

board, who have jurisdiction to administer, there must be some additional protection, in our opinion, to take the place of the sounding of the whistle and the ringing of the bell.

That we are willing to do by having wigwags or gates installed at the crossings which we want to have protected. Then, Mr. Chase, who is the Dominion legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Montreal, said this:—

Have these crossings properly protected, and as far as we are concerned it will be fine and dandy. We will be happy to quit blowing the whistle.

Then Mr. McIvor asked him:—

Mr. McIVOR: Therefore the crews are not in favour of this amendment?

Mr. CHASE: We are not opposed to it if you make arrangements to have crossings properly protected. That is the first thing.

Mr. Ives and Mr. Phillips both said they had nothing further to add to what had been said before. Then, Mr. K. D. M. Spence, solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, said:—

The only difficulty we foresee is that cases farther and farther away from cities and towns will be put up to the Board of Transport Commissioners and there may be considerable confusion as to which community is entitled to it.

The CHAIRMAN: The difficulty would be to define the words: "metropolitan area", and what is "contiguous".

The WITNESS: Yes, and what is "near". That is really the essence of the difficulty that we foresee.

Then, further on, the same witness said:—

The WITNESS: I would say that if the words "or near" were struck out, we would have very little further objections.

Then, Mr. Macdougall, assistant solicitor of the Canadian National Railways, had this to say:—

I should also like to make it clear that the Canadian National Railways do not object to this amendment being made or to this bill being passed, but they do wish that the views of their operating officers as to the effect of such an amendment be put before you.

And he again said, the same witness:—

I think personally that that could be done to make it more satisfactory and to ensure that it is going to be used simply for the purpose for which it was originally conceived. That is the best policy that could be adopted.

Then, the minister said:—

Hon. Mr. CHEVRIER: If I were asked for an additional opinion, I would say that there certainly ought to be some limitation added to this bill in addition to that of removing the words "in or near". I think a reference to population should certainly go in there; because if you do not put in a limitation with reference to population, you are going to enable rural municipalities adjacent to cities all along the line to make applications.

That, in essence, was what you said to-day, Mr. Chevrier. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have endeavoured to meet the objections raised to this bill by the various witnesses and to meet the objections of some members of the