 |

Dr Jacks, the President of the Chamber, thanked Mr Paterson for bringing this matter before them, but soft goods formed only the fringe of this Railway rate question. When he was President of the British Iron Masters' Association, they appointed an influential committee to deal with it. They found that they could send iron abroad cheaper than to places at home, a distance of 50 or 60 miles, and that they could bring pig-iron from Alabama into the consuming districts of England and Scotland quite as cheap if not cheaper than they could send it from Glasgow or Middlesborough to the same places. They made representation to the Board of Trade and to the Railway Companies, but they were simply met with a *non possumus*. The Railways said they did not pay dividends enough as it was, and they refused to change their rates unless they were compelled. The above is a remarkable conglomeration of injustice.

Then after three years' pressure from deputations appointed by the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce, the following letter was sent to Mr John Paterson, 9 Vincent Lane, Glasgow:—

"SIR,—With reference to the interview our representatives had with you yesterday, we beg to confirm a special rate of 57s 6d per ton for cotton, linen, and woollen manufactured goods (not silk), in bales or trusses, from Glasgow to London, until 31st December 1906, on behalf of the Caledonian, Glasgow and South Western, and North British Railways.—Glasgow, 2nd May 1906."

It will be noticed that there is no alteration of the rate from London to Glasgow, so that all soft goods coming will have to pay the 72s 6d, and the experiment is only for eight months. Will this have any effect on the South of Scotland Chambers of Commerce, where they are paying 66s 6d for the same goods to London that the Hillfoots are getting to the same markets for 37s 6d? We are a wonderfully law-abiding people!

Overlapping with men, vans, horses and drays is an enormous loss to the country, besides blocking the streets of London in the busiest time of

the day. All our large cities suffer from the glut of Railway vans and drays. The Chairman of the Great Central stated that the Railways could save £2,000,000 a year in London alone if they could arrange to do away with overlapping.

Our overlapping system means (according to experts) that the collection and delivery of goods in London averages 8s 6d per ton, and in the provinces 4s. This means that a ton of goods sent by the Midland from London to South Staffordshire, and the rate is 15s a ton, the Midland for collection gets 8s 6d; the South Staffordshire for distribution gets 4s. This leaves 2s 6d for hauling over the Railway.

On 7th July 1903, Sir A. Henderson, M.P., Chairman of the Great Central Railway, responding for the Railway interests, said—The Lord Mayor had remarked that if only our Railway Companies would carry British fruit and eggs at the same rates as foreign produce, it might be better for English producers. He could assure his Lordship that if only our fruit growers and rearers of chickens would give the Railways eggs and fruit in the same quantities as the foreigners did, the Railways would be very glad to give our farmers the same rates as the foreigners. It was not reasonable to expect small packages to be carried at the same rate as large ones.

He advised some sort of concentration at the various centres where small parcels could be made into large ones. But it was the fashion for every man's hand to be raised against the Railways. It should be remembered that they were only paying 3 per cent., which was not enough.

Lord Allerton, of the Great Northern, stated that he knew a Railway Company that had spent a million of money in Manchester, and it had never earned sixpence.

As with the lines in the South so with those in the North. A 25 years' agreement between the Caledonian and North British was arranged. Mr J. C. Bolton, M.P., Chairman of the Caledonian, said, on 22nd March 1892 —"The two had been constantly at war, and this led to an enormous expenditure of capital, which, if longer continued, must have resulted in serious disaster to one or both. By the arrangement, a great many advantages would be given to the public. Over part of their systems they would issue return tickets available for six months at one fare and a quarter (these tickets have now been raised to one fare and a half), available by either Company's lines. This statement never was correct.

The Marquis of Tweeddale, Chairman of the N.B., said that the saving of Parliamentary expenses alone through this arrangement in 1892 would

be nearly £40,000. What nonsense it is to keep our Railways as they are in face of such statements as these.

Lord Ridley, Chairman of the North Eastern Railway, at the meeting of his shareholders at York, February, 1903, in answer to a shareholder regarding train loads, said he was pleased to state that they had been improving in that respect. Their average train load for goods was $58\frac{3}{4}$ tons, and the average load of minerals was 113 tons, but he said their difficulty lay in this. Middlesboro' was the centre of the iron industry in the North of England, and suppose an iron manufacturer or merchant sent a traveller over to Liverpool to sell iron, he went to a customer and got an order for 30 cwt. of iron, and it was to be sent by the London and North Western Railway; and he went to another customer and got a similar order, and it was to be sent by the Midland Railway, and the third customer gave him a like order, and it was to be sent by the L. and Y. Railway. We have to put these three little lots of iron in three different wagons, that could easily have gone into one, but our trouble does not end there. We have to take one wagon to meet the North Western system, and the other to meet the Midland system, and the third to meet the Lancashire and Yorshire system. But the trouble does not end even then. All the three wagons go into different depots in Liverpool, and have to be taken by three different drays and horses and men to their destination, instead of going by one wagon and being delivered by one set of men and horse.

Sir Rowland Hill, in 1867, said—"The traffic ample for affording a profit for one line is often quite insufficient for two. Instead of organising the railways in the general interest of the country, the Government seems to have thought it to be its sole duty to 'keep the ring,' and see fairplay between the Companies, the great towns, and the landowners; had undoubting faith that competition would do all that was needed, but they have been sadly befooled."

Sir Rowland Hill thus gives his reasons why the railways should belong to the State. (1) The formation of competing lines is not producing, but rather defeating, the reduction of rates. They have grievously injured the interests of existing companies, and tended to check the useful extension of needed lines and other improvements. (2) That railways, being shown by experience to be essentially monopolies, cannot be advantageously left to independent companies, but should be in the hands of those who are charged with the interests of the country at large.

In February, 1903, Lord Claud Hamilton, Chairman of the Great Eastern, stated to the shareholders in Liverpool Street, London, in answer

to complaints of their falling stock—"The trouble was they had two Railways running into Yarmouth and four other Companies had running powers over them. They all carried fish to Sheffield. The six railways had one drummer each. One would get 5 cwt. of fish, another 10 cwt., and 15, 20, and so on." All these little lots of fish had to go into separate wagons and go by different routes, causing great trouble and waste, as the whole six lots could have gone in the one wagon to Sheffield, and would if the State had the railways.

## Lord Rosebery, Mr Asquith, and Mr Chaplin.

Lord Rosebery has told us that, if we mean to keep our home and foreign trade, our best men must go into the workshop, and not spend the best years of their lives in learning the dead languages. Mr Asquith informs us that, if we are not to lose our trade, we must have more technical schools all over the country. Mr Chaplin, the ex-President of the Board of Agriculture, has said that, if there is not some re-arrangement of our railway system, our trade will suffer more than it has done; and I think he is nearer the truth than the others. We are paying £60,000,000 a year or 55 per cent. more for the same service that the rest of the world is getting for £60,000,000 or 55 per cent. less. I can prove it. (See Statistics of the World's Railways.)

In one of the Parliamentary inquiries it was admitted by the late Sir George Findlay, that all the Companies were bound together to maintain rates, that no Company could reduce a rate without the consent of all the others serving the district. If a Company would reduce a rate, the others would not consent, although not interested in that particular rate or traffic, lest it might affect some other traffic they were interested in.

Mr S. Laing, Chairman of the Brighton Railway, says that it is not right that such important interests should be left entirely to a small company to decide what rate they should charge. Yet we are told we have competition.

Midland fishmongers pointed out that the fishing *industry* is being ruined by high railway rates, numbers engaged in it being in a state of *starvation*, while larger quantities of fish which could be easily sold are lost because of the high railway rates.

Mr Joseph Chamberlain showed great sympathy for the petitioners, and said that he had always thought that the Board of Trade and also the Committee had gone wrong from the beginning. He said it is like this. You have a rate of 9d which you want made 8d, but the authorities

give the Railways power to charge 1s, and they may if they like raise your 9d rate to 10d and need not lower it, and what can you do? Nothing. Lie down!

In 1893 the House of Commons passed the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this House the revised railway rates, charges, and conditions of traffic are most prejudicial to the agricultural and commercial interests of the country, and this House urges upon the Government the necessity of dealing promptly and effectively with the subject." The House of Commons seems to be ready, but the country is not.

Dr Rose, our Consul at Stuttgart, sends the Board of Trade an excellent report on the Rhine, Necker, Danube Ship Canal. He states that during the last twenty years the cost of transit has decreased about one-half, and at the present time it is something less than one farthing per ton per mile. So much for Germany.

Mr A. J. Parkes, in a public meeting in Smethwick, near Birmingham, December, 1903, stated that fifteen public works had to give up and leave the Midlands to get nearer the coast, so as to save the enormous railway rates to the seaports.

In December, 1903, Mr Paterson, in the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, said that the railway rates were ruining South Staffordshire. Mr Jesse Collings, M.P., thought there should be a deputation to the Board of Trade on the subject.

M. Humberston, Sheffield, states that British bar iron from Staffordshire to London is 13s 4d per ton. The rate from London to Staffordshire (over the same railway) is for German, 9s 10d; Belgian, 6s 4d; and Dutch, 8s 8d. The rate for Birmingham wire to London is 24s 10d; while the wire, similarly packed, from London to Birmingham over the same route is—German, 10s 4d to 11s 2d; Belgium, 8s 11d; and Dutch, 8s 2d per ton. Sheffield cutlery to Hull is 20s 6d; while German cutlery, Hull to Sheffield, is 6s 7d; Belgian, 8s 9d; and Dutch, 6s per ton.

French eggs from Dover to London are 3s 3d, but an English egg merchant from Dover to London has to pay 22s 7d per ton.

The first class fares are higher to-day from London to Dover than they were sixty years ago, and the line was thirteen miles longer then; and the rate for Class 5 goods is higher than it was then between Liverpool and Manchester.

On 15th November, 1904, this letter appeared in the "Times":—"Bullin & Bingham, Limited, put on the Midland and Great Northern

joint system at Thorney Station eight trucks of straw, 24 tons, value £25 to £30. Two trucks were loaded on 23rd July, two on the 30th, two on 7th August, and two on the 18th. For the service of storing on rail, after one week free, is 4d per ton per week for straw and 3d for grain. In this case the usual charge for rent should have been 3s 8d, but the Railway Company has charged £18 10s for rent, and the carriage charge is over £14. We have had similar charges made by this and other Railway Companies. Is it surprising that the English farmer is in the miserable condition he is? Will the Minister of Agriculture please note?—Yours, E. J. Bullin, secy., the Midland Corn and Agricultural Association."

Mr Acworth, one of the principal advocates of the present system of small Companies, says it has been mournfully acknowledged over and over again by railwaymen themselves that the contention of express trains, say between London and Manchester, or Manchester and Liverpool, is an extravagant one. The third of the number of trains could carry the whole of the traffic, and give a service frequently enough to deprive the public of any right to grumble. He also admits that the State has a natural right to overhaul the Railway Companies' accounts. This is strong evidence that the Railways are not wholly private property.

The late Sir E. Watkin, Chairman of the South Eastern Railway, said —"I always expect to find 'Old Womanism' in all administrations of human affairs, simply because there is a class who cannot dig, and to beg they are ashamed," so they scheme to live at all hazards.

The same gentleman, writing to the "Times" in favour of amalgamating the three Southern Railways—the Chatham and Dover, South Eastern, and the London and Brighton—wrote:—You were good enough to admit the advantages the public would gain by the fusion of the three Companies. It would give the use to travellers of 700 miles of rails of all the Metropolitan Railway stations, including London Bridge, Cannon Street, Charing Cross, Victoria, and Ludgate Hill, from which the separate sections are now debarred.

The Continental traffic of the two lines, the Chatham and the South Eastern, costs more than they receive for the work. This is a remarkable admission by such a man.

Mr T. Pope says, in the "Times," 18th October 1892, the passenger traffic on both sides of the Channel should be most profitable to those that have the monopoly. On the French side it is so. They run only one train, where we run two; they are paying 15 per cent., and we pay practically nothing.

