

CNOR Beachburg sub

Files seen:

CTA file 9188.146

CTA file 3878.344

File 6713.50 Interchange with CPR at Pembroke

RG 46 vol. 1428 file 20309.2 Station at Malwood

RG 46 vol. 1428 File 20309 Location of station at in South March

Merrilees Collection, National Archives, 84503/19 D 330, F2 Container 2000002705

CNR Blueprints showing lines abandoned.

National Archives RG 46 Accession Number 92-93/066 Box 20 file 26895.130 Fencing on Beachburg sub.

RG 46 vol. 1497 file 26281 Norway Bay

RG 46 vol. 1400 file 4205.2712 Pembroke station

RG 30 vol. 9371 file T/1046-65-151 Revised location at Clemow Lake.

RG 30 vol. 8371 file T/1046-65-152 Revised location at Grand Lake m. 126.37 to 129.94

RG 30 vol. 9371 file 1046-65-154 Diversion Pembroke Divisional yard mile 85.13 to 86.85.

RG 30 vol. 9334 file 1046-65-25 Connection with CPR at Pembroke

RG 30 vol. 9343 file 1046-61-145 Bridge middle crossing of Petawawa River.

RG 30 vol. 9343 file 1046-61-147 Bridge east crossing of Petawawa River.

RG 30 vol. 9306 file 1046-26-308 Complaint of W.R. Kirk, Foresters Falls

RG 30 vol. 9303 file 1046-26-185 Complaint by W. Kirk facilities at Foresters Falls

RG 30 vol. 9303 file 1046-26-195 Service on the Pembroke Branch

RG 30 vol. 9374 file 1046-67-41 Pembroke Industrial Spur

RG 30 vol. 9374 file 1046-67-45 Land for Ballast Pit spur.

RG 30 vol. 9335 file 1046-60-31 Transfer facilities at Ottawa (Chaudiere)

RG 30 vol. 9335 file 1046-60-42 Connection between Toronto-Ottawa and Ottawa-Montreal lines.

RG 30 vol. 9335 file 1046-60-38 Application for connection track with GTR in Ottawa.

RG 12 vol. 3710 file 4606-85-71 Bridge over the Rideau River at Hogs Back.

RG 43 vol. 623 file 19892 Pembroke Iron Works connection. See research notes under Locksley sub.

RG 30 vol. 9346 file 1046-62-18 Crossing of CPR near Bell's Corners

RG 30 vol. 9348 file 1046-62-46 Crossing of CPR at Pembroke.

RG 30 vol. 9281 file 1046-14-24 Opening for traffic Rideau Junction to Pembroke.

RG 46 vol. 1490 file 3561.120 Bridge across the Ottawa River at Fitzroy Harbour.

RG 46 vol. 1430 file 20394 station at South March

See also RG 43 vol. 531 file 16626 Subsidies on Toronto Ottawa line which is located on the research notes for Smiths Falls sub.

CTA file 9188.146

Mileage statement (partial) from junction with Montreal Tunnel and Terminal Railway.

by Mr. J.L. Mallory

Through	Constn	Locn	Stations
48.93			Hawkesbury Depot
53.27			L'Orignal station
58.25			Evanturel or Longeuil station
62.43			Laframbise or Alfred station
69.06			Treadwell station
75.13			Wendover station
85.43			Rockland station
91.13			Cumberland station
96.93			Orleans station
105.63	250.47	250.47	Ottawa junction C.N.O. Rly (constn and locn mileage is from Don Junction)
111.16	5.53	5.53	Commencement div A (Ottawa district and junction, div F Toronto - Ottawa)
111.63	6.04	6.04	Rideau junction east switch
118.16	12.05	12.05	C.N.R. over C.P.R.
120.24	14.22	14.22	C.N.R. over G.T.R.
123.14	16.94	16.94	South March station
133.24	27.15	27.15	Torbolton station
138.56	32.37	32.37	Carp River
139.12	33.22		Fitzroy Harbour station
139.65	33.54	33.54	Mississippi River
143.41	37.20	37.20	Ottawa River Bridge
151.66	46.00	46.00	End of div A commencement of div B Ottawa district
153.34	47.56	47.30	Bristol station
159.88	53.72	51.75	Clarenden station
164.84	59.00	58.90	Portage du Fort station
165.74	59.90	58.90	Ottawa River
171.78	65.94	66.20	Foresters Falls station
178.26	72.42	72.40	Beachburg station
182.76	76.92	77.40	Westmeath station
188.33	82.50	82.45	C.N.R. over C.P.R.
192.81		86.95	Muskrat River & C.N.R. over G.T.R.
192.66	87.00	87.00	end of Div B Ottawa Pembroke and commencement of Div F Pembroke Capreol
193.23		87.36	Pembroke junction
194.10		88.16	Pembroke station (on spur)
194.07		88.20	Indian River
197.60	91.50	209.00	Hiam station

