

time-zones of provinces and territories without referring to their longitude, following in this respect the principle of the English Act. But under that Act the greatest difference between the statutory time and mean solar time would be twenty-four minutes, and in the time-zones as defined in Mr. Fleming's article, thirty minutes; while under Mr. Tupper's it would be more than two hours in Quebec and Ontario. This would, I think, be a very great inconvenience, though a difference of half an hour might, in England, be counterbalanced by certain advantages. The hour zone system has never been made legal in the United States, except in the District of Washington (ten miles square), and it appears that elsewhere the subject is one for the State legislatures. The advantage of zone time would seem to be limited to zones comprised in one country or tract under the same civil jurisdiction. Boundaries by meridians would be difficult to find and use, and the extent of Quebec and Ontario from east to west is over 30°, or two hours of time. When the question first arose, the opinion of the gentlemen of the Washington Observatory was that the best plan for America would be to have one *Railway Time* (that of 90° west) across the continent, leaving solar time for the ordinary purposes of civil life. I believe this would be the best for Canada, and that Mr. Tupper's bill (with a provision that its time clauses should apply only to contracts and agreements, oral or in writing, in which expressions of time are declared to mean and refer to *Railway Time*, but should in them be binding in law), would be unexceptionable; though it would perhaps be still better if one *Railway Time* were enacted for the whole Dominion; legal civil time for other purposes remaining, as heretofore, the mean solar time of each locality. The twenty-four hour day is very good; it is and has long been used in Italy and other countries.

Ottawa, Sept. 22, 1891.

W.