

also, on their side, extend beyond the present limits of the towns (and consequently into the parishes in which they are situate) the streets belonging to the city, and which terminates at the boundary between the towns and the country? I consider this section so wise, so useful, that I should wish it to be well understood, that in default of such foresight on the part of the owner of lands and lots of land thus situated, the Magistrates might exact that plans of villages of the kind situated in the environs of the towns, should be submitted to them for their approval as soon as or even before such villages should become in any degree important, so as to correct any irregularities that may then exist; and to see that the streets be correctly laid out for the future, and that the reserves which the public utility or the embellishment of the place require, shall be made, and the owners of the lands compelled to observe these regulations in their concessions. I would most ardently beseech the committee to consider attentively this last suggestion, and to enquire whether it might not recommend, that the Magistrates of Montreal be authorized to cause, without further delay, plans to be made, in the manner above described, of the three villages in question, and this at the expense of the city.

29. The *Grand Voyers* of the districts, and their deputies, have no jurisdiction over the *parishes* of Quebec and Montreal. (See the 38th section of the Act of 1796, and the 4th section of that of 1799.) It is in the hands of the Justices of the Peace that is vested the power of regulating the highways and bridges in these parishes; but in cases where it is necessary to open, alter, straighten, extend, or take away such roads, to make water courses, to build bridges, &c., in a word, to perform any of the functions of the Grand Voyer in the parishes under his jurisdiction, how are the Justices of the Peace to proceed? It is extremely necessary to obtain a clear and