201.95	96.90	214.05 Alice station
204.10	101.00 2	18.30 North Branch Indian River
207.05	106.40	223.60 Indian River
212.45	108.50	225.08 Indian River
217.05	111.20	111.05 Master station
221.55	115.50	116.85 Divide station
224.25	118.20	119.35 Lac Rouge Creek
226.02	120.10	121.05 Kathmore station
227.92	121.90	123.90 South Petawawa
227.66	122.00	end of div F North Bay district commencement div
E North Bay district (mileage correct)		
232.92		128.00 Grand Lake station
233.22		128.40 Diversion of Grand Lake
234.32		128.45 Crossing Grand Lake
240.32		135.25 Clemow station
242.52		136.03 Little Meadowska station
248.02		141.80 Lac a Traverse
248.52		143.80 Petawawa River
253.02		148.00 La Veille station
253.62		148.85 Lake Francis
258.02		153.05 Vaughan station
262.66	157.00	end of div E comm div D
266.25	162.36	160.50 Cedar Lake station
270.35	166.45	166.00 Hawkesbury depot
273.65	169.90	169.90 National Park station
274.85	172.08	173.05 Gauchon Creek
281.75	178.00	176.85 The Narrows Gauchon Lake
287.65	183.94	182.55 Mink Lake siding
289.25	185.48	184.35 Mink Creek
290.35	186.60	185.45 Kiosh Koqui Lake
293.30	190.00	end of div D comm div C
294.15	191.38	189.25 Wolf Creek
300.35	197.60	195.60 Boulter station
307.01	204.54	320.55 Wistiwasing Creek
307.35	204.94	320.95 Wasing station
312.12	209.53	325.55 Graham Creek
312.70	210.05	326.00 Chisholm station
317.19	214.60	330.80 Wistiwasing River
318.65	216.08	332.00 Nosbonsing station
320.39	217.82	333.88 Nosbonsing and Nipissing River
322.50	219.95	335.70 Callender station
326.73	224.10	340.22 Lavasse River & CNR over CPR
327.36	225.30	end div C comm div B North Bay district
329.15	226.60	343.85 spur to T. & N. O. Rly
331.24	229.00	345.80 North Bay station.

CTA file 3878.344
(also contains material from file 3876.344 subway in lot 29 Rideau Front
Highway 16 at Federal)

Bridge was constructed by Dominion Bridge from their drawing P-1-4553 of 19 Sep 1911. 53 foot open deck girder bridge.

Interchange with CPR at Pembroke
File 6713.50
November 18, 1924

The town of Pembroke wanted an interchange at Pembroke because it was expensive when a shipment for delivery from CN had to be teamed. Neither railway felt there was a problem. CPR opposed this because they served all industries except one and an interchange would give CN more of an advantage. CN subsequently, on July 18, 1924, submitted a blue-print showing a proposed industrial spur and interchange connection, 1.38 miles in length leaving the Beachburg sub at mile 88.6. CN were prepared to pay for this. CP opposed as this would entail CN making a switching move on their main line. CN clarified they would build and pay for an interchange track. It was ordered that the CPR sput to Steel Equipment Co would be lengthened 1300 feet by moving the main line switch to the west and connecting the transfer track to this spur at a point 800 feet east of the main line connection thus providing a switching lead for CPR.

Station at Malwood
RG 46 vol. 1428 file 20309.2

Malwood – mile 22.3 Beachburg sub.

Company are using Dunrobin as a flag station, Woodlawn and Malwood are the two authorized stations. Mr. Scissons is preped to be caretaker, he lives a few rods from the station. Local people want a caretaker because shipments of stock (1-2 cars per week) and milk. For six months ending 31 Dec 1917 nothing was received, 8420 tons forwarded which produced revenue of \$955. Passenger receipts were \$59.50. CNOR felt that the business did not justify a caretaker. Inspector investigated and found that business was slight and that the train service did not encourage business development (tri-weekly mixed train) and concluded that a caretaker was not justified. Comment that every effort was being made to conserve the resources of the railway to move munitions and food supplies.

