

strated the value of special organization in handling fire protection work, the adoption of similar measures by other railway companies may confidently be expected in the future.

While, on the whole, Canada undoubtedly has a strong lead over the United States, so far as efficient railway fire protection by the railways themselves is concerned, some of the American railway lines have voluntarily, from motives of economy, taken vigorous action in securing efficient fire protection by railway employees. As a result of serious fire losses, resulting in large damage claims, a special department was organized in 1912 by the Boston and Maine railroad, and stringent instructions to all officials and employees were put into effect. As a result, the department of fire claims of that railway reports that settlements of fire claims in 1912 aggregated about \$30,000, or nearly \$200,000 less than during the previous year. In 1913, which was a relatively bad fire year in that section, payments for fire claims totalled nearly \$70,000, or less than one-third the payments in 1911, before the appointment of the commissioner of fire claims. The aggregate for 1913 included \$10,318 for a fire not set by locomotives, but which got beyond the control of the railway employees when burning slash, etc., which was not cleared away after the lumber was cut on property adjoining the right-of-way. It also includes \$5,230 for claims originating prior to March 1, 1912, when the fire claims department was organized. These figures are highly suggestive of what fire loss means to the company, and demonstrate what may be accomplished through a systematic scheme of fire prevention.

Another example is the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé railway, which, in 1911 and 1912, undertook a special campaign for improvement in matters of fire protection. In 1910, the company had claims for 1,509 fire losses, aggregating \$100,605. In 1911, there were 574 fires, with claims amounting to \$51,000. In the fiscal year 1912, the number of fires had been reduced to 135, and the expenditure for payment of claims to only \$6,000.

General Order No. 107

Following the issuance of Order No. 16,570, under date of May 22, 1912, objections to certain provisions of the order were made by the Canadian Pacific, Canadian Northern, and Grand Trunk Pacific railways. They claimed that some of the provisions in question were impracticable and would impose an unreasonable burden of expense upon the companies; also, that certain others were beyond the jurisdiction of the Board, as conferred by the Railway Act.

The Board considered very carefully the various objections, and finally decided that, while some of the points were not well taken, some