Mr F. R. Conder, lecturing to the Manchester Statistical Society, said that fifty years after the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, it costs more to convey a bale of cotton from the one city to the other than it did in 1829, although the cost of the locomotive power was four times less now than it was then.

The Right Hon. A. J. Mundella, late President of the Board of Trade, said the Railway Companies have nothing to do with the question of origin. They are not special Providences; they only render a service to the trader. They must be economically reasonable.

On the 30th March 1886, Mr C. H. Wilson, M.P., Hull, said—"All this divided authority, this enormous expense of management, Boards of Directors, with Managers at £4000 a year, and all contending with one another, is striking at the root of the prosperity of the country. The Railway rates are enormous. I do not like trespassing upon your time, but from Hamburg to the Humber, for the last two or three years, flour has been carried at 2s 6d a ton, 400 miles, about 0.7 of a penny per ton per mile. We are carrying by sea from Liverpool to Hull, round the island (860 miles), at a lower rate—two-thirds of the rate that the Railways would convey 120 miles across the country. They have got the canals into their hands, and, if something is not done to stop the Railway monopoly, my experience of foreign countries leads me to believe that we shall lose a great deal of the trade that we ought to have."

Mr Waring pointed out that the high rates were slowly but surely killing the trade of the country; that girders from Belgium were sent through Grimsby, and there is loading and unloading twice over, at a lower rate per ton than from Sheffield to Grimsby, with only one loading at each end.

Mr Grierson, Great Western General Manager, replied that our charges were less from the iron and coal districts nearer the sea than were the Continental charges to their own ports. But Mr Waring pointed out that, if we had natural advantages over the Continent, the Railways had no right to that advantage more than they did service for.

Mr Gladstone once declared in the House of Commons that passenger fares in Britain were the dearest in Europe, and no nation's industries were so highly rated as ours were in this country. And all this to provide a 3¼ per cent. dividend. When introducing his Bill to empower the country to take over the Railways, Mr Gladstone, in 1844, said it is no sound reason that, because this country is rich, it should pay Companies more than is reasonable, or that cheap travelling should not be provided for

the public; but there is no likelihood that the greatest possible cheapness to the public will be tried under the present system. The proper object should be solely public—for the benefit of agriculture and trade—and if the Railways earn enough to cover the cost of working and replacement they have attained that object.

One of the General Managers of the Midland Railway had a different opinion from Mr Gladstone. Sir James Allport said the result of such schemes as Mr Gladstone proposed would ruin the country and the Railways. The people would not work, and the lines could not accommodate the trains. He was not long in his management when the Midland Railway caused a revolution in the English Railway system by doing away with the 2nd class and reducing their 1st class fares to 2nd class price, and making their 3rd all 2nd class. The shareholders educated him.

Sir Daniel Gooch, another great Railway authority, told the Royal Commission in 1865 that he did not believe reducing the fares would cause the people to travel, and reducing the fares would hamper the Companies. One says the travellers would be too numerous, and the other they would be too few, and both the tramways and the Railways have settled the question for them.

The great Duke of Wellington thought the 3rd class trains were a breach of contract, as it would set the lower orders going aimlessly wandering about the country.

On 5th December 1894, Sir W. B. Forwood said the trade of Liverpool was not growing so rapidly as they had a right to expect, and it was not caused by the ship canal, but by the Railways, who were strangling the trade of Liverpool. They charged 8s per ton for conveying goods to Manchester, about 30 miles, and they carried the same goods from London to Southampton, about 90 miles, for 6s per ton. The reason the grain trade went to Hull was that the Companies favoured the trade between Hull and the inland towns. No good would be done till Liverpool built another line into the Midland towns to contend with the other six routes already in existence.

The poor man could not see that sinking more millions in a new Railway that was not wanted could not possibly lessen the rates, but rather increase them.

At the annual meeting of the Great North of Scotland Railway Company in Aberdeen in 1903, the Chairman (Dr Ferguson) said the acute competition had led to enormous cost in the running of unnecessary trains and the duplication of works. He thought they should form some plan of

combination or amalgamation, which would at once put an end to competition. Short of the Government itself assuming the property and management of the Railways of the country, such amalgamation as he proposed would be an immense advantage to the Companies. As a commencement, an effort should be made to amalgamate the whole of the Scotch Railways into one Company. This is a remarkable statement from the President of a Railway with a capital of £6,182,872.

Mr O. J. Williams, in a letter to the Cheltenham Chamber of Commerce, said he was told a sack of corn could be carried from Minnisota, across the Continent of America, shipped across the Atlantic, and landed at mills in Birmingham cheaper than a like sack could be delivered at the same mill from Cambridgeshire; and that fruit and flowers can be sent from the South of France to Cheltenham cheaper than from Covent Garden.

It would not be easy to convince a Sussex hop grower that it was quite just to carry French hops cheaper from France to London than from his farm in Sussex. If Railway charges were based on the cost of service this could not happen.

The Farmers' Alliance resolved—"That we demand that the means of communication and transit be placed in the hands of the Government, to be operated in the interest of all the people, as the Post Office, telegraphs, and telephones are."

A writer in the "Daily News," 10th October 1903, asks why it is that the English traveller stepping on the pier at Calais or Boulogne finds himself in a new world of speed, comfort, punctuality, careful and successful organisation? Where can we find such journeys as are made between Calais and Paris, Paris and Madrid, Paris and Marseilles and the Riviera, Paris and Switzerland? Yet we are told England is first and the rest of the world is nowhere.

At the annual meeting of the Trade Protection Societies held in London, 11th May 1904, G. M. Chamberlin, J.P., Norwich, in the chair. [This could be, and should be, powerful society, with 94 affiliated branches, and a membership of about 50,000 traders, and with 30 members of Parliament as honorary members.] The Convener of the Railway Rates and Charges Committee said "they had forwarded to the President of the Board of Trade the request of the Society for an inquiry into the character and conditions of Railway rates and charges, but the President, although petitioned in a similar way by the Chambers of Commerce and other trade societies, declined to accede to our or their request." Then the same

meeting passes this resolution, on the motion of Mr Whitmore, seconded by Mr Keay:—"That this Association, having repeatedly called the attention to the preferences accorded by Railway Companies to foreign produce and manufactures, desires to (1) express its regret that the President of the Board of Trade has declined to appoint an inquiry into such preferential treatment; (2) renews its conviction that only by an official inquiry can the full extent of these preferences be ascertained; and (3) again requests the Government to appoint such an enquiry with a view to the differences now existing being adjusted in the interests of British trade and commerce."

The Hon. George Peel, in a speech at the annual meeting of the Railway Investment Company in the Cannon Street Hotel, 22nd March 1906, said—"I have been asked to make a statement to you regarding the action and pressure your Committee have been making to get at the reason and cause of the serious decline in value of our Railway investments.

"In the year 1900 our stocks seriously declined, and in 1901 a crisis seemed rapidly to approach. These facts naturally engaged our attention. We *could* not grapple with the question over the whole of our Railway systems, so we turned our attention to the London and North Western, in which we have stock amounting to £375,000, and, that Company being the premier Railway, it would serve as a standard to judge from.

"We *found that* in 1901 the Company had spent a capital sum that required to earn £=11,000 in order to maintain the former rate of dividend. and not only was this not earned, but there was a loss of £216,000, making a total loss of £627,000. This loss was not due to a fall in receipts, but to increased expenditure in canvassing and handling traffic, and the price of coal. From these and some other causes, we *found that* working expenses had riser from 54 in 1890 to 63 per cent. in 1901.

"We then turned our attention to train loading, and found that no progress had been made in heavier loads from 1880 to 1900, although the traffic had greatly *increased*. The Companies had simply put on more trains with very light loads. We pointed out the enormous success of the American heavy train loads, and the resultant splendid dividends they are paying. If American roads can affect this saving, why cannot we?

"The number of wagons in this country is about 1,500,000, or about 65 per mile. The Railway Clearing House had the *wagon* capacity restricted to 10 tons; we have got this altered, and they can now be built to contain from 12 up to 29 tons. The result of this is that the North Eastern has improved its train *load* 55 per cent., the Lancashire and York-

shire by 38 per cent., and the North Western by 30 per cent., and the other Railways are following up.

"Allow me, however, to put the matter more comprehensively. Taking thirty-two Railways in the United Kingdom, the actual number of freight train miles run in 1905 was, roundly, 146,000,000 miles. But that figure would have been no less than 182,000,000 if the freight trains had been run on the expensive and extravagant system which was in vogue in 1899. That is, a saving of no less than 36,000,000 freight train miles has been effected in respect of a single year. Consider the economies thus resulting in every branch of railway expenditure, and consider also what would have been the financial position of our Railways to-day if matters had been allowed to remain as they stood in 1899. Even though much remains to be done in this direction, the results already effected must be a source of congratulation to the officials, and of gratification to ourselves.

"We asked for better figures, as it is necessary to know how much work is done and how far the tons of goods are carried. But our English accounts give no such figures. The Chairman of the London and North Western Railway said, on the 20th February, 1903, that such figures were useless. On the other hand, Mr Acworth, the greatest railway authority we have, in reading a paper before the Royal Statistical Society on 16th December, 1902, said that these figures were of great value in all other countries of the world, as it caused the various departments to do their best to keep their departments up to the highest efficiency, and the system in the United States has been most effective.

"Mr Burdett-Coutts, M.P., as you are aware, has taken great interest in this matter of figures, and has repeatedly made speeches at the Euston meetings, and on 20th February, 1903, in reply to the Board's assertion that no more figures were needed, pointed out that eight important points were wanted:—(1) The ton mileage, (2) the passenger mileage, (3) the train load, (4) the wagon load, (5) the engine load, (6) the length of haul, (7) the average receipts per passenger per mile, (8) the average receipts per ton of freight per mile. Yet even this was only a fraction of the deficiency.

"We know that the absence of adequate figures deprives one Company of the means of profiting by the experience of another, and prevents the shareholders from insisting on economy. The result has been an almost continuous process of amalgamations of small into large Companies. The great Companies having agreed together on rates, proceed to invade each other's territory that would not pay the one Company, and to set up rival and adjacent collecting offices, and engage contentious staffs of canvassers

to lavish money to injure other Companies, without benefiting themselves or the public, and generally to engage in a species of contention which was as wasteful as it was useless.

"That was the deplorable state of things which we found in 1902. Instead of co-operating to give all facilities to the public, it was admitted on all hands that the Railways were quarrelling among themselves. In August, the Chairman of the London and North Western went so far as publicly to speak of being 'robbed of traffic,' and of being 'robbed right and left.' At the same date, the Chairman of the North Eastern had to confess that, instead of thinking of the public, they were 'quarrelling over a ton of goods,' while a third Chairman admitted that the conduct of the Railways was 'ridiculous.' These were our witnesses. Unhappily, I am not referring to a past evil only, but to one still existing in spite of all our protests and arguments. For now, after all these years, there was an announcement in 'The Times' of 12th March, 1906, that there is 'a serious conviction' which is 'steadily growing' in the minds of our railway men that 'the expensive methods of competition in vogue have reached their limit.' We have arrived at this 'serious conviction' several years ago.

"Gentlemen—I have dealt with our proposals, but before I sit down I must refer to another individual. I mean Sir George Gibb, of the North Eastern. He has placed on record that ton mile figures cost him the sum of £800 a year (one of our opponents said it would cost £15,000 a year), and his officials say now they will not do any more without them, they are so useful. We find that in 1899 the earnings of a North Eastern freight train was 6s 8d per train mile. But by the knowledge of what had been done, we tried what might be done, and we have raised the earning per train mile to 10s 3d. This means that if the freight traffic of 1905 had been worked on the same lines as 1899, the North Eastern would have run 6,400,000 more freight train miles than they did do in 1905. Then in 1905 the North Eastern secured £99,000 more gross earnings than in 1904, and its working expenditure was £1000 less, so the nett gain was £100,000; and it spent £56,000 out of earnings on its system instead of issuing more stock."

