

7 GEORGE V, A. 1917

I agree as to the right of the Board, but perhaps the clause does not allow the Board enough power or discretion as to the cost.

Mr. MACLEAN: If Mr. Chrysler can suggest something that he thinks is fair, I won't object, but I want the general principle admitted in the Act.

Mr. NESBITT: I agree with Mr. Maclean but there is a possibility that this clause does not allow the Board enough leeway.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: But the municipality has to pay the extra expense. It does not cost them anything. They also have to pay the expense for the upkeep.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: If you take the wider view, if it is a foot path, it may cost nothing additional. If it is a carriage way, does the whole structure not require to be built with additional strength?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the municipality not pay the additional cost?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: If it is a carriageway they would have to build it stronger. Probably for a foot path it would require to be built stronger. Have the Board the right to make any order as to the cost?

Mr. MACDONELL: Only as to the additional cost.

Mr. NESBITT: Would that be part of the additional cost?

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: They might have to strengthen the bridge to carry the additional weight.

Mr. CARVELL: Suppose the railway company could show the Board there was not a sufficient factor of safety to admit of the new structure being applied to the old, the Board would not authorize the construction of the highway bridge.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If it were absolutely new, would they make the municipality pay the additional cost?

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: If they had to build the bridge stronger in order to carry it, the municipality would have to pay the extra cost.

Mr. MACLEAN: And Toronto has entered into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific, to double-track the bridges leading into Toronto, and the city clearly admits it would have to pay for the increased cost by strengthening the piers and the size of the steel and everything else, and that is provided for in this Bill.

Mr. NESBITT: That is the only thing I am contending for, and we have Mr. Johnston's view as to that.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: We will leave it to Mr. Johnston and Mr. Chrysler.

Mr. NESBITT: I am perfectly willing to do that. It is understood Mr. Johnston and Mr. Chrysler will look at subsection 6 and see if it provides for what we want in regard to the additional cost of strengthening the bridges.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: It should be wide enough to cover all the cases. In the case of the Victoria Bridge the committee will remember probably there was 60 feet of pier and 60 feet of abutments supporting it, to carry the railway. You add to that 30 feet more on each side to carry the highway. That means not merely 30 feet of structure on the level of the travelled roadway, but it means 30 feet more of abutment from the base up—30 feet more strength in the construction of the bridge.

Mr. NESBITT: That is all we want to get at. Was there any subsidy given to them?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, a very big subsidy.

The CHAIRMAN: You do not believe, with the section as it stands, that you are protected in regard to the foundations of the bridge.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: No, sir, not now, as this clause is drawn.