Letter from CNR 23 Dec 1963. We have a shelter of frame construction and post foundation on lot 22, conc. 3 March twp. No longer required, no passenger train stops nor is there any express or lcl. There is a 74 car siding. CNR intends to retire the station. There was no objection from the Reeve of the twp. On 17 Jan 1964 Board wrote to CNR – saw no objection to retiring station.

RG 46 vol. 1428 File 20309
Location of station at in South March

Two stations in the County of Carleton were fixed upon, Torbolton and South March, between 10 and 11 miles apart, the former to accommodate the village of Woodlawn and the latter the village of South march. Between these two villages is the village of Dunrobin, about 4.5 miles from Torbolton and $6\frac{3}{4}$ miles from South March. CNOR decided to put a station between Torbollton and South March and people expected that this would be as near to the village of Dunrobin as possible, say at the town line about $\frac{1}{3}$ mile from Dunrobin. Under some influence, alleged to be that of certain members of the Municipal council, the railway selected a site about $4\frac{3}{4}$ miles from South march at a point where the councillor or councillors hoped to have a new village and summer resort.

The Board, having been notified by the Clerk of the council, (this was received after the order was issued) that it was in favour of a site about 2 miles to the east of Dunrobin and $4\frac{3}{4}$ miles from South March, issued an order approving the location.

CNOR applied 30 Jul 1912 for approval of station grounds in March twp. At m. 22 from Ottawa. The twp. council approved the location. Order 17342 was issued 27 Aug 1912 approving the location as shown in the plan in lot 22.

Protest from a number of local residents to move site to lot 27 on the boundary line between March and Torbolton twps. Something less than 2 miles to the west of the site which has been selected because this would be more accessible. Ask that a hearing be held and that CNOR be prohibited from doing anything further on the work on the selected site.

Hearing was held on Tuesday 16 Sep 1913 in the Central Station building. There were petitions from both sides. The complaint was dismissed because the railway had gone ahead in good faith – one site was as good as the other. No order was necessary.

On 19 Sep 1913 there was a request for a rehearing on the grounds that March twp. Never passed a resolution approving of the proposed location and although the Clerk wrote to the Board saying that the council had approved the location he now admits that this was an error. The work said to have been done by CNOR was not as far advanced as stated and there was no overflowing well on the property as suggested. It was pointed out that the best country starts at a point just west of Armitage, m. 22 while the poor country is east of there – it was suggested that it would be better to have the shorter distance between stations in the good country rather than the poor country and at the same time to accommodate the three villages.

There was an affidavit, sworn on 20 Sep 1913, from Godfrey Armitage who was Reeve during 1912 also Henry Read, David Scharf, Councillors and Thomas Richardson, Clerk indicating that the the Council Meeting of 25 Aug 1912 approved the location of the

station grounds – there was a clerical error in that the Minute Book makes reference only to the “crossing” and should have referred to “plans of the Station Grounds and Crossing”.

Order 20332 was issued on 18 Sep 1913 which dismissed the complaint.

On 20 May 1914 an Inspector visited the area and was told by farmers that the railway intended to put the station at Dunrobin regardless of the order of the Board. The railway intended to put in a siding and water tank at Dunrobin. The inspectors visit was prompted by Mr. Armitage who said that the station was not going to be put where the order said it should be.

28 May 1914 letter from CNOR saying that water was better for boiler purposes at m. 23.6 than at m. 22 (they had had samples analyzed by University of Toronto and that a majority of people were in favour of m. 23.6. The company was in the process of preparing plans and a new application for approval of this site.

Hearing was held on Friday 17 Jul 1914. Application was for a station and water tank on north side just to the east of the town line road between Torbolton and March twps. on lot 27. Judgement was reserved and the area was visited by Mr George Spencer, Chief Operating Officer on 24 Jul 1914.

At m. 22 there is no settlement other than a couple of farms and the country adjacent to approaching from South March is poor, rocky and used principally as grazing land. The site is located on a good road and is easily approached and view is good. Good location from an operating point of view.

The site at m. 23.5 (1500' – 1600 feet from main road) has good access but would need to have some work to eliminate spring flooding. At the corner of the two roads is Dunrobin which consists of one store with Post Office, one blacksmith shop, two churches, an Orange hall and 7 or 8 dwelling houses. Country surrounding is good farming country, well settled – a prosperous agricultural community.

