

Safety on Railways.

Mr. POWELL—If universally adopted, would there not be some virtue in these curved grab irons?

Mr. TAIT—No; there is no necessity for them.

Mr. CASEY—That is a question largely for the men to give their opinion on. You say your men prefer the old plan, but I know we will have some men preferring this plan, and perhaps you can get statements from your men who prefer your present system.

Mr. POWELL—Are those your master mechanic's views?

Mr. TAIT—I have charge of the transportation and the operation of trains, and I have no hesitation in expressing my own opinion.

Mr. POWELL—While these might be a decided advantage where you approach from the side would it not be an inconvenience when you wanted to get off the car?

Mr. TAIT—Yes; we think so. The arched iron would only do in case of a ladder at the end.

Mr. INGRAM—No practical man would ever ask for that iron.

Mr. CASEY—I would like to have Mr. Tait's opinion of the compensation question.

Mr. TAIT—In regard to clause 7 that is a matter on which we shall ask to be heard at the next meeting of the Committee. I would like Judge Clarke to speak on this clause.

Mr. CASEY—You might ask him to prepare a written memorandum on the subject and put it in and then we can discuss the matter further. Have you anything to say on clause 8?

Mr. TAIT—Yes, sir, I have a few remarks to make on that point. This clause is evidently framed with the object of giving to the railway employees the extraordinary power to insist upon the railway companies at all times employing what may by the employees be considered a proper number of men.

Mr. CASEY—It does not say so. That is not the provision of the bill at all.

Mr. POWELL—That is left to the law to decide.

Mr. TAIT—I presume evidence would be wanted.

Mr. CASEY—This is the bill handed to me by the railway employees and I think it is imperfect in the matter of saying who is to decide what number is to be employed.

Mr. TAIT—Probably evidence will be required, and the employees on a section for instance where there are five men employed might agree that they would give evidence that two men more were wanted on that section, thus easing the work for the five men already employed.

Mr. CASEY—I think this is a matter that would be left to the Government engineer or some one of that kind.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT—It is emphatically a matter for the Privy Council Committee to deal with.

Mr. CASEY—I do not think so.

Mr. TAIT—In the case of a strike of all classes of railway labour we have to go on and operate the road. We may not have a full complement of men as required by law that we would desire to have but we still could continue our operations on such sections as might be required to save life and property. This would give those on strike a decided advantage for they would at once appeal to the law to show that the company had not a sufficient number of men.

Mr. CASEY—Is there any legislation of this kind in the United States?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT—I do not know of any.

Mr. CASEY—Any legislation comparable to this?

Mr. TAIT—The only law in the direction to the equipment of cars with special appliances is what is known as the Coupler and Air Brake Act.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT—Yes, and that we are complying with.

Mr. TAIT—We do object to having a time put upon us for fixing it at 2 or 3 years.

Mr. CASEY—Have you a benevolent fund amongst your men?

Mr. TAIT—We have not, but we have practically the same thing as the Grand Trunk in this country. Of course if they are injured through their own negligence they have