

pany gave notice of an application for a charter to bridge the Ottawa between Metcalfe square and ferry landing, St. Patrick street, and to build a railway up the canal. The following is their notice:—

“NOTICE is hereby given that application will be made at the next Session of the Parliament of Canada for an Act to incorporate a company for the purpose of constructing, maintaining and operating a bridge across the Ottawa river, from some point in the city of Ottawa, between Metcalfe square and the ferry landing at the foot of St. Patrick street, to some point in the city of Hull, for railway, carriage, foot and passenger traffic purposes; with power to amalgamate with or enter into arrangements with a railway company or companies, or any corporation for the use of the bridge.”

“A. FERGUSON,

“Solicitor for the Applicants.

“Dated 27th November, 1889.”

On the 20th of December the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company deposited plans at the Railway Department of a bridge across the Ottawa, and a railway up the canal, to which they received the following reply:—

“OTTAWA, 10th April, 1880.

“SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 10th instant, I am instructed to say that the plans of the bridge over the Ottawa river to be built by the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway were received in the Department on the 20th of December last.

“I am, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“A. P. BRADLEY,

“Secretary.

“A. FERGUSON, Esq.,

“Barrister, &c. Ottawa.”

On this, the Chief Engineer of Railways reports that the company has no authority to build any railway on the Ottawa side from the bridge. On the 14th of December, 1889, the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Co. gave notice that they would apply for an Act to extend the time for bridging and completing their railway for general traffic purposes, as follows:—

“The Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company hereby give notice that application will be made at the next Session of Parliament of Canada for—

“1. To extend the time for bridging the Ottawa river and for completing the said railway to Pembroke.

“2. To amend the Acts of the said company in relation to an issue of bonds by the said company, and to further declare and define the powers of the company as respects the same; and to divide the right of issue over different sections of the railway; and to reduce the amount of any issue over any section of the railway; and further to obtain authority to make a special issue of bonds on the bridge and its approaches over the Ottawa river, near the city of Ottawa; and further to enable the company to so construct its bridge over the Ottawa river between Hull and Ottawa as to make it available for ordinary traffic also, and for other purposes.

“H. LASSEY MALTBY,

“Secretary.”

It will be seen that no notice was given for power to build a railway up the canal. The Interprovincial Bridge Company's application was regular and went through the proper forms. The Pontiac Pacific Railway Company asked for certain amendments in the Interprovincial Company's Bill, and these were agreed to and put in, and the railway company asked that five or six names be put on the board of provisional directors. When the original Bill was introduced the incorporators were Mr. Booth, Mr. Magee, Mr. Chabot and myself—that is, the original application that was made for the purpose of obtaining a charter for the Interprovincial Bridge Co. At that time a conference of the different parties interested was held, and it was considered to the advantage of all parties that the various railway companies should be interested in the scheme and become incorporators with the Interprovincial Bridge Co. That was done, and at that time there were five names representing the Canada Atlantic Railway Co., seven names representing the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company; three representing the Vaudreuil and Ottawa Railway Co., two representing the Morrisburg and New York; seven from the city of Ottawa, and three from the city of Hull. This gave the railways companies a total representation, on that board, of seventeen, as against ten of other parties interested. At that time the originators and promoters of the bridge company imagined that all the difficulties were arranged; there was a perfect understanding that the bridge should be built as an independent work, and it should be used in common by all railways, present and future, and this arrangement should be conclusive. But by some influence or other another shuffle of the cards took place, and after this Bill was before the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons that committee reported:

“The committee have also examined the notices given on the petition of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company for certain amendments to the Acts affecting the company, and find them sufficient for all the objects mentioned in the petition, except for the purpose of extending their line of railway to the Canal Basin, in the city of Ottawa, which was not mentioned in the notice.”

In our own committee the petition of the railway company was considered, and was reported on to the Senate as follows:—

“Your committee also examined the petition of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway Company, pray-