The station to go in at South March will serve the village of March Corners, also the Rifle Range. March Corners has a Post Office, the next one is Dunrobin.

The business of the Cheese factory is declining as dairy products are moving more to the city and increased production of calves for market. This will affect the cheese factory at Dunrobin and has already put out of business the factory at March Corners.

There is a long passing track already laid in at m. 22 and if a change is made it will mean a considerable loss to the company. It would be easier to get water from m. 23.5 than m. 22.

The inspector concluded that the greatest consideration in favour of m. 22 is the equal distribution of distance between stations; that at m. 23.5 would best serve the people and community.

On 14 Aug 1914 order 22399 was issued refusing the application for a station at m. 23.6.

30 Sep 1920 request from Dunrobin Women's Institute to engage a caretaker at Dunrobin for the winter months when there isn't even a fire. CNR agreed to have the section foreman keep the station clean and tidy but points out that there is very little business from this point and they have three stations within 5.3 miles (Malwood, Dunrobin and Woodlawn) and it is questionable whether it will be necessary to apply to have the station at Dunrobin closed. This was investigated by an Inspector who found that the revenue for 6 months was \$620 and it was hardly fair to ask the CNR to employ a caretaker at a cost of possibly \$25 per month – reasonable to have the section gang do the work.

Letter from CNR 1 May 1959. We have a frame combination general waiting room and freight shed 32' x 16' 5" requiring extensive repairs at Dunrobin which is located at m. 24.07 Beachburg sub. Flag stop for mixed train in each direction daily. Nearest open stations are Fitzroy (9.5 m west) and Ottawa 24.07 east. Intention to retire and dismantle the station. There was no objection from March twp. Board advised CNR on 2 Jun 1959 that it had no objection.

Merrilees Collection, National Archives, 84503/19 D 330, F2 Container 2000002705
CNR Blueprints showing lines abandoned. Shows 1931 diversion – m. 37.32 became m. 37.36.

National Archives RG 46 Accession Number 92-93/066 Box 20 file 26895.130
Fencing on Beachburg sub.

15 Nov 1962 Letter from Robert D. Sully to Campeau Corporation copy to Minister of Transport.

Complains about the lack of fencing at Riverside Park West. Interference with drainage creates a hazard to children.

Location is south of Brookfield Road. Seven strand wire fence was erected - shown on CNR plan.

17 Apr 1963 letter from Sully to BTC

With the proposal to construct a pedestrian underpass perhaps CN will be able to keep its fences intact.

There was construction work which destroyed the fencing for about 600 feet. CNR replaced it quickly.

17 Oct 1966 Four year old child killed between Merivale Road and Woodroffe Avenue in the Crestview subdivision, north of the tracks.

1 Feb 1967 from CNR to BTC

CNR prepared to erect 9 strand page wire fencing or to contribute an equivalent amount to a more substantial fence.

Joint inspection was carried out.

1973. Children were using the embankment to slide down. Problem was solved by planting shrub maple trees.

RG 46 vol. 1497 file 26281

Norway Bay

8 September 1915 from Council of Bristol

Resolution to have the station at Norway Bay built about 800 feet west of the side line between lots 11 and 12 range 2.

Plan of Norway Bay

22 September 1915 Petition from property owners of Norway Bay asking for a flag station during the camping season to be located at a point opposite lot 9 or about 800 feet east of the wharf road. The object of presenting this petition is to oppose the location asked for by the Council.

Much correspondence with Canadian Northern - line not yet in operation therefore no hurry.

1 December 1915 Petition for a flag station with shelter at or about the point where the railway is crossed by the side road which runs from Elmside Post Office to a point on the Ottawa river at or about the centre of the bay. This location which is about three miles east of a station already located on the railway known as Bristol's Corners, will be the most convenient location for the permanent residents of the district, the majority of the residents of the summer resorts and therefore a most advantageous location for the railway.

In the accompanying letter:

The municipal Council of Bristol has passed a resolution stating that in its opinion this station should be built 800 feet west of the side line running between Elmside Village and the river, while in the petition which I understand has already been filed the petitioners desire the station placed 800 feet east of the Wharf Road which lies about a little over a mile west of the Elmside Road.

6 August 1916 from E.J. Knight, 32 Frank Street to Board

On behalf of my family and about fifty others and also on behalf of humanity at large I would like to bring to your notice the non-existence of anything in the way of a station at Norway Bay on the Canadian Northern Railway. Last night a large party of about the above number arrived at the train stopping place about twenty minutes before the train was due and then the train was about twenty minutes late. In the meantime one of the worst thunder storms I have seen in years came up and every body was soaked to the skin, owing to, as I have said above, the non-existence of a station.