A correspondent, writing in "The Times" of 12th March, 1906, said a suggestion was made at a Clearing House meeting that all the traffic drummers in this country at the time of the South African war should have been sent to the Front and their places never filled again, and that the Companies should adopt plans of co-operation such as the North Western, Lancashire and Yorkshire, and Midland had adopted two years

ago, then they could withdraw all their drummers from the towns and districts they were in. Drummers were a very expensive luxury. They were men of good address and great persuasive powers, but they often make promises they cannot fulfil trying to filch a few tons of goods from a contending line.

Then the duplicating of depots is another source of waste and loss. In a business centre in the North, where two railways are contending for the traffic, one of them established a depot near the principal warehouses, and this meant a saving of cartage to the traders. The other Company could not afford to lose their trade, so they bought up expensive property next to the first one and built there, and they got their old customers back, and the trade is paying neither of them now

Mr R. Price Williams, C.E., in a letter to "The Times," 26th March, 1906, says—"When the Government bought the telegraphs it was thought they were dealing with the proprietors, but they were only dealing with the lessees. After they had paid the bonds the Railway Companies stepped in and got other £3,000,000, so it is no wonder that our telegraphs have never paid." The Railway lawyers were too many for the Government experts. This comes of employing cheap labour.

An article in the February number of "Chambers' Journal," 1906, by one in the secret, says—"The acute contention between the Companies causes duplicating of lines that they know will never pay a profit. Railway experts describe such line as strategic, and say that if we did not do it they would. This system of contention is carried on somewhat in this form. The A line has a paying traffic between Z and X, so then the B railway tries to get at it by all possible means, and they ultimately manage to get at it. The rates are not reduced, but often raised, the traffic is divided, and it now pays neither of them. Some people wonder why these duplicated lines are made. But we should remember that each Company has a large staff of officers, such as solicitors, surveyors, valuers, and engineers, that must be kept employed. They must have work and salaries. They work up the schemes of running into the other Company's territory. Then the Company in possession has to employ the same class of men to defend themselves against the intruder, so the one class of experts does a very good turn to their friends of the same professions at the shareholders' and the public's expense. Railways suffer from a superfluity of officers. An official, when vacancies occur, puts his sons and nephews and other relatives into them, and so things go on from generation to generation. Then the directors that appoint the staff have to find places for their friends. A

chief officer on a line running North was recently retired on full pay so that his work might be given to an athletic friend of an athletic son of the Chairman."

## Traders' Wagons.

There are more than half a million wagons belonging to private traders in Great Britain. Some of the Railways, such as the London and North Western and the Great Western, possess very few coal wagons of their own. The Railways have no power to fix minimum loads, but they can fix the maximum at 20 tons. So if a coalmaster or merchant chooses he can load a 10 ton capacity wagon with 4 tons of coals and make the Railway carry all the extra dead weight that could have carried 10 tons. Then, again, the fact that the great bulk of the mineral wagons belong to private individuals or firms is almost an unmixed evil to the Railway Companies and the country. The expense in labour and the loss of life and limb in shunting, sorting, and marshalling these wagons to get them sent back to their homes (for they cannot be used by anyone else for any other purpose) is enormous. The Railways would greatly benefit economically if they owned all the wagons that worked on their own system, but if the Government had the lot the benefit would be very much more apparent, as little or no shunting would be needed and the wagons could be sent wherever they were wanted at once.

Our mineral and goods wagons we have practically since our railways started built them of timber, or with steel frames and timber bodies, but steel and wood combined do not answer, as the painters cannot get at the steel frames to paint and keep them from corroding. All-steel wagons have been in use on the Continent for thirty years. They are much more economical.

About sixteen years ago a South of England Railway Company placed an order with a Midland carriage building company for (bogie) passenger carriages. When the carriages were ready to get to their destination they had to pass over a railway in the Midlands. The railway refused to allow them to be run over their rails, as they thought they were not safe, and a considerable amount of pressure had to be brought before they would let them go even by a slow goods train. This surely goes to show that ignorance and prejudice are bosom friends.

In India a wagon can take a load of 17 tons with a tare of 7 tons. In America their bogie wagon made of pressed steel, tare 17 tons, carrying capacity 45 to 50 tons, so that the American steel wagon carries 5 to 2

against 2 to 1 or even 3 to 2 in Britain. This shows clearly that our British railways haul a great deal more dead weight than is done in other Continental countries and America.

## Railway Monopoly.

Competition in rates and fares being long since abandoned, they try now to make a show by advertising their feeding and lodging departments. In 1874 the Midland introduced Pullman sleeping accommodation, and in 1879 the Great Northern went one better by introducing the dining-car as well. Then the London and North Western followed suit, but the present system of feeding and sleeping the passengers on the three main routes North did not attain the present proportions till the year 1893, when the vested interests of the refreshment rooms at Preston, York, and Normanton fell into the hands of the Companies. This made a saving of a twenty minutes' stop at these half-way stations, and they now run their trains that much slower.

A remarkable case of private contract withdrawal was that of the Great Western at Swindon, where a 99 years' lease had been given to the station refreshment room-keeper. For the period of the lease all passenger trains that passed through the station were to stop ten minutes. The capital said to be invested in this Swindon restaurant was £100,000. They, or he, run the show for fifty years, and in 1895, to get the liberty of their own trains and station, the Great Western shareholders paid back the £100,000 to clear them out.

Some of our present dining trains can serve 100 passengers at one time. The Great Eastern have breakfasted as many as 226 on one journey. Before the introduction of restaurant cars, Spiers & Pond sold annually 60,000 lunch baskets on the South Western Railway.

Our 51 Companies own over 100 hotels.

The Midland in Manchester is said to be the most complete hotel in Europe. It slept some 40,000 people the first year of its existence. The "Manchester Guardian," interviewing Mr Towle, writes:—"We have a staff of 380 servants, and pay £24,000 a year in wages. We serve 400 meals in the grill-room every day, and 500 meals in the French restaurant —these latter at an average of 10s per head—every week. Between 400 and 500 people obtain refreshment every day from the American bar, and quite half of these are American 'temperance' drinks. In the German restaurant there are sold in a year 80,000 special German dishes and 500,000 portions of German Lager beer. The Turkish bath is visited

by 180 people every week, and the hairdresser's shop by 500 customers. Our own bakers make for the hotel 3900 separate portions of bread every day; and in one year our own laundry-lists numbered 1,500,000 articles. Ours, I think, is the only complete sub-post office in a hotel in this country. We despatch and receive in one year 50,000 telegrams and a million telephone messages. There are 500 telephone instruments in the hotel. In twelve months we issued postal orders and money orders to the value of £5000, we sold £2500 worth of postage stamps, and we issued nearly one hundred Savings Bank books. There are 7200 electric lights in the building. Electricity costs £6500 a year, and gas £100 a month. These are a few miscellaneous figures taken at random from our first year's return. I could quote many more, but perhaps these will suffice to show that the business of the Midland Hotel is of a very exceptional character, and its future welfare a matter in which the general public of Manchester, as well as the shareholders of the Midland Railway, have at any rate a parallel interest."

They are all largely in the farming trade. The North Western keep about 250 poultry and 100 pigs to eat up the hotel leavings, to be turned into chickens, eggs, and pork to again feed the sons of the upright; and it is all called private enterprise, and "Live and Let Live."

## Sea Monopoly.

The London and North Western has 17 ships, and joint share with the Lancashire and Yorkshire of 5 more, running from Holyhead Garston docks, Fleetwood, and Stranraer on this side, to Dublin, Greenore, Larne, Belfast, and Londonderry on the Irish side, and holds or controls nearly all the docks it sails into.

The Great Western is owner of 16 ships, and has docks and harbours at Plymouth, Llanelly, Briton Ferry, Brentford, Bridgewater, Newquay, New Milford, and Fishguard on this side, and at a number of ports on the South and West of Ireland and the Channel Islands.

The North Eastern has the docks in Hull, Middlesborough, the Hartlepools, Monkwearmouth, Straiths, Blyth, and Dunston. It is applying to Parliament this year for powers to put on a fleet of steamers to sail from these ports, so as to contend with the Lancashire and Yorkshire and the Great Central for the Continental traffic. It is said to be the largest dock owner in the world.

The Lancashire and Yorkshire in 1904 bought up some 19 ships plying

between the Humber on our side to about 14 different ports on the Continent. The North Eastern is going to double the fleets. Will it pay them both seeing the private Companies did not get enough before they sold to the L. and Y.? This Company owns the docks at Fleetwood, and, with the North Western, runs a fleet of steamers to Ireland. They also run a fleet between Liverpool and Drogheda.

The Midland has sunk a million of money at Heysham in ships and docks to run to Belfast and the Isle of Man, and the venture is said to be a big white elephant. It is partner also in the Stranraer and Larne fleet.

The Great Central is owner of the Grimsby Docks, and runs 13 or 14 steamers to gather in goods from the Continent.

The Great Eastern has 12 steamers trading between Harwich and the Continent.

The little Great Northern have no merchant navy. About a quarter of a century ago, they sunk £55,000 in trying to make a dock at Sutton Bridge, but it filled up as fast as they dug it out. It could hold money but no water, and it was water they wanted, so they went out and left it till this day. But the Danish Government fleet of steamers ply into their hands on the East Coast, and they carry their goods very cheap to London.

The London and South Western have a fleet of 16 ships trading from Southampton to the Channel Islands and France. It is also joint owner with the Brighton Railway Company in the boats running between Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight, and it runs two boats between Lymington and Yarmouth.

The London and Brighton's harbour is at Newhaven. From there it runs 15 ships to Dieppe and Caen. It has also its jointure in the Portsmouth and Isle of Wight boats.

The South Eastern and Chatham have ports at Folkestone, Whitstable, Port Victoria, Queenborough, Strood, Gravesend, Rye, and Dover, and they run 18 steamers in connection with their system.

Then nearly all the Railways running into London have docks on the Thames, and are gradually monopolising the river front at Poplar, Chelsea, Augersteins, Warph, Blackfriars, Brentford, Tilbury, Gravesend, and so on.

Then the Railways in South Wales have all got Parliamentary powers to put ships in the sea to carry the coal from their own harbours whenever they please to do so.

In Scotland the position is the same. The North British own docks at Silloth, Alloa, Charlestown, Bo'ness, Burntisland, Kincardine, Methil, Tayport, and Mallaig, with 7 steamers on the Clyde.

The Caledonian have docks at Grangemouth, South Alloa, and Bowling. They have 11 ships on the Clyde.

The Glasgow and South Western have the docks at Troon, Largs, Fairlie, and Ayr, and they have a fleet of 10 steamers on the Clyde.

The Highland Railway Co. are pressing a Bill (1905) through Parliament to enable them to put on boats to run to Fort-Augustus and Invergarry. They are being opposed by the North British and Caledonian, as well as Mr Macbrayne, the steamship owner, as his boat trade with the West Highlands would be destroyed.

In Ireland the Railways are following suit, struggling to collar and monopolise the best harbours they can, such as North Wall (Dublin), Greenore, Drogheda, Bangor, Donaghadee, Larne, etc.

It is supposed that the Railway capital invested in harbours and ships is over £100,000,000, or about one-tenth of the paid-up capital of our Railways is sunk in docks and shipping. The experts do not know whether these enterprises pay or not, but it is generally said they do not pay. The Board of Trade returns for 1904 give the Railway income from ships and harbours at a little over £4,698,000, but when the working expenses come out of this—say £2,600,000—that only leaves 2 per cent. for the invested capital. There can be no doubt that this miserable result is arising from the tremendous contention of ships running from port to port with quarter and half loads of both passengers and goods; and they carry these little cargoes of foreign goods into the centre of our country for about half the price they will carry our own, and so make us pay to dump the foreigners' goods. The foreign Railways and docks—such as Hamburg, Antwerp, Amsterdam, and other great Continental ports—belong to the Government, and it will soon be impossible for us here to compete with Governments working on a plan of such wise and magnificent liberality.

