

the car swings around to the end ladder, when if he tries to get on a side ladder he is apt to lose his grip.

Mr. CASEY—But if the train was going the other way?

Mr. TAIT—He would never do that. He should always get on the rear end of a car. If there is no ladder on the one car there will be one on the next.

Mr. CASEY—Suppose a train of cars all set with ladders the other way?

Mr. TAIT—Out of twenty cars it would be very rare to find no ladder on the rear end of some of the cars.

Mr. POWELL—Are there any considerations other than those of safety and convenience, such as economy for instance, that would lead you to adopt the end ladder in preference to the other?

Mr. TAIT—It is entirely a matter of safety. It would be cheaper to put them there than on the side.

Mr. POWELL—This is the view taken by experts in the business?

Mr. TAIT—Yes; for this reason, that a man getting on there would be swung around. Another reason is, that for a man mounting from a flat car to a box car roof this is much better.

Mr. CASEY—I want to call your attention to the plan I have handed you, which shows the facilities on the end plan for getting on to the ladders. In other words, that end plan shows an arrangement to enable men to get from a flat car to the end of a box car, and then around to the side ladder. The purpose is the reverse to what you mention, that of convenience for a man jumping on the side and getting to the end; would not both work equally well?

Mr. TAIT—Not at all. If compelled to put side ladders on, in the interests of a man we would still continue to put those on the end. I saw the side idea and have discussed it with our men. I do not know where the agitation comes from, as our men are satisfied.

Mr. CASEY—We have two principles in the bill: One in regard to getting to the top of cars and the other for getting on the roof. Sub-section "B," clause 2, of bill No. 2 provides for "arched iron rails extending from the top of each ladder to a sufficient and firm support, placed at the side of the running board, and so arranged as to assist persons climbing on to the roof by means of such ladders."

Mr. INGRAM—You see this arched rail here on the tracing, would you consider it more dangerous than what is on at present?

Mr. TAIT—Yes; because it is apt to trip men in passing from one car to another. They do not always run on the board and the jolting of the car is apt to throw them off it.

Mr. INGRAM—Do you find in American and Canadian cars a difference which makes it more dangerous?

Mr. TAIT—Yes; but there is more danger in a difference of a few inches than in one of a foot, as the men are more apt to overlook it.

Mr. CASEY—You consider the plan proposed by the employees more dangerous than the other? Have you consulted the men?

Mr. TAIT—Yes; we have consulted the different orders of railway labour and can give you letters from them. There is one point I would like to make clear. A large part of the cars passing over our road and over the Grand Trunk are foreign built, belonging to United States companies. I presume it is not intended to apply the Act to these, as it would mean that we would have to retire from handling United States cars, a very serious matter to us.

Mr. CASEY—It is not proposed to extend the Act to them.

Mr. TAIT—There would be about two-thirds of the cars handled equipped with these things spoken of and over one-third would not be equipped with them. The men would therefore find a diversity to which they are not accustomed. At present they know what they have to depend on, but if you make us follow this bill they will never know what they have to rely on in the way of steps, ladders and grab irons, as there will be so many American cars fitted only with the present devices.