The Canadian Northern Railway simply have nothing there in the way of a station, not even a shed, so it can be readily seen what shape the people were in, and to make matters worse, a freight car was off the track near South March and the train did not arrive in the City until about twelve forty-five, the people having to sit in drenched clothing from about eight forty till the train arrived in the City.

Trusting the Commission will force the CNR to put up some kind of station at once.

17 August 1916 from Canadian Northern, Temple, Legal to Board

The railway company has endeavoured to have the location of the proposed station defined by the residents in the district and the matter has been delayed due to conflicting reports as to where the station should be located. Our Passenger Department has now definitely settled where they desire the shelter, and I have instructed our Superintendent to proceed immediately with the work.

21 August 1916 from Board to temple CNoR

Call attention to requirement to file plans and specifications.

14 October 1916 from CNoR to Board

Not the intention to provide any yard tracks as the conditions only warrant the provision of a shelter. Owing to the extreme scarcity of labour they have been unable to proceed with the erection of a shelter on the south side of the tracks about 16 poles west of milepost 39. Accommodation will be provided in time for next season's business. We have never considered it necessary to have flag stops approved by the Board.

26 October 1916 from Board to Temple

Plans for flag stations showing the character and location of the station should be filed with the Board as in the case of other stations.

26 October 1916 CNoR files plan showing shelter to be erected

22 November 1916 report from Inspector McCaul

Two separate stations are necessary, one for the campers and summer traffic. This station would only be in use for four months and would require a shelter with proper and suitable space to shelter passengers during wet or stormy weather and with proper conveniences. The station platform would require greater length than the standard length of platforms on this line.

This station should be located between mile post 40 and the Wharf Road.

The other station would require to be a permanent one to accommodate the permanent residents. It should be at mile post 39. Should be a permanent station not below Board's standard No. 1-A.

Similar situation exists at Hudson, Que. Hudson is the regular station and Hudson Heights the summer station.

18 January 1917 from Canadian Northern

Inspectors report. Entirely unnecessary to have a permanent station near McIntosh Road, our regular station at Bristol, 8500 feet west of the Wharf road should be ample for all year round business.

A temporary flag station to take care of the tourist business is reasonable and we are quite willing to place it at the point where it would be most convenient for all interests. Our traffic department are under the impression that the suggested location meets that condition but if the Board thinks otherwise we would be very glad to have a hearing and he points settled. The idea of having three stops within three miles does not appear to be reasonable.

20 January 1917 hearing set for 6 February 1919 in Ottawa Central Station.

26 February 1917 order 25905 is issued.

Judgement of Assistant Chief Commissioner

Norway Bay is a summer resort on the north shore of the Ottawa River. There are nearly 100 cottages in a stretch along the shore of about two miles.

Heretofore access has been via the CPR station at Sand Point and thence across the river by ferry. The largest number of cottages are in the vicinity of the ferry wharf. With the construction of the Canadian Northern Railway which runs parallel to the Ottawa River and at its closest point distant about 1500 feet therefrom an new method of access has been provided.

Several petitions presented to the Board.

The Board has come to the conclusion that the geographical centre of the Bay which is the dividing line between Lots 10 and 11 would be the best location for the station bearing in mind the interests of all of those concerned.

Order should go - station to be completed by 1May next. Plans should be submitted by the company within one month.

10 March 1917 from John Stewart Bristol

Withdraw my offer of a road allowance as a convenience for passengers. If the said station is located according to my offer at 900 feet east of the side line known as Bay Road or on the boundary between lots 9 and 10 my offer will still hold good.

26 March 1917 from C. Northern to Board

Sending blue prints (on file) and requests a time extension until 1 July, owing to shortage of labour and the difficulty of securing material it will not be possible to complete the station by 1 May.

28 April 1917 order 25987 is issued - time extension to 1 June, 1917

8 June 1917 from C. Northern to Board

The shelter at Norway Bay is practically completed and our men are now at work building the platform, which we expect to have finished some time this week. It was not possible, owing to the shortage of labor and material, to comply with the Board's order by June 1st although it was our intention to do so.

