

to apply to radial roads as well as to steam roads? In my constituency there are many dangerous level crossings which are run over at high speed by radial roads, and accidents have occurred there. I think the sum is entirely inadequate to cover the number of crossings demanding attention. What share of this proposed expenditure is to be applied in each section of the country? I believe there are from fifty to a hundred or perhaps more accidents caused by level crossings in a year. I have known five or six people having been killed and many injured in one accident in my district. This is a serious matter and we want to encourage the minister in every possible way in dealing with it.

Mr. REID: The only railways that come under this measure are those under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Would that cover radials?

Mr. REID: Only those that have a Dominion charter and are under the Board of Railway Commissioners. The manner in which the money is distributed is this: It does not matter from what part of Canada an application is made to the board to remove a dangerous crossing. If a complaint is made to the board by any individual or corporation or municipality, in regard to a dangerous crossing, the board investigates, makes a report, and, if it so decides, passes an order compelling the railway company to remove the dangerous crossing by constructing a subway or otherwise, and assessing the proportions that the railway, the municipality and the Dominion Government shall pay under this measure.

So far, the appropriation of \$200,000 has been a sufficient amount each year for the past ten years to cover any sums the Dominion Government has been called upon to pay, and that is the reason why I have continued that amount in this resolution. If in any year this amount should not prove sufficient, we would have to ask Parliament that the Act be amended increasing the amount.

Mr. NICKLE: I might suggest to the Minister of Railways and Canals—and I feel sure he will not consider it an impertinence, as he is not a lawyer—that he do not change the figures “09” in the last line of his resolution to “19,” because I think the resolution is correctly drawn. If the minister will refer to the statutes of 1909, section 7 of chapter 32, he will find that in that year the principle was intro-

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

duced in Canadian legislation of a certain amount, \$200,000, I think, for five years being set aside to be administered for the purpose of assisting municipalities and railways in getting rid of dangerous level crossings. At the same time that section 7 was passed enunciating that principle, section 6 was also passed which amended the Railway Act and declared the principle to be that any railroads constructed after 1909 should, at their own expense, take such steps as might be necessary to protect the public.

That this House may be more fully conversant with the legislation, let me read the two sections of the Act, which was assented to on May 19, 1909. Section 6 reads:

The said Act is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 238 thereof:—

238A. In any case where a railway is constructed after the passing of this Act, the company shall, at its own cost and expense (unless and except as otherwise provided by agreement, approved of by the Board, between the company and a municipal or other corporation or person), provide, subject to the order of the Board, all protection, safety and convenience for the public in respect of any crossing of highway by the railway.

Section 7 reads:

The said Act is further amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 239 thereof:—

239A. The sum of two hundred thousand dollars each year for five consecutive years from the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and nine, shall be appropriated and set apart from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of aiding in the providing by actual construction work of protection, safety and convenience for the public in respect of highway crossings of the railway at rail level, in existence on the said first day of April.

If the minister should yield to the suggestion of the hon. member who sits on my right that the word “nine” should be changed to “nineteen,” the effect of his resolution taken in conjunction with the legislation on the Statute Books might be that this country should assist in construction work, by way of subways or otherwise, in respect of all railway crossings in existence on the 1st day of April, 1919. Now that is not what this House wants to do at all, if I understand the purport of the minister’s resolution. I take it that what the minister is endeavouring to do is to place at the disposal of the Railway Commissioners a specific sum of money that may be used for bettering conditions in respect of railway crossings that existed on the 1st day of April, 1919, but not to relieve the railway companies from responsibility in respect of crossings constructed since that date. But if he were to adopt the suggestion made by the speaker on my