the income of the Union has risen from $3,000.00 in 1904 to $5,440.00 in 1911, and over $5,800.00 in 1912.

Unfortunately, it is only the expenses that have increased for the Journal, so far as the Union is concerned. The costs of printing and office have advanced; the number of copies sent out is larger; but the amount of the subsidy is just the same as it was in 1905.

And while the Journal carries good advertising, it should be understood that much advertising is withheld because the Journal voices the views of the Union for Municipal liberty.

The work of fighting for public rights is intensely interesting, or the speaker would have dropped it long ago.

It is difficult to have spoken in this way, when so much kindness and appreciation are offered to the Journal; but sometimes the only way to bring a matter forward, is to talk about it, and this must justify this part of the Report.

Again we have to plead for increased advertising support from the Municipalities, in the way of tenders for work or debentures; and once more let us assure every Municipality that we welcome news from them.

Let me again repeat how very grateful and encouraging are the kind of works of our many friends, and how much they aid in keeping up the courage necessary for the work.

Upon motion duly seconded and carried, this was received and adopted.

Then followed the Report of Mr. Fred. Cook,

Ottawa Representative

As usual, notices of all applications to Parliament were sent by the Assistant Secretary Treasurer to all cities and towns likely to be affected by, or interested in, the proposed legislation. There were not many requests for the special aid of the Union's representatives, evidencing that the watchful methods of the past few years at Ottawa are appreciated by the membership of the Union.

During the session of Parliament which closed on the 5th June, 151 private bills became law. Of this number 12 were for the incorporation of Railway Companies; 41 were amendments to existing Railway Charters; 32 were for the incorporation of miscellaneous companies; 22 amendments to existing private Acts (not railways); 8 extensions of letters patent, and 36 divorces.

The remarkable educative influence of the Union upon Parliament is shown by the prompt way in which clauses for the protection of municipalities are inserted in Bills under consideration by the Railway Committee of the Commons. There are three clauses which, through the instrumentality of the Union, were first incorporated in Railway Charters a few years ago, and are now called "The standard clauses for the protection of municipalities."

One clause provides that, in the event of any railway or power company securing the right to acquire or produce electric or other power or energy and to sell it to municipalities, the rates or charges shall be fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

The second clause requires that the consent of municipalities shall be secured for the erection of poles, etc., for the transmission of electric light or power.

The third clause imposes upon a railway company, the obligation of securing the consent of a municipality to run its line along any street or highway of such municipality.

At the recent session of Parliament, not only with regard to new Acts of Incorporation of railway companies, but with respect to companies chartered years ago and seeking extensions of time or increased powers, these protective clauses have been made to apply in all to 19 companies, as follows:

Bill No. 38.—The Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.
Bill No. 39.—The Algoma Eastern Ry. Co.
Bill No.40.—The British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.
Bill No. 41.—The Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.
Bill No. 42.—The Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.
Bill No. 43.—The Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.
Bill No. 44.—The Manitoba and North Western Ry. Co.
Bill No. 49.—The Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.
Bill No. 54.—The Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.
Bill No. 70.—The Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.—(Name changed to the Toronto and Northern Western Ry. Co.)
Bill No. 79.—The Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.
Bill No. 83.—The Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.
Bill No. 93.—To incorporate the Quebec Rapid Transit Ry. Co.
Bill No. 96.—The Canadian Northern Ry. Co.
Bill No. 99.—The Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.
Bill No. 105.—The Canadian Northern Ontario Ry.
Bill No. 110.—The Canadian Pacific Ry.
Bill No. 135.—To incorporate the Nipissing Central Ry. Co.
Bill No. 159.—The Brantford and Hamilton Ry. Co.

It requires no special effort now on the part of the Union to secure the inclusion of these clauses. Mr. E. A. Lancaster, M.P., Chairman of the Railway Committee of the House of Commons, and always a warm upholder of municipal rights, simply makes the suggestion to the Committee in every case, and the clauses are inserted.

Bill No. 80 to incorporate the Huron Lake Shore Railway Company was rejected at the instance of Mr. R. G. Code, K.C., representing the Ontario Government. The Company asked authority to build a railway from Sarnia to Meaford, through the counties of Lambton, Huron, Bruce and Grey. The extraordinary powers sought by the promoters were responsible for the defeat of the measure. The Company, among other things, asked permission to generate and sell electric or other power or energy. This provision, it was thought, might interfere with the work of the Hydro-Electric Commission in Ontario, and was instrumental in defeating the Bill.

It was expected that the bill to revise and consolidate the Railway Act of the Dominion would be before Parliament at the last session. The work of revising the Act has been entrusted to Mr. Samuel Price, K.C., of St. Thomas, and Mr. Price was engaged upon the work for several months. Following up the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Union, the Honorary Secretary, Mr. Lighthall, had several conferences with Mr. Price, and submitted to him suggestions for the further protection of municipal rights. Mr. Price had completed the draft Bill before the prorogation of Parliament, but by reason of the length of the session, it was deemed advisable to postpone the consideration of the measure until next session. It is expected that the Bill will be brought down early, and after it has received its second reading will be referred to the Railway Committee. An opportunity will then be afforded