

want of repair, insufficient or erroneous construction, or from any other cause or whenever circumstances arise which in his opinion render it expedient, he may direct one or more engineers to examine and inspect the railway or any portion thereof or of the works connected therewith or the engines and other rolling stock in use thereon, or any portion thereof, and upon the report of the inspecting engineer may condemn the railway or any portion thereof or any of the rolling stock or appliances used thereon and with the approval of the Governor in Council may require any change or alteration therein or in any part thereof or the substitution of any new bridge, culvert, viaduct, or tunnel or of any material for the said railway, and thereupon the company to which such railway belongs or the company using, running or controlling the same shall after notice in writing proceed to make good or remedy defects in the said portions of the railway or in the locomotive, car or carriage which has been so condemned, or shall make such change, alteration or substitution as has been required by the Minister."

I take it that the Chairman riding upon a railway and finding the track not in good shape for the speed that is run at or for the amount of traffic it has to handle, or finding any defects in its cars or locomotives has the right to make a report to the Government Engineer and it will be his duty under that clause to send an expert to examine the road, on your complaint. In the event of the report made to the Minister that the report from you was true, the Minister could compel the railway company to reduce its speed and to make necessary repairs or stop running the road.

Mr. CASEY—That is your reading of the law as it stands?

Mr. MORFORD—Yes, I think clause 205 of the Railway Act covers section 8.

Mr. CASEY—Now, as that is all your original statement, I propose to ask the Committee to arrange in this way that I ask the witness a few questions from notes on his evidence, and that then we have a general questioning.

Mr. INGRAM—Would it not be better for us all to ask questions as they occur to us?

Mr. CASEY—I think it would be better if I, as promoter of the bill, were to ask him some questions in succession, and then every member will have the same right. Now, Mr. Tait told us in reference to an automatic device in the air brakes, that they had tested some of these devices and that he knew of one that was perfectly efficient, but his objection to it was in the loss of time. The drift of his statement was that the only device known of which would accomplish the purpose was Mr. Deyell's. Did you ever try it?

Mr. MORFORD—No, sir. Mr. Deyell brought his device to my office two or three years ago. I looked it over very carefully, but did not recommend it for just the reason Mr. Tait expresses there.

Mr. CASEY—Would that objection be material if the device were applied to passenger trains where there is no cutting out?

Mr. MORFORD—There is some cutting out on all passenger trains.

Mr. CASEY—Always?

Mr. MORFORD—On our road we always cut out when changing at St. Thomas, and at Windsor, for the boat, trains are always broken up.

*By Mr. Casey:*

Q. How much is the delay usually?—A. The delay in bleeding would take, I should judge, over one minute to release the cylinder, and it would no doubt cause a good deal of delay.

Q. Would it cause more delay than stopping at stations?—A. Well, we allow time for switching at St. Thomas on all passenger trains and freight trains, changing engines; yet some trains do not get in for 30 minutes or an hour on account of delays in switching elsewhere.

Q. Have you ever heard of any device to sound a whistle to notify the engineer when anything is wrong with the brakes?—A. I have heard of none. The whistle is operated by the conductor, but if trains break in two it does not sound automatically.

Q. Have you known of accidents from the failure of the air brakes to work?—A. Not to my knowledge.