## The Lowest Fares in the World.

The Belgian Government advertise the cheapest Railway fares in the world. In 1905 it issued tickets, 3rd class, to carry a passenger for five days and five nights over all their Railways, amounting to 2530 miles, for 9s 3d, or about 24 miles for one penny.

In the International Railway Congress at Washington, 4th May, 1905,

Earnest Gerard, chief of the Belgian Railway, Post, and Telegraph Departments, said, for extent of country and population, their mileage and traffic was the greatest in the world.

## Slow Passenger Traffic.

TABLE SHOWING THE TIMES OCCUPIED BY THE FIRST FIVE TRAINS EVERY DAY IN RUNNING TO THE FOLLOWING STATIONS FROM MANCHESTER,—SHORT DISTANCE.

| MANCHESTER to | Number of Miles. | 1. Train. | 2. Train. | 3. Train. | 4. Train | 5. Train. | Average Time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Minutes | Minutes | Minutes. | Minutes | Minutes | Minutes. |
| Alderley Edge ... | 13 | 36 | 25 | 40 | 37 | 32 | 34 |
| Bolton ..... | 11 | 16 | 30 | 16 | 27 | 30 | 24 |
| Bury ..... ... | 9 | 31 | 30 | 1 04 | 31 | 30 | 37 |
| Cheadle..... | 8 | 30 | 28 | 26 | 31 | 27 | 28½ |
| Crumpsall ..... .. | 2 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| Eccles ..... | 4 | 15 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 18 | 15 |
| Guide Bridge ..... | 5 | 17 | 19 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Heaton Norris..... | 5 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 18 |
| Lymm ..... | 13 | 38 | 42 | 27 | 33 | 41 | 36 |
| Middleton..... | 6 | 29 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21½ |
| Mobberley ..... | 12 | 36 | 35 | 30 | 37 | 33 | 34 |
| New Mills ..... | 14 | 34 | 1.0 | 41 | 26 | 29 | 38 |
| Pendlebury ... ... | 4 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Reddish..... | 4 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 8 | 13 | 12 |
| Prestwich .. ... . ... | 4 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| | 114 | 5h. 49m. | 6h. 12m. | 6 hrs. | 5h. 38m | 5h. 44m. | 5h. 52m. |

Five hours 52 minutes are thus taken to cover a distance of 114 miles. This is equal to a speed of 19.45 miles per hour.

## Fast Passenger Traffic.

TABLE SHOWING THE TIMES OCCUPIED BY THE FIRST FIVE TRAINS EVERY DAY IN RUNNING TO THE FOLLOWING STATIONS FROM MANCHESTER.—LONG DISTANCE.

| MANCHESTER to | Number of Miles. | 1 Train. | 2 Train | 3 Train | 4 Train. | 5 Train. | Average Time. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Hrs. m. | Hrs. m | Hrs. m. | Hrs m | Hrs. m. | Hrs m |
| Abergele | 74 | 2.34 | 2.53 | 2.30 | 2.0 | 2.32 | 2.32 |
| Aberystwith | 140 | 5.50 | 6.0 | 6.25 | — | — | 6.05 |
| Accrington | 23 | 1.15 | 1.05 | 1.01 | 0.54 | 1.22 | 1.07 |
| Ashbourne | 48 | 2.14 | 2.05 | 2.10 | 2.10 | 2.55 | 2.19 |
| Bacup | 22 | 1.32 | 1.17 | 1.15 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.18 |
| Bakewell | 38 | 1.21 | 1.33 | 1.42 | 1.55 | 1.22 | 1.35 |
| Barnsley | 36 | 1.32 | 1.50 | 1.27 | 1.14 | 2.02 | 1.37 |
| Barrow | 87 | 4.0 | 3.05 | 3.25 | 3.27 | 3.05 | 3.24 |
| Batley | 35 | 1.19 | 1.40 | 1.10 | 1.19 | 1.17 | 1.21 |
| Birmingham | 83 | 4.0 | 3.35 | 2.50 | 2.20 | 2.20 | 3.03 |
| Blackburn | 24 | 1.08 | 1.23 | 1.15 | 1.16 | 1.0 | 1.12 |
| Blackpool | 49 | 2.0 | 1.45 | 2.05 | 1.22 | 1.43 | 1.51 |
| Bradford | 40 | 2.02 | 2.06 | 1.16 | 1.21 | 1.22 | 1.37 |
| Bristol | 191 | 5.0 | 4.48 | 4.52 | 6.15 | 5.30 | 5.17 |
| Carlisle | 121 | 4.55 | 3.50 | 3.08 | 3.40 | 3.58 | 3.54 |
| Chesterfield | 58 | 2.30 | 2.10 | 2.21 | 2.08 | 2.10 | 2.16 |
| Colne | 34 | 2.18 | 1.52 | 1.44 | 1.26 | 1.53 | 1.51 |
| Dewsbury | 34 | 1.24 | 1.35 | 1.05 | 1.13 | 1.18 | 1.17 |
| Doncaster | 52 | 2.20 | 1.48 | 1.56 | 1.45 | 1.58 | 1.57 |
| Gainsborough | 74 | 2.33 | 2.31 | 2.18 | 2.33 | 2.24 | 2.28 |
| Glasgow | 222 | 5.55 | 6.35 | 5.28 | 6.51 | 5.15 | 6.1 |
| Hayfield | 16 | 1.10 | 0.51 | 1.07 | 0.50 | 1.04 | 1.1 |
| Hindley | 19 | 0.34 | 0.48 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 0.52 | 0.46 |
| Keswick | 121 | 2.21 | 4.20 | 4.50 | 3.55 | — | 3.30 |
| Liverpool | 34 | 0.40 | 1.32 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.52 |
| London | 183 | 4.55 | 3.50 | 4.50 | 3.45 | 4.45 | 4.25 |
| Macclesfield | 17 | 0.45 | 0.53 | 0.29 | 0.51 | 0.30 | 0.42 |
| Newcastle | 143 | 4.30 | 4.18 | 3.48 | 4.18 | 4.22 | 4.15 |
| Northwich | 21 | 0.58 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.57 | 0.50 | 0.56 |
| Oswestry | 66 | 2.27 | 2.30 | 3.10 | 2.37 | 2.55 | 2.48 |
| Peterborough | 127 | 3.31 | 3.39 | 3.42 | 3.32 | 3.38 | 3.37 |
| Runcorn | 28 | 1.38 | 2.40 | 2.40 | 1.57 | 1.22 | 2.03 |
| St. Helens | 21 | 0.50 | 1.20 | 1.33 | 1.53 | 1.17 | 1.24 |
| Sheffield | 41 | 1.18 | 1.10 | 0.58 | 1.05 | 1.12 | 1.08 |
| | 2,322 | 83.27 | 84.05 | 80.59 | 73.35 | 70.16 | 81.29 |

Eighty-one hours and 29 minutes are thus taken to cover a distance of 2,322 miles. This is equal to a speed of 28.52 miles per hour.

Owing to the more frequent headway of service on suburban lines there is not much difference in the number of train-miles run per annum by suburban trains and main line trains, consequently the *mean* number of miles between the two services would be a fair indication of the mean speed of trains throughout England and Wales. If therefore take $\frac{28.52 + 19.45}{2}$ = say 24 miles as the mean speed for the speed of 24 miles per hour.

This speed, which we hear so much about here, will not compare favourably with the speed of the trains on the Continent and America, attested by our Consuls and others.

## State Purchase.

Regarding the ability of the State to work the Railways beneficially, we have the ten principal countries in Europe to guide us with their annual working expenses.

| | State Lines. | Company's Lines. |
|---|---|---|
| In Germany their labour expenses are..... | 9.40 | 13.10 |
| In Austria Hungary ,, ..... | 6.50 | 8.47 |
| In Belgium ,, ..... | 5.05 | 10.13 |
| In Denmark ,, ..... | 6.89 | 5.77 |
| In France ,, ..... | 16.16 | 9.58 |
| In Italy ,, ..... | 6.49 | 8.76 |
| In Norway ,, ..... | 7.30 | 7.00 |
| In Holland ,, ..... | 5.30 | 10.35 |
| In Roumania ,, ..... | 4.40 | 10.80 |
| In Russia ,, ..... | 9.27 | 13.70 |

It will be noticed that France is the only country that is, curiously, on the wrong side; but up till 1901 the State only held the branch lines, but since the north main lines fell into the State, this is being rapidly reversed. This shows about 24 per cent. labour saving expense for the State over the private Companies.

Would the operation of purchase be difficult? The German Government has done it as well as the Belgian Government. Our Colonies have all done the same. There is about £1,200,000,000 in Railway stock, on which an average of 3¾ per cent. is paid. The Government could borrow money at 3 per cent., and pay out the discontents, as was done at the reduction of the National Debt. Is there any sound argument against State Railways? In Belgium, since the State purchase, the Railway freights and passenger fares have been reduced over 40 per cent. The same has happened in Germany and our Colonies. What stops our Railway progress? Nothing but sentiment. We have a lot of sentiment; for the working man, when out of work, we make him pay a penny a mile to look for it, while his brother in Austria can travel six miles for a penny.

If the State were to obtain the Railways at their value, the whole

could be paid up in twenty-five years by adopting a sinking fund of 3 per cent. while paying 3 per cent. interest.

Sir George Findlay states, that if the Government took over the Railways we should give the present owners fair compensation. He says, on lines earning a profit, the State should guarantee a dividend at the average of three years preceding the purchase. Lines paying no dividend to be taken at half their nominal value, the Government paying 2½ per cent. on that amount. Lines under construction to be taken at their nominal amount, the State paying 2½ per cent. on that.

Sir H. W. Tyler said all the organisation and machinery are already provided, even if they had all to be taken over at once. But further, this organisation, complicated and widespread as are its ramifications, is kept in working order by constant duty, and it is just as available for work under the State as it is under Boards of Directors. Each system has its general manager, its traffic superintendents, locomotive superintendents, and its engineers with men, machinery and plant in active operation.

Sir Rowland Hill said "A fool is a man that never makes an experiment." Every country in the world almost has adopted State Railways, and they have been all without exception successful.

From the year 1835 to 1839 about fifty Acts of Parliament were passed imposing strict and rigorous equal mileage rates, but bit by bit this just law was legislated away. The law intended there should be no preference either of localities, goods, or persons. But in 1845 Parliament annulled the above wise law and gave the Company power to vary the rates, so as to accommodate them to the circumstances of the traffic, either upon the whole or any portion of the Railway, and so they charge less for carrying foreign goods a long distance than for home goods over a short distance.

# ECONOMIC OPINIONS.

There is it seems at present a struggle going on between four sets of opinions or principles. On the one hand, it is held to be right that commerce and transport should be taxed for profit to the State, and on the other that the community should be taxed to promote the increase of commerce.

The latter portion of economists state that we have over 100,000 miles of good roads in this country practically free of charge. That these roads have immensely improved since the days of the toll-bars, and at much less expense to the country, and the work on them has tripled since those days. They further state that the French and Belgian macadamised roads and canals are free for any one to put a dray or a boat on the canals or road, and a great saving would come to the people through saving the wages and salaries of all the collectors of rates and fares all over the country.

Then the great majority that support the present system hold, that those that constantly and closely handle the material for the life and well-being of the people should pay the money for the maintenance of the men for the collecting of the means of paying taxes and dividends, and of course the trader turns round again upon the user and consumer of the goods, which seems to be a roundabout road for a near cut.

Others say that a single rate should be charged both for passengers and goods irrespective of distance, on the lines of the Post Office, which would put all the King's subjects on the same footing, and would do away to a considerable extent with classification. That it was more nearly proportionate to the cost price than any other that could be levied, seeing the collecting, sorting, delivery, and superintendence is by far the largest items in the work, and being always the same whatever the distance was. But the opponents of this plan say, look at the difference of the accommodation that is required even in passenger accommodation. There is first, second, and third class compartments, for ladies, smokers, and non-smokers. If the passengers could all be bundled into one class of carriage

the difficulty might be got over; but it has been got over in America and in some parts of Britain.

