

Safety on Railways.

"Clause 7. Every employee of a railway company injured while in the discharge of his duty shall, for every day during which he is thereby unfitted for duty, be entitled to compensation from the railway company at the rate of not less than 60 per cent of the current rate of wages for men similarly employed by the railway at the time the injury occurs, to be paid for not more than 52 weeks.

"2. Every such employee permanently disabled while in the discharge of his duty shall be entitled to compensation from the railway company to the amount of not less than \$3,000.

"3. The legal representatives of every employee who is killed or who dies from injuries received while in the discharge of his duty within six months after such injury shall be entitled to compensation from the railway to the amount of not less than \$3,000."

At present is there any arrangement for paying gratuities to railway men on the branch companies?

Mr. HARRIS—Not that I know of. I have never heard of it.

Mr. POWELL—What do you think of that provision in view of their finances?

Mr. HARRIS—I think it would put the roads in great danger of having to shut up in some cases.

Mr. ELLIS—That would intimate that you have many accidents?

Mr. HARRIS—There would be very few accidents, because when a man has to bear any risks he is more careful. He has no right to go in to couple cars which are going at a dangerous speed, when he has simply to step back and signal the engineer to slow up.

Mr. CASEY—In regard to coupling cars, Mr. Hudson, who represented the railway men before the committee, pointed out to us that a man between two cars often had to couple cars when going at a rate that might take him off his feet, and that he should have something on the end of the car to catch hold of. He urged that the handle on the workman's plan now before you would exactly answer that purpose, and that end ladder cars would not have it on. You see the double handle I refer to?

Mr. HARRIS—Yes. The ladder, of course, would be a help to him; but only on one side. On that side he would be all right, but not on the other. That would be a good arrangement, in my estimation.

Mr. POWELL—What is your opinion about this allowance of \$3,000?

Mr. CASEY—I would rather Mr. Harris did not go into matters he had not thoroughly read, but which are merely read at the table to him.

Mr. HARRIS—I have read the bills over and I think I understand them.

Mr. POWELL—Now, Mr. Harris, you have looked into the matter of the \$3,000 gratuity. How about the branch roads in the Maritime Provinces? Could they stand that financially?

Mr. HARRIS—I don't think they could.

Mr. POWELL—Financially, how are they getting along at present?

Mr. HARRIS—Well, a considerable few of them are going behindhand, and others are just keeping on by being extremely careful and saving at every point.

Mr. POWELL—At present there is no arrangement covering that feature of the bill.

Mr. HARRIS—Not that I have heard of.

Mr. POWELL—This general question I will put to you respecting the charges and expenses these branch companies would be put to in order to place air brakes on their cars and engines. It would lower the revenue without effecting greater safety?

Mr. HARRIS—I don't think ours could afford it. I don't think there is any necessity for air brakes on small roads for the reasons that trains are run at low speed; with small engines, carrying necessarily a small number of cars. With trains running one hundred ton engines on long roads, running fast with long trains of cars, I think it a splendid arrangement.

Mr. CASEY—I understood you to say, you thought with the large roads with long trains, this would be a good arrangement.

Mr. HARRIS—Yes, in regard to the air brakes.

Mr. CASEY—But coming back to the compensation clause, you say you do not think there is any necessity of applying it to your road, because you do not have many accidents?