

Mr. HUDSON—Do the men get back there what they put in? What the company put in is proportionately trifling.

Mr. CASEY—About one-sixteenth of the total receipts appear to have come from the company.

Mr. ELLIS—Mr. Ingram put this question to Mr. Wainwright: "The officers are elected by the men?"

Mr. WAINWRIGHT—Yes; the chief officers represent the company *ex officio*, but the rest are elected by the men.

"Mr. INGRAM—There is no fraud in the election?"

"Mr. WAINWRIGHT—None at all, they elect the officers themselves. At last meeting one gentleman got up and made the statement, that it had been thought a few years ago, that the society would not succeed because they thought it would be run from headquarters and by the officials of the company, and they were delighted to express themselves that the men had everything to say in its management." This of course is Mr. Wainwright's statement.

Mr. HUDSON—I do not think this is an argument that would affect the question.

Mr. CASEY—I will give you the contributions of the men and the company from 1st January, 1885, when the society was organized, to 31st December, 1896. The members contributed in that time \$1,512,593 and the company contributed \$150,868.

Mr. HUDSON—Quite different; and so far as the men attending the meeting are concerned, if you ask Mr. Wainwright for the names and occupations of the men who attended the last annual meeting you will be surprised at the smallness of the number of employees who were there. I do not wish to state how many there were.

Mr. CASEY—That is what we want to ask you.

Mr. HUDSON—I cannot give it to you exactly, but I can get it for you.

Mr. CASEY—Mr. Wainwright proposes that, in case this bill should pass, railways like the Grand Trunk which contribute to a fund of this kind should be exempted from its provisions. Do you consider that such a contribution as the Grand Trunk make in this case ought to put them outside the limits of this bill?

Mr. HUDSON—No, sir; the men are willing that this whole thing should be dropped.

Mr. CASEY—You are aware of the feeling of the Grand Trunk men?

Mr. HUDSON—Yes.

Mr. CASEY—Now, in regard to the amount of the compensation payable, I find it is put here at 60 per cent of the current rate of wages during the time a man is laid off, and \$3,000 for death or permanent disability. Would you discuss these amounts?

Mr. HUDSON—We fixed that amount for disability; we put it at what a man would earn. An engineer earns so much, and a brakeman so much, and in case of injury he would have 60 per cent of what a man similarly employed would get. In case of death, we consider a brakeman's life just as valuable as that of an engineer, and we fix the amount at \$3,000. This, we consider, is as little as can be asked.

Mr. CASEY—How does that compare with the benefits of the insurance companies?

Mr. HUDSON—It is about on a line with the different organizations. We have no sick benefit, but we take accident assurance in the different companies to cover sick benefit.

Mr. CASEY—What do you get in these?

Mr. HUDSON—If we take \$1,000, we have \$5 a week; if we take \$2,000, we have \$10 a week.

Mr. CASEY—Clause 8 of the bill provides that every company shall have a sufficient number of operators, trainmen, section men, etc., to safely carry on its business. Mr. Wainwright and Mr. Tait say that this clause would simply put them in the hands of strikers; that in the case of a strike, or anything of that kind, they might be able to run their trains; they would not be able to keep up their full number of men, but they would be able to run the road. Under these circumstances they would be running it illegally, and subjecting themselves to the penalties of the law. Is that the intention of the clause?

Mr. HUDSON—No; it is not the intention of the clause at all. The intention of the clause is to provide that there shall be a proper number of section men—not two