The idea of uniform Railway rates, on the lines of the Post Office, should not be lost sight of. There could be a single rate for any distance for different classes of goods. We have eight classes now, commencing with coal and ending with pianos. These classes could either be kept as they are, or reduced or increased as the experts thought best. If the station terminals at each end, which absorb about 65 per cent. of the whole cost of removing goods, if each class were paying a different terminal rate as they were doing now, the State would distribute the cost evenly over the whole system, as it does in the Post Office, parcel post, telegraph, and more than likely the telephones.

We have all seen the enormous increase in the parcel traffic of the country (it increased in the first six years 86 per cent.) by all systems of conveyance, on land and water, since the Post Office commenced to carry parcels and reduced the rates quite 60 per cent. under what they were thirty years ago. A system of transport on something like the above lines would put energy into the brain and hands of the whole nation. Land in the remote corners of England, Ireland, and Scotland would be cultivated, because they would be able to compete with the nearer lands to our great towns, and fish could be brought from the farthest to the nearest place, all on the same terms, and every man would practically get the same reward for his industry.

Other zonists propose a three-zone system uniform rate for 50 miles or under, then 200 miles or under, and above that distance.

The general question of the purchase of the Railways was brought before Parliament in 1844 by Mr Gladstone (then a member of Sir Robert Peel's Government), a Select Committee was appointed to consider the subject, and through their recommendation the Bill of 1844 was passed empowering the Government to purchase. At that time the Railways were paying from 8 to 10 per cent., and the invested capital was about £70,000,000.

The apologist for private railways in Great Britain points out that the Railways of this country are the result of private enterprise. They (except in Ireland) have never received any pecuniary assistance from the State, nor been aided by grants of land, such as has been done on a large scale in other countries. From the outset the Government would have nothing to do with building the railways, beyond allowing the landlords, lawyers, and capitalists to fight each other, and so pile an enormous burden

upon the people nearly twice as much as the National Debt. When the powers were obtained the land had to be bought at fabulous prices. What makes it surprising is that ever the Railways should have been made.

It is not proposed to appropriate the Railways without purchase, or to steal them. The present shareholders would be dealt fairly with, according to the stock they hold.

One remarkable feature about this Railway controversy that has gone on for over sixty years is that there has been a steady rise in the Railway rates all the time, while a steady fall in all the other necessaries of life has taken place. Since 1866 wheat has been reduced 50 per cent., flour 40, barley 35, oats 33, maize 37, potatoes 25, beef 20, butter 50, sugar 40, tea 25, yet our Railways to-day charge more for transporting goods of the cheaper class than they did fifty years ago for the dearer goods.

The United States Railway rates have been reduced 75 per cent. The whole of the Australian railways have made substantial rate reductions, and the South African rates have been reduced since the war and the Continental rates are much lower than ours.

## How the Railways could be Acquired.

Railway shareholders number 550,000. The capital invested could be taken over in various ways, but perhaps the precedent of the National Debt would be the best to follow. In bringing in his Budget of 1900, Sir M. H. Beach said at one time this country was responsible for 1200 millions, but the amount received by the Treasury was only 700 millions. For £60 cash the Government at one time had given £100 Stock, and on that £100 Stock 6 per cent. per annum was paid as interest, which means that this country really paid 10 per cent. In time this was reduced to 5 per cent., then 4 per cent., then $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., and now $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Railways should be treated in the same way. A Company that has been paying 7 per cent. might have that continued for five years, then at five yearly intervals the interest could drop till it reaches the rate of Consols.

Under the State a great saving would accrue. (1) The present cost of Parliamentary expenses in promoting and opposing Bills. (2) A vast amount of clerical labour. All goods, or nearly all, would be prepaid. We can put a stamp or stamps on an eleven pound parcel, why should we not be able to do the same on a 100 lbs. or a 1000 lbs. parcel? Hundreds and thousands of hard-worked clerks would be saved the drudgery of

writing railway invoices. Think what the Post Office would be if it had to write an invoice for every parcel that goes through. (3) The salaries of many useless directors, clearing-house officials, and competitive officials. (4) The cessation of useless competition, and empty, or almost empty trains.

Our Railways could be as easily worked as the tramways are by having the train all one class, and on the corridor system, and worked on the same principle as in Austria-Hungary; say 2½d for the first five miles; and 6d for the next twelve miles; then 1s for twenty-five miles; and 2s for fifty miles; 4s for one hundred miles. The passenger to enter in at one end of the carriage and pass out at the other end. The guard to sell the tickets on the train to the people in their seats. The station agent or porter to collect the tickets on the platform, and see that the passengers did not go over their zone station.

This would save booking offices, booking clerks, tickets checkers, and ticket collectors. These men alone number about 18,000 on our railways. The public would not have half the worry they have now hanging round the booking office, pushing and wriggling about to get a ticket, and annoyed and badgered at nearly every station to find the ticket to get it checked. This could easily be done if all the railways were under one system. When shall we wake up?

## What State Purchase Means.

What would 25 years' purchase mean upon the Board of Trade returns? For the three years ending 1904 the average yearly profits were about £42,326,859, or about 3⅛ per cent. on the invested capital. Now 25 times £42,326,859 is £1,059,071,475. The Government could borrow the money at 3 per cent. or £35,000,000 a year, and the income, as we have seen, after paying all expenses, is £42,326,859, leaving a profit to the Government of £7,000,000, which, through so many other channels of economy, could easily be raised to other £23,000,000, making in all £30,000,000 a year.

Thus we see that the forces march for State ownership:—Mr Price, M.P., chairman of the Midland Railway Company, said—"If, on all hands, it is admitted that the public or the Board of Trade should interfere, then it follows that the State should purchase the Railways"; and the late Mr Grierson, General Manager of the Great Western Railway, examined before a Committee, said—"If Parliament was of opinion that interference in the Railways was desirable, the proper course would be for the Government to acquire the Railways and try the management themselves."

While Mr Acworth, the sturdy supporter of the Railway Companies through thick and thin, said—"This interference will before long, in my judgment, land the country quite unexpectedly in a logical *impasse*, from which there can be no outlet except by State purchase of the entire Railway system."

Mr C. F. Clark, President of the Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce and Hon. Secretary of the Hollow Ware and Ironfounders' Association, was asked by—

Mr Monk—Do you think those things (as to rates) would be better managed if the Railways were the property of the Government?

Mr Clark—I certainly do think so. I think that a great deal of money which is now spent in Parliamentary fights would cease to be expended; we have to pay interest upon that money, and we should avoid what I believe is the case now, that is the double terminal charges at junctions.

Mr Monk—Do you think that is the general opinion of the traders at Wolverhampton?—Yes, I think so.

Mr Monk—Those opinions have been expressed in your Chamber of Commerce more or less?—Yes, they have.

Mr Isaac Banks, Manager of the Clyde Shipping Company, and late Cork Agent for the Great Western line of steamers, and ex-Traffic Manager of the Waterford and Limerick Railway, gave the following evidence:—

Mr O'Sullivan—Seeing the very expensive mode of management we have in Ireland, what would you suggest for their improvement generally?

Mr Banks—It is my opinion that the lines will never be worked for the benefit of Ireland until they are taken up by the Government. I believe the same good results would follow as in the case of the postal telegraphs and the penny postage, if the Government held the reins.

Lord Randolph Churchill—You would not be against the purchase of the Irish Railways by the State?

Mr Banks—I am very much in favour of it. I think it would be the very best thing that ever happened to the country. Do you think that would be the opinion of the mercantile community generally?—The trading community would be all in favour of it. In reply to Lord Randolph Churchill—Mr Pim, of Pim Brothers, Dublin, said, I think it would have been a great benefit if the State had purchased the Railways. In reply to Mr Edward Watkin, Mr T. A. Dickson, Commissioner of Inland Navigation, and member of the Belfast Chamber of Commerce, said, I consider that a great political mistake, not merely a commercial mistake,

was made by the Government not taking up the whole of the Railway system in Ireland and extending it.

On 16th February 1893, the President of the Board of Trade said to a deputation of 200 Members of Parliament—"The present state of things cannot last; the Companies are straining the patience of the trading public, the smaller traders are being most grievously oppressed, and again I assert that this, if persisted in, will be most detrimental in their effect upon the general trade of the country."

On 3rd March 1892, the House of Commons passed this resolution—"That in the opinion of this House, the revised Railway rates, charges, and conditions of traffic are most prejudicial to the industries and agricultural and commercial interests of the country, and this House urges upon the Government the necessity of dealing promptly and effectively with the subject."

And this extract from a speech of the Chairman of the Hull and Barnsley Railway Company speaks for itself—"I did think, after the fight had been lost and won, that there was a reasonable prospect that we might have lived in amity with the North Eastern, but the North Eastern turned up in the House of Commons in the shape of their Chairman, and, after making a very acrimonious speech, in which he charged us with everything short of actual dishonesty—indeed, I am not quite sure whether he did not charge us with that—sheltered under the privilege of Parliament, he succeeded in throwing out the Bill. . . . The motion was seconded by Mr Cropper, Director of the Midland Railway Company; and I may tell you that the Manager of the Great Northern told me that he had it from these Railway Directors in the House of Commons, who were interested in such matters, no fewer than one hundred and thirty-six promised to vote against us."

Upon which he proceeds—

"Of course, that shows what the power of the Railway Directors is in the House. Well, I am a Railway Director myself, and I am in the House of Commons myself. If it is on any future occasion proposed that the votes of Railway Directors, or even shareholders, should not be allowed in the House of Commons on matters in which they have a distinct interest, I for one, Railway Director as I am, shall vote in favour of the proposition."

This extract from Sir Edwin Chadwick will also explain the adverse decision of the Devonshire Commission in 1867 upon the question of putting Mr Gladstone's Act into operation.—"I confess that I was somewhat surprised at its (the Commission's) composition, in which the mistake appears

to have been made, in assuming that the interests of Railway Directors and others who have profited largely by the existing system, AND WHO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION, were identical with the interests of the ordinary shareholders, who, as a class, have lost or been ruined by their mismanagement. If I had made a fortune by the system in question, or belonged to a house which had received large sums on account of it, or had derived greatly augmented values of land from it — if I owed my public position to it. . . . I should have felt that my proper position would be that of a witness, or of an advocate, rather than of a judge upon the system. Immediately the composition of the Commission generally was seen, the directorates and private enterprisers were at their ease upon it, and their confidence was early confirmed by the course of its investigations. . . . Out of a committee of twenty-seven members (if one excepts the votes of those gentlemen who were on their trial) only three are responsible for the decision."

Such voting of interested parties would certainly appear to be against the spirit of Parliamentary usage, if, indeed, it is not against the actual letter of the law, which lays it down that no Member of Parliament shall vote upon a question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest.

Sir George Findlay said before one of the Committees, that if the Railways were State property there would be great danger of a general strike of all the railway workers for better pay and shorter hours, and a terrible strike, such as this, might lead to something like civil war. But what of the 190,000 in the Post Office? Our Government is by far the largest employer of labour in Britain. Then the Railways are not like any other mercantile bodies: they are monopolies issuing from the State and withdrawable by the Government whenever the House of Commons decides to take them over. And we have seen that the State has had to step in, as in the L. & N.-W. Crewe case, and have the men sent back to their work to save the Company from the result of their own folly.