25 June 1918 from Charles Matthews, Monkland Avenue, Ottawa

On Saturday I travelled by that road and found that although the station building and platform had been erected, the train continues to stop at Cuthbertsons and Ferry Road crossings, the Conductor stating that his orders were not to stop at the new station until it was finally completed. The station building has been, I am informed, up for about two weeks but the Company have made no further progress. All that is required to render the station accessible for use is to remove the wire fence separating the right of way from the highway which parallels it and cut down the tall grass on the right of way. The station is certainly a more convenient place for passenger traffic than the other stopping places where the absence of platforms or shelter or other conveniences renders it very difficult for women and children to board or leave the cars.

There are few cottages in residence now but by Saturday 30th instant practically every cottage will be occupied and it will be a very great inconvenience to a very large proportion of the residents if the train does not stop at the station. The case is urgent and I request that the Company be required to at once comply with the evident intention of the Order. If, for any reason, the Company is unable to take down the wire fence the people at the Bay will, I am sure, if given the necessary authority, speedily overcome that obstacle.

29 June 1917 from Superintendent Farnham (?) C. Northern to Spencer at Board

I have issued instructions to have this stop put in effect at once, although the station is not quite complete.

4 July 1917 report from Inspector Blyth

I inspected the new station at Norway Bay. It consists of an office 10 x 12 ft, a waiting room, 10 x 14 ft and a storage room 10 x 12 ft. In addition to this there is a canopy at the west end of the building 48 x 12 ft. This canopy is floored with cinders. The station building is 34 ft long and has a pine platform 36 x 8 ft. Between the tracks and canopy at the west end the platform is extended with cinders making in all about 85 ft of a platform. The filling was not completed on 1st instant, but the men have been working and I have no doubt will continue until the work is completed. There is a deep ditch between the

roadway and the station which should be piped and filled and the railway fence should be cut into the corners of the station at both ends to prevent cattle getting from the roadway onto the track. When this is completed I am of the opinion that the facilities will be ample for the services at Norway bay for some time to come.

31 May 1920 from Canadian National to Board

For the protection of the summer travel and in order to preserve a telegraph block between proposed summer train No. 48 (Pembroke local) and train No. 2 (the through train) we propose to install agents temporarily at South March, mileage 11.5, Fitzroy Harbour, mileage 27.5, Norway Bay, mileage 39 (this appears to be an error) and we wish to move the agent at Foresters Falls, mileage 60, to Dufort mileage 53.2 (Dufort being a water stop and 30 minutes from Beachburg and 25 minutes from Bristol.

With the fall timetable it will be necessary to close these summer agencies and in order to avoid unpleasantness or applications by local residents to have the agencies kept open I would be glad if you would file this letter with the Board an order that there may be no question at that time as to what our intentions are.

10 July 1922 from CNR to Board

Application for approval of plan showing location of shelter and platform at Norway bay, mile 46.2 Pembroke sub.

Memo from Spencer Operations.

Norway Bay is referred to instead of Wharf Road as shown on the plan. Norway Bay station is located at mile 45.

9 August 1922 order 32722 is issued.

9 October 1959 from CNR to Board

Intention to remove the station building at Norway Bay, mile 45.61.

28 December 1959 from Board

Sees no reason to object to your proposed action in this matter.

End of file.

RG 46 vol. 1400 file 4205.2712

Pembroke station

2 February 1965 from CNR

Called bids for the construction of a proposed new station and express freight shed at Pembroke. This structure will replace our existing facilities and we expect a contractor at the site to commence the construction work in the very near future.

Encloses prints of two drawings (not on file) and requests an order approving the location of the new station and express freight shed.

16 February 1965 from Board to CNR

The plans do not have the approval of the Municipal Authorities. Have the plans approved and resubmitted.

End of file.

**RG 30 vol. 9371 file T/1046-65-151
Revised location at Clemow Lake.**

19 November 1913 to Temple CNOR Plans for relocation at Clemow Lake m.133.45 to 134.75 to improve alignment. Please file with the Board.

29 November 1913 order 20918 is issued.

12 February 1914 file ends, filing in registry office, publication.

**RG 30 vol. 8371 file T/1046-65-152
Revised location at Grand Lake m. 126.37 to 129.94**

20 January 1914 to Temple CNOR Plans for relocation at Grand Lake m.126.37 to 129.94 to improve alignment. Please file with the Board.

24 January 1914 order 21266 is issued.

25 February 1914 file ends, filing in registry office, publication etc.

**RG 30 vol. 9371 file 1046-65-154
Diversion Pembroke Divisional yard mile 85.13 to 86.85**

10 August 1914 to Temple CNOR Plans for diversion from 85.13 to 86.85 for the purpose of improving grades. Pembroke divisional yard. Please file with the Board.

