

experienced in carrying on street works without interrupting it.

The Directors believe that any inconvenience to the making of street repairs, arising from the railway tracks, will be outweighed by the greater public convenience of the railway, and they assume that this was the view of the Legislature and of the Corporation of Ottawa, when the charter was granted.

The Directors are gratified to find the Corporation has not insisted upon the maintenance of the streets between and outside the tracks as urged at Toronto, and they take this opportunity of assuring the Corporation and the citizens that if they could depend upon earning more than the amount necessary to pay working expenses, they would not object to become liable for items assumed by Street Railway Companies in larger cities. But they feel it would be deceptive on their part to promise what they may be unable to perform, and they are sure the good sense of the people will acknowledge that obligations to bear certain burdens are of no value without there is adequate responsibility. It is in this view that the Company is unwilling to assume burdens it is incapable of sustaining, and they wish to meet the second proposition fairly. If the Corporation seek the right to interrupt the traffic of the street railway at will, without compensation, the Directors are convinced that this would be ruinous to the Company, and destructive to the usefulness of the railway. If this right be not sought, the Directors are unable to see any necessity for the proposition. In any case it is a mere money question of trifling importance to the Corporation, as compared with the Company, and the question is merely which is most able, and which, under all the circumstances, ought to bear the cost, if any.

With respect to the third proposition, that no track be laid across Sappers' Bridge while in its present state, the Directors feel that this amounts to an indefinite postponement of the railway without cause, and without compensation for the loss the Company may thereby sustain. The rails themselves will not obstruct the traffic any more upon this bridge than elsewhere, and as to a passing car, the track being laid on one side would leave the other free, with far less risk in meeting the car (which is confined to its position) than in meeting any other vehicle. In connection with this matter, the Directors assume that the parapets of this bridge will be removed, as they form an obstruction each greater than the combined width of both, for if removed there would be a solid roadway ample for three vehicles abreast.

The Directors have purposely reserved the first proposition until the last, because it is not only the most important to both parties, but they feel it is the only one point of necessary difference.

The Directors can only account for this unexpected opposition to the provisions of a charter obtained here less than two years ago, without opposition by either the Corporation or any of the citizens, on the assumption that the project was so hopeless a one that there was no prospect of its being realized; and that with reference to the double track provision it was supposed that a single track would probably be more than could be accomplished. Experience has established that a double track, while accommodating the public far better, can be worked at much less cost, and will earn much more money than a single one with its necessary turnouts or switches. The Directors have, therefore, come to the conclusion that it was