Is it practicable to apply the Zone system, with the foregoing scale of fares, in the United Kingdom? By this I mean, can a self-paying traffic be procured at the reduced fares? I certainly see no reason to the contrary. Mr W. M. Acworth has endeavoured to show in one place that the Hungarian scale is impossible with us for certain reasons, which in another place he most adroitly refutes. Thus, in discussing the Zone system in the "Nineteenth Century," Sept. 1891, he says:—

"It is, I believe, almost impossible to set bounds to the potential traffic between, say Liverpool and Manchester, or London and Brighton, if only

the fares were low enough; BUT NO POSSIBLE REDUCTION OF FARES CAN DEVELOP TO ANY GREAT EXTENT THE TRAFFIC ALONG COUNTRY LINES, FOR THE SIMPLE REASON THAT THE PEOPLE ARE NOT THERE TO TRAVEL." But in the "Nineteenth Century" for December 1892 (the following year), in an article on "Railway Mismanagement," he suggests the adoption of the Hungarian scale in Ireland, because it "seems to me to have many points in common with Hungary. BOTH COUNTRIES ARE POOR, INHABITED BY A SCATTERED AND BACKWOOD POPULATION LITTLE USED TO TRAVEL, a population, moreover, fond of horses and accustomed to make such journeys as they find necessary, anywhere at least within twenty miles of their homes, by the aid of their own or their neighbours' horses."

## Private *versus* Public Management.

There are about 270 Dock and Harbour Trusts in Britain; one-third of these are under the control of municipalities. On the Mersey, the Clyde, and the Tyne are prominent instances of enormous interests successfully managed for the public by the public.

In 1902 a Royal Commission reported on the Port and Docks of London. A more radical condemnation of the present system could not have been made out by the "Clarion" or "Reynolds' Newspaper." The chairman of the Commission was Earl Egerton, and with him Lord Revelstoke, Hon. Alfred Lyttelton, M.P., Sir Robert Giffen, K.C.B., Sir John Wolfe Barry, Sir John Hext, Mr John Ellis, M.P., Hon. William Peel, M.P., with Mr B. H. Holland as secretary; and the Commission was entirely unanimous in its decision. They state that the shipping trade of London has been steadily going back, notwithstanding the enormous increase of the population. The reason they give for the foreign ports forging ahead is that the docks, quays, wharves, &c., are, without exception, owned by national or municipal authorities, and are constructed out of national or public funds. The Commissioners quote from an American report of 1897, stating that the four continental ports of Havre, at the mouth of the Seine; Antwerp, 58 miles up the Scheldt; Hamburg, 70 miles up the Elbe; and Rotterdam, 18 miles up the Rhine. At each city are magnificent and costly systems of docks, piers, anchorage, and water-ways, under public ownership and control, with a depth of water to float the largest ship at any time. At the end of 1901 the Germans had afloat 24 ships of over 10,000 tons, as against 28 British of the same size. The Commissioners also state that London is a much more expensive port, both as regards payments and delays in unloading and loading than any of the first-class continental

ports are. They point out that the economical ship is the large ship, and unless you can provide for the large ship you cannot compete for the carrying trade. The Committee point out that the chief cause of delay is that the large ships cannot get into the quays, and barges have to be used, which are slow and expensive, and entirely out of court as a business arrangement. The reason why the dock companies cannot rise to the occasion is because of the extraordinary regard paid to the vested interests of the wharfingers and lightermen, who state and maintain that they have vested interests in the landing and shipping of goods in the port of London. (The vested interests of the drink traffic are not in it here.) The Commissioners begin their conclusions and recommendations—1st, That if London is to hold its place as a port against its rivals, they must spend seven millions in deepening the docks and river. 2nd, That it is difficult, if not impossible, as things now stand, with so many conflicting interests, and the weak financial position of each interest and company, and that the division of port interests and junctions between the Thames conservancy —Trinty House, Watermen's Company, London and India, Surrey Commercial, Millwall Dock Companies, Lightermen and Bargemen's vested interests—should be vested in one authority, to consist of about 40 persons: —eleven from the London County Council, three from the City Corporation, five from the Bank of England, and the rest by various public bodies. I have no doubt that soon, perhaps, most of my readers will think and say that I have digressed in leaving the subject of Railways for a minute, but I only wanted to show that too many cooks spoil the broth, and especially when their interests conflict.

## Proofs of Communal Enterprise.

Glasgow Telephones, January 1903:—The profits, after payment of interest and sinking fund annuity, was £3650 17s 10½d, which was carried to depreciation account. These profits have been made in the face of strenuous competition on the part of the National Company against the Corporation system. The charges by the National Telephone Company in London are £17, and in the provinces £10. The Glasgow Corporation only charge £5 for unlimited service. These are the kind of truths the traders want to see and know.

Guernsey has a population of 40,300. Eight years ago they put down a telephone system. The total capital invested is £23,583. They have 1217 subscribers, or one for every 33 of the population. The revenue for 1903 was £4064 7s 6d, or an average per instrument of £3 6s 9½d. Working

expenses, interest, depreciation, Post Office royalty, and sinking fund absorbed £3830 9s 5d; setting aside £32 5s 3d for the special contingency fund, which stands now at £397 2s 5d; and leaving the nett profit of £201 12s 6d.

When Parliament compelled the London Gas Companies to reduce the gas that was costing them 2s 6d to manufacture, from 12s to 4s 6d per 1000 cubic feet, the Company was going to be ruined, but they are still managing to keep in existence under the strain of about 50 per cent. of profit.

In Leeds a second Gas Company was started to lower the high charges of the first. Result, same dividends paid on both capitals, and price of gas raised. The Corporation had to buy up both.

The Board of Trade Tramway returns February 1905 states that in the year 1878 Great Britain and Ireland had 269 miles of Tramways.

The invested capital was £4,207,350, or about £15,637 per mile.

In 1904 we had 1840 miles, and the invested capital was £46,451,444, or about £25,245 per mile.

In 1878 the passengers carried were 146,000,000, at an average fare of 1.84d.

And in 1904, 1,799,000,000 passengers were carried, at an average fare of 1.11d.

The receipts in 1878 were £230,956, or about £858 10s per mile.

In 1904 the receipts were £2,912,110, or about £1637 per mile. This speaks for itself.

The average profit in 1879 was 3.97 per cent., and in 1904 6.27 per cent.

The number of miles of Tramways belonging to local authorities in 1904 was 1148, and to private companies 692; total miles in 1904, 1840.

The invested capital by local authorities in Tramways was £28,060,524, or about £24,460 per mile; and by private companies £18,390,920, or about £26,562 per mile.

The amount paid over in relief of the rates by the local authorities was £207,087, and the private companies swallowed the lot.

## Money.

There is probably no subject with which the general public are more mystified than with the functions of money. Many people are unable to understand how huge industries can be taken over by municipalities or the Government when they think of the enormous cost. "Where is the money to come from?" they ask.

It is computed by our best statistical financiers that in both the British Islands, if all the copper coins and copper bullion, all the silver coins and silver bullion, all the gold coins and gold bullion, all the jewellery in silver and gold worn by the King's subjects in Great Britain and Ireland were put together in one great pool, it would not amount to 200 million pounds.

Yet we find the Public Water Board of London taking over from the London Water Companies 31 million pounds worth of property, without practically paying a penny for it. How has it been done? What has happened? The shareholders in the private Water Companies have simply handed in their share certificates to the Metropolitan Water Board, and in exchange have received certificates from the London County Council Water Board for the amount of their shares, including the added amount of value on their shares. For every share certificate of £100 in the old company, the new Water Board have given certificates for £109 10s. Nothing has happened but the alteration of the figures on the certificates. So easily is a private industry municipalised or nationalised. It is all a matter of words and figures.

# QUESTIONS THAT WANT ANSWERING.

What would be the political aspect if the Railways were merged into the hands of the Government? Would not the railway men combine with the postmen, telegraph, telephone, and the Government shipbuilders to force the hands of our legislators for the furtherance of their own ends, and against the interests of the whole country?

My answer to this would be, we have 581,000 employees on our railways. There are 152,265 males in the post office, telegraph, telephone, and warship building yards, making altogether about 775,000. But they are not all voters. I think we may easily deduct 275,000 as having no effect on the Legislature.

This leaves us with a balance of 500,000 supposed to be in favour of harassing the nation for unreasonable wages and shorter hours of work, with their half million votes. But there are 7,266,708 voters in the country. Is it likely that the seven million, with all the virtue and justice on their side, will lie down quietly and be sat upon—one man to twelve? It seems to me the bogie is not worth considering.

Another question that is often asked is, "What would you propose to do with or for the men that you say would not be wanted if the Railways were in one pool, or nationalised?"

My answer to that is. The most humane, and I think the easiest way, would be to keep the men on at what could be found for them to do. They would gradually fall into their place in the system, and no more young men would be taken on till the original staff were all employed. The situation would be something like this. We have at present on our Railways 581,669 men, their ages ranging from 15 to 60 years. Taking the average of their ages at 45 years, their average retiring rate through whatever cause would be about 12,778 annually, or 35 every twenty-four hours, and in eight years over 100,000 will have left the service, and over 100,000 new ones gone on to fill their places.

I think the workers in the Government departments show less inclination to strike than any other class of workers in the country. The State

pensions that the employees look forward to have a good deal to do with this matter.

Of course the thin end of the wedge bogie comes in—If the State takes the Railways why should it not take everything else? Because the Railways are a monopoly, and they do not and cannot compete with each other. Only a short time ago, the same argument was used against the parcel post and the telegraph systems, as well as State education. But these have all gone to rest. The true line of distinction between things the State may and may not take up is between things which can be multiplied indefinitely, and where there is effective competition, and things which cannot be multiplied and have no effective competition. The community makes its own roads and bridges, and why not its railways? The post office and telegraph was at one time private enterprise; the telephone is practically in the hands of the Government now.

It has been proved beyond a doubt, where a quick and frequent service has been given, with a generous reduction in fares such as our tramways have given, the traffic has increased fourfold. If that increase has been got from passengers, is it not likely also to obtain with goods and minerals? Now assume that the Government acquired the Railways, did away with the 3600 directors, the 4000 clearing-house clerks, and the 10,000 touts and drummers, and all their expensive offices and shops, as well as the vast amount of money that Railways spend on advertising by leaflets and large bills and books, and through newspapers, and get their rails, engines, carriages, wagons, and brakes all made uniform, introduce open corridor carriages so that the people could go in and sit down where they liked, and the guard to come round and sell the tickets on the train as the tramway guard does now, and do away with the booking office, booking clerk, ticket checker, and ticket collector, and let the Railway-Master General reduce the fare to, say, ½d per passenger per mile, and the freight rates to about half the same proportion to what they are now, the alteration would put new life into the trade of *this country*, by putting us on a footing to enable us to compete with the rest of the world on fair lines.

In the report of Mr Chamberlain's Fiscal Tariff Commission it says, "Both in the replies to our inquiry forms, and in the evidence of witnesses who appeared before us, there is a general consensus of opinion that freight charges both by land and water are more burdensome in the United Kingdom than in foreign countries, and that the trade of this country is injured by the preferential rates to our competitors. But in the opinion of witnesses, it is not transport charges alone which constitute the element

of danger, but the combination of the transport policy of foreign countries, with their export organisation.

Our main lines and suburban city trains are made up of about ten coaches, having a mean capacity of 500 passengers, so that the passengers load is only about 12 per cent. of its carrying capacity.

The average earnings for goods and mineral traffic in 1902-3 was 6s 8½d per train mile. The average speed of our goods trains is about 15 miles an hour.

Mr Young, draper, South Shields, had two cases of goods sent from Manchester on the 15th March 1905, and they were not delivered till the 30th, thus they were fifteen days on the railway.

The justification for the trouble and expense of making a railway was, that by mechanical power and concentration of load a much more economic system would be introduced for transit of minerals and goods, as it was evident that the ordinary road with its curves, corners, and up and down hill eccentricities could be no match for the level steel rails led over bridges, viaducts, cuttings, tunnels, and embankments. Yet we have to pay more than we have on the roads.

The "Yorkshire Post" of 5th April 1905 reports a meeting of the Chambers of Agriculture, where a resolution was passed to nationalise the main macadamised roads, and that one-third of their maintenance should be borne by the Government. The reason given was, the cutting up of the roads by the motor traffic. It seems a paltry reason beside the dozens of reasons that can be given for doing the same thing with the Railways.