12 August 1914 order 22387 is issued.

17 September 1914 file ends, filing in registry office, publication etc.

**RG 30 vol. 9334 file 1046-65-25
Connection with CPR at Pembroke**

31 October 1912 from C. Hodge (General Superintendent CPR) to A.F. Stewart, Chief Engineer of Construction, Mackenzie Mann & Co

We are willing to consent to an application from you to the Board of Railway Commissioners for connection with our line at the location mentioned, but think the siding necessary for the interchange of cars should be off your proposed connection rather than along our track involving an additional opening in our main line.

2 December 1912 from Temple to Board

Application for authority to connect temporarily with CPR, Pembroke.

4 December 1912 order 18218 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9343 file 1046-61-145

Bridge middle crossing of Petawawa River.

Built by Canadian Bridge Company drawing 1486 B & C.

RG 30 vol. 9343 file 1046-61-147

Bridge east crossing of Petawawa River.

Built by Canadian Bridge Company drawing 1485 B & C.

RG 30 vol. 9306 file 1046-26-308

Complaint of W.R. Kirk, Foresters Falls

10 November 1920 Response from General Superintendent.

A caretaker has not yet been appointed to look after Forrester's Falls and until the appointment is made the Section Foreman is performing Caretaker's duties. The arrangements are in effect that the conductors on trains 201 and 202 will accept shipping bills and orders for cars taking them to the nearest station for action by regular agent. The agent was not removed from Forrester's Falls until the 28th of Oct. and you will note that altho Mr. Kirk makes a complaint on Oct. 23rd there was no real opportunity for complaints until after the agent was removed. Mr. Kirk was evidently anticipating trouble.

RG 30 vol. 9303 file 1046-26-185

Complaint by W. Kirk facilities at Foresters Falls

13 October 1916 from Kirk to Board

Kirk was Reeve of Township

No loading siding just a passing siding, to get to the cars with hay and grain we have to drive along the ditch at the end of ties. In a wet time the wagons go almost to the axles. About one year ago the company laid off rails and ties for a siding her, has lain here ever since. Have just been informed the company has issued orders to have this material removed.

Requests an order directing CNOR to construct a loading siding.

Also the road from the public highway becomes almost impassable in wet time.

26 October 1916 from Fitch General Manager

Business conditions do not warrant a business spur but we have arranged to construct a stock pen which will be done as soon as labour conditions permit. Have been able to do very little improvement work owing to scarcity of labour.

November business heavier than anticipated CNOR putting in four business tracks.

Report from Inspector McCaul - shippers, through Mr. Kirk, agree to supply teams and men gratis for the hauling of materials for the roadway if it is taken in hand immediately.

14 December 1916 from Fitch

A siding has now been built that will take care of ten cars per day.

Further complaint from Kirk. Siding is fine but no provision has yet been made for a roadway. Cars on part of it cannot be gotten to at all.

15 January 1917 from Fitch

As soon as the frost is out of the ground ten or twelve cars of gravel will be obtained and deposited.

21 April 1917 further complaint from Kirk about the access road.

22 May 1917 from Fitch

Severe labour shortage. With such small section forces track had many slow orders. We have opened a ballast pit but we should not use ballast for roadways that is absolutely essential for the track.

23 May 1917 from Fitch - gravel delivered today.

RG 30 vol. 9303 file 1046-26-195

Service on the Pembroke Branch

29 January 1917 from D'Arcy Scott to Spencer, copy to CNOR, Temple

Chief Graham of the Ottawa Fire department telephoned me to say that his daughter was coming down from Beachburg on the Canadian Northern on Tuesday night last and the train no. 80 did not arrive in Ottawa until 2 a.m. yesterday morning. It stopped at the station at the end of Henderson Avenue and left its passengers there to find their way home as best they could.

Reply from Spencer.

The railway company has made it a practice when, for any reason the train from Pembroke, namely no. 80, has not made connection at Rideau Junction with the Toronto-Ottawa train no. 8as per time table, to run the passengers into Henderson Avenue by special engine as was done in the case referred to.

The service as advertised is a connection at Rideau Junction which will bring the passengers into Central Station. My opinion is that when they do not make this connection at Rideau Junction a special coach should be run into Central Station and thus give the passengers the full service.

