

wrong. It is all right where co-operation is entered into between the municipality and the railway, as it has been in the case mentioned, or where bonuses have been given. The Alexandra Bridge was bonused to a large amount of money by the City of Ottawa upon condition that a highway bridge was provided and accommodation for foot passengers. The provision of this Bill says that not co-operation, not joint cost in any proportion, simply the additional cost shall be paid. That is to say, you take a railway bridge anywhere, constructed for railway purposes only, and the municipality may come along and construct a footpath along each side of it, paying only the additional cost of the footpath, and thus making use of the structure which the railway has provided, without providing any contribution to its cost at all.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Board can order what compensation is reasonable and proper.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: The Board can order a municipality to pay the additional cost of constructing, maintaining and renewing a footpath or a roadway. But that leaves out the whole structure which the railway company has built without providing any contribution to the original cost. That is only an objection to the form of the Bill, the section should be amended. The objection we make is that, knowing the size of the population who are to use it and the conditions surrounding it, we say our railway bridge should not be used as part of the public highway; without our consent, it is a source of danger and trouble to the people operating that railway to have particularly foot passengers, and in a minor degree, the use by teams and vehicles. There is the difficulty about safeguarding it. The railway is not built at a point where a highway crossed the river, yet you concentrate traffic from perhaps a considerable district and bring it just to the place where they are moving trains.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: If there was no road there, they would have to arrange for a road.

Mr. CARVELL: Would there not be more danger to the traffic than to the railway?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: The railway would be responsible in the end, they would have to pay damages.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: Not when the Parliament of Canada insist on it.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: According to my recollection of the bridge which crosses the river at Winnipeg, which was partly a public highway and partly a railroad bridge, the road crosses on each side on the outside of the tracks, and traffic on the highway, has to find its way away from the railway in each direction. There is always the danger of part of the railway being used near the terminus of the bridge for a cross-over by people who are on the wrong side, which concentrates traffic crossing the tracks, which brings it to the place near the tracks, and unless great skill is used—as there was, I admit, in the construction of the Alexandra Bridge so that the traffic does not encounter the steam railway except at one point as members of the Committee will remember, there is a certain amount of foot passenger traffic which crosses from the west side of that bridge at the level to get to the east side at this end of the bridge.

The CHAIRMAN: Just here a moment, Mr. Chrysler, if you will read the last three lines you will see that this all comes under the control of the Board, and the Board may impose any terms or conditions as to the use of such passageway or otherwise which are deemed proper.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: It won't protect us, Mr. Chairman. In the second place, I submit there is no reason why the municipality or the people who make use of it should have the use of our bridge as a structure to hang a public highway on without contributing in part at least to the cost of that bridge. The principle is wrong.

Mr. MACLEAN: The public has subsidized these railways—

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: They have and they have not.

Mr. SCOTT, K.C.: I want to add this to what Mr. Chrysler has said, I have not the figures here, but taking the number of people killed on railways during one year—I