It is advocated that the manufactories that are in large towns should be put on the tops of our hills, and the valleys should grow our food. But the Railways carry all the means of production much cheaper to our large towns than to the hillsides of our country, and this keeps the manufacturers consolidated in one place. If the Government had the Railways, they would most likely encourage the placing of works in places where the smoke and refuse would get most easily away into the atmosphere and into the sea.

In 1868 a Royal Commission sat to consider and report upon this question of Railway Nationalisation, and urged the purchase of the Railways.

Now, what valid argument is there against State Railways? Look at continental experience. In Belgium, since the State purchase, freights and passenger rates have been reduced 40 per cent.; in Germany, the profits from these Railways pay the interest on the National Debt, and the charge

is 40 per cent. less than our private companies do. All our Australian Colonies run cheaper and pay well; in Austria-Hungary the recent experiment has been a great success, and all over the world the result has been the same. The purchase of the Railways by the State should be a leading feature in the programme of all politicians from all parties, for the common good of our common country.

What the Railways will have to come to is—Light, frequent trains, with one driver, and one guard to sell the tickets and take the money, as on the tramways; running two or three corridor coaches with a seating capacity of about fifty each coach. It is absurd to see trains of 200 tons weight carrying an average of 2½ tons of passengers.

## An Ultimatum to Railway Companies by the London "Times."

The "Times" puts its ultimatum on the Railway question in this form:—"The Railways exist for the public, not the public for the Railways. Their privileges and laws are derived from Parliament, and may be revoked or revised by Parliament. They cannot be allowed, and will not be allowed, in the long run, to revive the obsolete charges without making adequate provision for their equitable and uniform imposition. The travelling public is very patient, but, unless we are mistaken, its patience is not inexhaustible. Unpunctuality it has been educated to tolerate, but it will not tolerate vexatious charges levied at random and with no pretence of uniformity."

## A House of Commons Committee thus expresses itself.

"Your Committee feel it difficult to understand fully the explanations afforded by the Railway Companies, and still *more difficult* to justify what they do understand of them. They cannot but think that the course of the Companies was mainly actuated by their determination to recoup themselves to the fullest extent by raising the rates of articles when the maximum rates were above the actual rates; but for this they would simply have altered their rates only where they found that the old rates were in excess of the new legal rates, and have left the others as they were, until such time as they could be examined *in detail*."

In fine, the policy which has been adopted by Railway Companies with reference to the charges for merchandise traffic may be described as one of mystery and evasion. It cannot be said to have been successful, and it is unworthy of the great corporations who are responsible to so large an extent for the prosperity of the commercial community.

## A Motion Carried in the House of Commons in 1892.

"That, in the opinion of this House, the revised Railway rates are most prejudicial to the industries and agricultural and commercial interests of the country; and this House urges upon the Government the necessity of dealing promptly and effectively with the subject."

## Resolution for Meetings.

I would suggest the following as a useful form of Resolution for meetings called to consider the question of Railway management:—"That, in the opinion of this meeting or association, it is desirable that a Royal Commission should be appointed to call evidence and ascertain whether we have the best possible economic system of conducting our Railways; and, if not, whether it would be for the advantage of the trade and commerce of this country, and ultimately for the benefit of the State, in its financial relations, that the Railways should become national property, especially in view of the preferential rates given to foreign countries against our own traders, which is crippling the commerce of our country."

## George Stephenson.

George Stephenson told a Select Committee in 1840—"I have come to the conclusion that wherever combination is practicable competition is impossible."

## Mr Gladstone's Opinions.

Mr Gladstone, in introducing his Bill for the State ownership of our Railways (1844), used these remarkable words:—"There is no likelihood that the experiment of the greatest possible cheapness to the *public will* be tried under the present system" (*i.e.*, Private Ownership). Why did Mr Gladstone use those words?

## Royal Commission on Canals.

On the 22nd May 1906, Mr W. D. Phillipps, General Manager of the North Staffordshire Railway and Canals, stated before the Royal Commission on Canals (at question 2468)—Do you think effective competition could be carried out?—I should be disposed to say that you should rather spend your money in buying up the Railways.

And in answer to question 2662, he says—I think you may take it that nowadays there is no competition between anybody or anything. *Prices* are agreed, and everything is agreed. Wherever there is a prosperous community there is a ring which keeps up rates, prices, and everything else.

# STATISTICS

OF THE

# WORLD'S RAILWAYS.

| | I. Shareholders. | II. Invested Capital | III. Average per Shareholder. | IV. Miles of Railway. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | £ | £ | |
| United Kingdom..... | 566,460 | 1,175,001,000 | 2074 | 22,634 |
| United States ..... | 327,851 | 2,752,734,308 | 8007 | 214,478 |
| Germany ..... | State. | 662,150,000 | .. | 32,280 |
| Belgium ..... | ,, | 89,222,500 | ... | 2,846 |
| Austria Hungary ..... | ,, | 393,497,000 | ... | 22,125 |
| Holland ..... | ,, | 18,305,975 | .. | 1,809 |
| British India ..... | ,, | 241,574 677 | ... | 27,762 |
| Canada ..... | ,, | 66,625,000 | .. | 7,750 |
| South Africa .. ..... | ,, | 38,652,750 | ... | 3,100 |
| Australia..... | .. | 150,817,000 | ... | 15,075 |
| Egypt ..... ..... | .. | 15,000,000 | .. | 1,451 |
| Average (excluding Gt. Britain)..... | | | | 30,710 |

| | XII. Number of Merchandise, Mineral, and Live Stock Vehicles. | XIII. Average Number of Tons carried per Vehicle per Annum. | XIV. Average per Vehicle per Day. | XV. Total Revenue from all sources in 1904. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | £ |
| United Kingdom..... | 1,247,601 | 362 | 19 cwt. | 111,833,000 |
| United States ..... ... | 1,692,194 | 774 | 42 cwt. | 411,494,602 |
| Germany ..... | 428,400 | 604 | 35 cwt. | 99,500,000 |
| Belgium ..... | 73,010 | ... | ... | 9,580,475 |
| Austria Hungary ..... | 192,400 | ... | ... | 38,950,015 |
| Holland ..... ..... .. | 16,600 | ... | ... | 3,764,825 |
| British India ..... | 206,300 | ... | ... | 29,521,533 |
| Canada ..... ..... | 27,930 | ... | ... | 9,146,075 |
| South Africa ..... ... | 14,515 | ... | ... | 7,851,500 |
| Australia ..... | 56,065 | 689 | 37 cwt. | 12,688,475 |
| Egypt ..... | 7,497 | ... | ... | 2,668,296 |
| Average (excluding Gt. Britain)..... | 297,497 | | | £62,516,559 |

| V<br>Average Cost per Mile of Line. | VI<br>Number of Employees. | VII.<br>Number of Employees per Mile of Line. | VIII.<br>Number of Locomotives | IX.<br>Number of Locomotives per Mile. | X.<br>Number of Passenger Vehicles. | XI.<br>Number of Passenger Vehicles per Mile |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| £ | | | | | | |
| 51,914 | 581,664 | 26.9 | 22,443 | 0.99 | 70,543 | 3.12 |
| 12,868 | 1,296,121 | 5.59 | 46,743 | 0.21 | 39,752 | 0.18 |
| 20,512 | 581,000 | 17.75 | 20,310 | 0.62 | 37,923 | 1.17 |
| 31,900 | 59,766 | 21. | 3,315 | 1.17 | 8,100 | 2.88 |
| 17,785 | ... | ... | 8,300 | 0.37 | 16,500 | 0.74 |
| 10,118 | ... | ... | 967 | 0.53 | 2,387 | 1.31 |
| 9,061 | ... | ... | 10,692 | 0.38 | 25,400 | 0.91 |
| 8,596 | ... | ... | 840 | 0.11 | 794 | 0.10 |
| 12,468 | ... | ... | 846 | 0.29 | 1,146 | 0.37 |
| 10,004 | ... | ... | 2,532 | 0.17 | 4,135 | 0.27 |
| 10,338 | 15,000 | 9.3 | 465 | 0.32 | 700 | 0.48 |
| £14,565 | 645,629 | 13.9 | 9,501 | 0.31 | 13,683 | 0.84 |

| XVI<br>Average Revenue per Mile | XVII<br>Total Working Expenses | XVIII<br>Total Working Expenses per Mile. | XIX<br>Net Profit for Dividing. | XX.<br>Profit on Invested Capital per cent. | XXI.<br>Average Number of Trains per Day. | XXII.<br>Revenue per Train Mile. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| £ | £ | £ | £ | £ s d. | | s. d. |
| 4,940 | 69,173,000 | 3,055 | 42,660,000 | 3 12 7 | 48 | 5 7½ |
| 1,976 | 261,978,216 | 1,259 | 153,270,308 | 5 14 6 | 12 | 8 0 |
| 3,082 | 63,051,325 | 1,985 | 36,412,678 | 5 9 10 | 26 | 6 4 |
| 3,366 | 5,837,370 | 2,051 | 3,743,300 | 4 3 10 | 41 | 4 7 |
| 1,760 | 25,188,300 | 1,138 | 13,766,775 | 4 5 2 | 17 | 5 9 |
| 2,081 | 2,462,800 | 1,914 | 1,272,025 | 6 19 0 | 33 | 3 6 |
| 1,063 | 12,425,050 | 447 | 17,096,483 | 7 1 6 | 10 | 5 0 |
| 1,180 | 5,856,700 | 755 | 3,295,375 | 4 18 11 | 8 | 7 11 |
| 2,524 | 5,670,875 | 1,829 | 2,160,625 | 7 2 2 | 16 | 9 1 |
| 841 | 8,605,900 | 571 | 4,082,575 | 2 15 0 | 8 | 5 11 |
| 1,739 | 1,369,916 | 973 | 1,298,376 | 8 12 1 | 14 | 6 6 |
| £1,961 | £39,147,645 | £1,288 | £36,639,852 | £5 14 2½ | 18 | 6 3 |

| | XXIII. Working Expenses per Train Mile. | XXIV. Profit per Train Mile. | XXV. Average Number of Passengers in a Passenger Train. | XXVI. Average Sum received for carrying a Passenger 100 Miles. | XXVII. Average Sum received for carrying one ton of Goods or Minerals 100 Miles. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | s. d. | s. d. | | s. d. | s. d. |
| United Kingdom... | 3 5½ | 2 2 | 41 | 8 3 | 9 10 |
| United States ..... | 5 0 | 3 0 | 50 | 8 3 | 3 3 |
| Germany..... | 4 1 | 2 3 | 74 | 4 2 | 5 7 |
| Belgium ..... | 2 9 | 1 10 | 81 | 3 1 | ... |
| Austria Hungary .. | 3 8 | 2 1 | 63 | 3 9 | 5 7 |
| Holland ..... | 2 4 | 1 2 | 32 | 5 1 | 4 9 |
| British India ..... | 2 4 | 2 8 | 217 | 1 8½ | 3 9 |
| Canada ..... | 5 0 | 2 11 | 70 | 7 4 | 3 6 |
| South Africa ..... | 6 5 | 2 8 | .. | ... | ... |
| Australia..... ... | 4 1 | 1 10 | ... | ... | ... |
| Egypt ..... | 3 7 | 2 11 | 105 | 4 3 | 5 9 |
| Average (excluding Gt. Britain)... | 3 11 | 2 4 | 86 | 4 1 | 4 6½ |

| | XXVIII. Average Goods Train Loads. | XXIX. Average Day's Load for a Waggon conveying Goods or Minerals 100 Miles | | XXX. Profit from running a Goods Train 100 Miles. | XXXI. Working Cost of conveying one ton of goods 100 Miles | XXXII. Profit from conveying one ton of goods 100 Miles. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Tons. | Tons. | Cwts. | s. d. | s. d. | s. d. |
| United Kingdom... | 68 | 0 | 15 | 3 3 | 5 1 | 4 9 |
| United States .. ... | 287 | 3 | 1 | 4 11 | 1 7 | 1 8 |
| Germany..... | 160 | 1 | 5 | 4 8 | 2 7 | 3 0 |
| Belgium ..... | ... | ... | | ... | ... | ... |
| Austria Hungary .. | 140 | 1 | 3 | 4 3 | 2 8 | 2 11 |
| Holland ..... | 105 | 1 | 3 | 2 10 | 2 1 | 2 8 |
| British India ..... | 140 | 3 | 4 | 3 0 | 1 9½ | 2 0 |
| Canada ..... | 241 | 3 | 5 | 3 5 | 2 2 | 1 4 |
| South Africa ..... | ... | ... | | ... | ... | ... |
| Australia..... | ... | ... | | 1 8 | ... | ... |
| Egypt ..... | 147 | 2 | 0 | 4 10 | 2 5 | 3 4 |
| Average (excluding Gt. Britain).. | 174 | 2 | 3 | 3 8 | 2 2 | 2 5 |

# INDEX.

Acworth, Mr, on British Rates and Fares, 42.
On Providence and Nature Discriminating, 4
On Express Trains, 252.
Advertising, 11.
Agricultural Commission, 108.
American Railways, 19, 46, 50, 64, 68, 74, 85, 186.
Andrew, Mr, on North British Railway Rates, 148.
Austrian Zone System, 243.
Antwerp's Low Railway Rates, 241.
Apples' Rate—Folkestone to London, 45, 52.
Associated Chambers of Commerce, 52.
Average Working Expenses, 20.
Income per Mile, 29.
No. of Tons Carried per Mile, 30.

