

'And no such money shall in any one year be applied to more than three crossings in any one municipality or more than once to any one crossing,' are changed to read,

'And no such money shall in any one year be applied to more than six crossings on any one railway in any one municipality or more than once in any one year to any one crossing.'

It will be seen that under the existing arrangement the total maximum amount that a municipality could receive from this fund in any one year would be \$15,000.

Under the new Bill, a municipality could receive as much as \$90,000 in connection with each of the railways within its limits, provided of course that the fund did not become exhausted. The new wording 'more than once in any one year to any one crossing' may possibly contain an error.

*Section 264.*

This section is the same as before, and I would recommend that an effort be made to add an amendment to the effect that in cities and towns the minimum width of the highway at any overhead crossing of any railway to be constructed hereafter shall not be narrowed to less than the existing width of the street. The minimum width of 20 feet provided for in the Railway Act may be satisfactory in many locations in the country, but should never in any circumstances be permitted within the limits of a city.

*Section 268.*—Subsection 1, which is the same as before, reads as follows:—

'The inclination of the ascent or descent, as the case may be, of any approach by which any highway is carried over or under any railway, or across it at rail level, shall not, unless the Board otherwise directs, be greater than one foot of rise or fall for every twenty feet of the horizontal length of such approach.'

*Remarks.*—I would recommend that, if possible, a new subsection should be added to the effect that in towns and cities, in the case of every railway to be constructed hereafter, the grade of any approach by which a street is to be carried over or under the railway or across it at rail level, shall be specially determined and approved by the Board, without regard to the maximum grade stipulated in subsection 1, and that the whole cost of altering the grade of the street including alterations to pavements, sidewalks and other works shall be borne by the company.

The reason for recommending the above amendment is that, under this section as it is at present, the company submits its plan for a street crossing and almost always adopts a one-in-twenty grade. This plan is usually approved by the Board as a matter of course, but the grade of 1-in-20 turns out later to be unsatisfactory and the city when changing the grade of its street to a less steep inclination is unjustly compelled to bear an expense which would not have arisen if the railway had not entered.

It is hoped that the above remarks will not be taken as inferring that the Board has in the past dealt unjustly with municipalities in this respect. It is merely an explanation of what usually occurs, largely because the representatives of both the railways and the municipalities have in the past considered that the maximum amount of grading for which the company is responsible in the quantity resulting from a 1-in-20 grade.

*Sections 367 to 378.*—Dealing with telegraph, telephone, electric power and other wire lines belonging to companies within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada, contain a considerable number of new clauses. So far as I can see these sections contain nothing objectionable, and it only remains