Balfour Brown, K.C., on Railway Rates, 43.
Belgian Railways, 239, 264.
Bell, Mr, M.P., on the Danger of Shunting, 75.
Blackburn Chamber of Commerce, 52.
Board of Trade Reports, 52.
British Railwaymen, 12, 221, 223.
Bull—Carrying from Carlisle to Glasgow, 53.
Buller, Mr, on Preference Railway Rates, 119.
Bury, Mr, General Manager, Great Northern, 149.

Cardiff and Dunfermline, 9.
Canals to be pushed on the Government, 56.
Carriers—Too many of them, 88.
Churchill, Lord R., on Competition, 72.
Clearing-house—Its Wastefulness, 84.

Classification causes Dishonesty, 98.
Chessman, Mr W. R., to the Trades Union Congress, 28.
Chambers of Commerce Discussions, 12, 62, 68, 177.
Chamberlain, Mr—His Opinions, 170, 250, 281.
Class Rates Unequal and Unfair, 41.
Clements, Mr, on Chatham and South Eastern Rates, 137.
Cost Per Mile Average, 18.
Comparison of Railway Capital, 18.
Companies not Overpaid, 27.
Contract—Dunfermline and Cardiff, 242.
"Cornhill Magazine" on Third Class Passengers, 30.
Contentions—Bad Results, 34, 188.
Continental Results Compared, 58, 60, 80.
Cornelius, Mr, on Rates—Harwich to London, 112.
Corridor Carriages, 228.
Coutts, Burdett, Mr, M.P., on Deficiency of Railway Figures, 257.
Couplings as Life-Saving Appliances, 191, 194.
Comparisons of Railways Abroad, 230.
Communal Enterprise, 277.

Darlington Railway Coal Rates, 35.
Dennis, Mr, on Boulogne to London Rates, 227.
Directors of Railways, 17.
Diversity of Railway Rates, 45.
Drysdale, Mr, on Hamburg to Glasgow Rates, 122.
Dublin to London Egg Rates, 45.
Dudley, Mr, and Parcel Contertion, 174.
Duplicating of Railways, 90-92.

Earning Power of Railways, 19-26.
Economic Opinions, 269.
Empty Trains, 17.
Egg Rates, Galway to London, 45.
Egyptian Railways, 269.

Fast Passenger Traffic, 266.
Ferguson, Dr, on Railway Nationalisation, 254.
Findlay, Sir George, General Manager, L. and S.W., 27, 275.
Fish from Thurso, 46.
Fletcher, T. R., on Load Guages, 76.

Forbes, Mr, General Manager, London and Brighton, 151.
Foreign and Home Rates, 100, 177.
Forwood, Sir W. B., on Railway Rates, 254.
Fraser, Mr, on American Ability, 195.
Freights, Shipping, 62.
French Railways, 242.
Fuller, Mr, on Hull to Nottingham Rates, 116.

Gardner, Mr, General Manager, Great Eastern, 153.
German Iron Imports, 52.
Railways, 208.
Gibb, Sir George, General Manager, North Eastern, 154.
Gladstone, Mr, Opinions, 77, 253, 284.
Glasgow and Dunfermline Rates, 45.
Goods and Minerals Carried, 25, 117.
Train Mileage, 25.
Classification, 36.
Goods Rates, 76, 218.
Government and Purchase of Canals, 57.
Great Northern Railway, 24, 51, 57, 70.
Great Western Railway, 169, 253.
Great Central Railway, 69.
Grey, Earl, on Shipping Rates, 63, 66.
Grey, Sir Edward, on German Success, 13.
Grierson, Mr, General Manager, on Competition, 44.

Hanbury, Mr, on Railway Directors, 27, 47.
Hamilton, Lord Claud, Chairman, Great Eastern Railway, 176, 249.
Hay, Mr, President of the Iron and Steel Institute, 43.
Hennell, Mr, Goods Manager, Great Western, 152.
Herbert Spenser, on the year 1845, 34, 82.
Herrings, Carriage to London, 45.
Hicks-Beach, Sir M., on the Canals, 57.
Hill, Mr, General Manager, South Eastern, 158.
Hill, Sir Rowland—Reasons for State Railways, 249.
Hodge, Mr, on Scottish Railway Rates, 132.
Hours of Work, 224.
House of Commons Committees, 283.
How the Public Suffer, 90.
How the Railways could be acquired, 271.

How Traders Lose their Legal Cases, 35.
Humberston, Mr, Secretary, Iron Workers, Sheffield, 251.
Hutton, Mr, on North of England Railway Rates, 113.

Indian Railways, 198.
Ingratitude of Directors, 105.
Invested Capital, 23, 26.
Irish Legal Railway Rates, 38, 165, 178.
Issuing Stock, 32.

Jacks, Dr, on London and Glasgow Railway Rates, 217.
James, Mr, J. F., on the Shipping Ring, 63.

King, Mr, Oxford, on Foreign Hay, 142.

Lawyers' Bills, 11, 80, 82
Lee, Mr Arthur, Bristol, on the Canals, 59.
Leeds and Liverpool Canal, 57.
Legal Railway Rates, 35, 42.
Length of Lines, 26.
Light Railways, 240.
London and North Western, 18, 37, 53, 70, 74, 80, 164, 169.
London Season Tickets, 32.
Workmen's Tickets, 46.
Loss on 1st Class Tickets, 89.

Macnamara, Mr, Secretary, Railway and Canal Commission, 160.
Mally, Mr, Goods Manager, London and South Western, 159.
Manchester to Glasgow, 45.
Massey, Mr, Hull Chamber of Commerce, 51.
Metropolitan District Railway, 69.
Midland Railway, 33, 69.
Miles of Railways in the Three Kingdoms, 23.
Miller, Mr, General Manager, Caledonian Railway, 145.
Minerals Carried, 47.
Misdeclaration of Goods Sent, 106.
Money, 278.
Monopoly, 261.
Mullins, Mr, on Rates, Cardiff to Birmingham, 130.
Multiplicity of Industries, 31.
Mwwo, Mr, of the Board of Agriculture, 108.
Muskin, Mr, on Fruit Rates to Manchester, 142.

New South Wales Railways, 233.
Newspaper Influence against Nationalisation, 11.
Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, 53.
North British Legal Rates, 40.
No Competition, 71, 73, 74.
Nottingham to Glasgow Rates, 52.
Number of Railway Companies in 1845, 18.
Shareholders in 1904, 23.
Employees in 1904, 23.
Men per Mile of Line, 24.
Locomotives in 1904, 24.
Vehicles in 1904, 25.
Passengers in a Train in 1904, 29.
Railway Goods Rates in 1904, 43, 77.

Overcrowding in London Trains, 33.
Overlapping in London, 247.

Parliamentary Bills, 35.
Passengers Carried, 25, 28.
Train Mileage, 25.
Paterson, Mr John, on Glasgow Rates, 217.
Peel, Hon. George, on Serious Fall in Railway Stock, 256.
Phillipps, Mr, General Manager, North Stafford Railway, 284.
Pope, Mr J. Buckingham, 13, 44.
Post Office, 12, 164, 168, 171.
Power to Purchase, 16.
Preferential Rates, 36, 97.
Private Traders' Wagons, 26.
Private *versus* Public Management, 276.
Prussian Railways Compared, 210, 220.

Questions that want Answering, 280.

Railway History, 16, 83.
Combine, 18.
Contention, 20, 56.
Earnings, Expenditure, Profit, 25.
Rates and Taxes, 31.
Legislation, 77, 79.
Classification, 98.

Remuneration, 166.
Service, 193, 195.
Pension Fund, 175.
Directors, 48.
Statistics, 286.
Rates for Coal, 50.
Return Tickets, 32.
Railways Never Pay Back their Capital, 27.
Resolutions Adopted, 15.
Useful Form Suggested, 283.
Ridley, Lord, on Railway Contention, 249.
Royal Commissions on Railways, 78, 80, 86.
Royse, Mr D. W., Manchester Chamber of Commerce, 56, 59.
Robertson, Mr, on the Indian Railways, 200.
Rosebery, Lord, on Home and Foreign Trade, 250.
Rush for Railway Stock, 17.

Scotter, Mr G., on Undue Preference, 44.
Shareholders' Meetings, 69.
Shipping Freights, 62.
Signalling Stations, 192.
Sligo to Dublin and Belfast, 46.
Slow Passenger Traffic, 265.
South African Railway Rates, 67, 69, 237.
State Purchase of Railways, 267.
Stephenson, George, 34, 284.
Stewart, Mr, of L. and N.W., on Small Truck Loads, 19.
South of Scotland Chamber of Commerce, 46.
Superannuation Fund, 31.
Swiss Railways, 245.

The Cost of Carrying Goods in 1776, 43.
The Cost of Carrying Goods in 1906, 53.
The "Times" Ultimatum, 283.
Thomson, Mr, on Scottish Rates to London, 117.
Throp, Mr, on Preference Rates for Foreign Goods, 115.
Time Tables for Railways, 28.
Tomlinson, Mr, M.P., for Preston, 135.
Too Many Men, 24.
Total Passenger Train Miles, 26.

Total Vehicles, 26.
Traders' Grievances, 12.
Traders' Risk Rates, 95.
Traders' Wagons, 260.
Train Mile Earnings, 27.
Tramways Results, 30.
Transport Rates, 36.
Tyler, Sir H. W., on Legal Powers, 43.

United States Consul on German Industries, 59.
Useless Accommodation, 89.

Vincent, Sir H., M.P., on Railway Contention, 245

Want of Uniformity, 74.
War of the Guages, 16.
Wages and Risk, 100, 105.
Waste of Life and Labour, 21.
Waste and Loss through Drumming, 91.
Wasteful Rivalry, 92.
Watering Stock, 21, 84.
Waterways, 56.
Watkin, Sir E., on Old Womanism, 252.
Weight of Passenger Carriages, 33.
Western Australia, 233.
What the Workmen Pay for their Wages, 103.
What Contention Means, 91.
What State Purchase Means, 272.
Wigham, Mr, on Foreign Rates from Liverpool, 139.
Williams, Mr R. Price, on Railway Honour, 259.
Wilson, Mr C. H., M.P., on Divided Authority, 253.
Wilson, Mr C. J., on Scottish Coal Rates to Carlisle, 43.
Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce, 46.
Workmen's Trains, 29, 105, 226, 239.

PRINTED BY A. ROMANES & SON, "PRESS" OFFICE, DUNFERMLINE.