In this particular case the train was delayed by snow troubles and very cold weather.

Asks Temple to take up.

19 February 1917 from Fitch, General Manager

Trains 201 and 201 are the only regular trains on the Pembroke subdivision and are mixed trains. Therefore it is not possible to always make connection and the revenue derived

does not warrant the expense of running a coach into Central Station. When the train is late we run the passengers into our Hurdman station on Henderson Avenue which should be satisfactory.

Further complaint January 1921, some traffic counts. Local passengers are handled on mixed trains running to and from Hurdman three days a week.

RG 30 vol. 9374 file 1046-67-41

Pembroke Industrial Spur

13 January 1913 Application showing proposed spur to Pembroke Box Factory.

From the Montreal-Port Arthur line at the west boundary of Stafford township through the township of Stafford and town of Pembroke with two branches at its northerly end in the Town of Pembroke for the service of the Box Factory, the Steel Equipment Company, the Pembroke Lumber Company and the local freight of the town and surrounding country.

8 October 1913 Opposition from the town of Pembroke

1. The spur will cross a number of streets in the town and before any approval of the town is given it should be determined what protection should be given at each of the said streets.
2. The spur will serve two, perhaps three industries of the town and as the cost of purchasing the right-of-way and construction will involve a large expenditure the spur should be so constructed as to serve all or the largest possible portion of said industries and also the shippers and importers of the town.
3. The spur should extend a considerable distance east of the point shown on the plan in order to properly serve the requirements of the industries of the town.
4. At present the main line of the Canadian Pacific comes through the town also a branch of the GTR and there is no interswitching between the said roads at this point. The town submits that if the CNOR construct a spur from their main line into the town for the purpose of serving the industrial interests of the town, such spur should be constructed with a view to completion of a proper system of interswitching between the different roads coming into the town.
5. The town further oppose the application on the ground that before any spur be approved there should be submitted to the Board some system of interswitching between the different railways coming into said town.

3 November 1913 memo to Temple (Legal) from ?Oliver (in the CNOR)

The reply of the solicitor for the town is a faint attempt on the part of the local solicitor of the CPR to straddle the fence. At the time the Board visited Pembroke in connection with our main line location the town people insisted upon some definite undertaking as to what we intended in connection with industrial tracks and at that time we stated that we were prepared to build an industrial track through to the front of the town. It is in compliance with that undertaking that the present plans are now submitted and the attitude seems to be somewhat different to the attitude at the time of the hearing in Pembroke.

Clause #3 and clause #5 of the answer are not consistent. Clause #3 asks for the extension of the proposed spur while clause #5 opposes the whole application. We will be very glad to construct a spur in the town of Pembroke to facilitate an interswitching arrangement but we will not be thrown into an expensive proposition which will necessitate our company financing an expenditure for the benefit of the town, the CPR and the GTR.

3 November 1913 memo to Temple (legal) from ?Oliver (in the CNOR)

We filed plans covering proposed industrial spur in Pembroke and this shows a connection with the CP siding at the Pembroke Box Factory, This is the only connection that we would have with the company's line and if it were intended to use it as a transfer, additional tracks would have to be put in as the single track shown would be required for the operation of the Box Factory's business. Other than this we have made no attempt to work out any interswitching proposition because we generally wait until we are doing business before we advance to such a stage as that. If there is to be any general scheme of interswitching in the town to be worked out the GTR and CPR should get together and there should be no difficulty about our company being able to join in such an arrangement as we will doubtless have a permanent connection with the GT and it would be very easy to arrange a transfer track with the CPR from some point on our industrial line.

15 November 1913 from Town of Pembroke to Board copy to CNOR

I thought that the parties would be heard before an order was issued.

The spur will only serve two perhaps three industries and these could be served without coming into that part of town, where the spur will be useless.

Town is anxious to get the CNOR with an industrial spur to that part of town which will accommodate the greatest number, having regard to the cost.

Opportune time to bring up the question of interswitching between the different roads. CNOR misinformed at the town's attitude at the time of the location of its main line. The question of industrial tracks was not seriously discussed. The question was the location of the station.

Doesn't wish to dictate or even offer suggestion as to the construction of its road, industrial spur, team tracks, or location for station or freight sheds; but in the location of the spur, as asked for in the application, it appears to the town that the company has been ill advised.

If the town is to have interswitching facilities the same should be decided upon before the CNOR has expended large sums in locating its spurs, team tracks and freight shed facilities.

4 December 1913 from CNOR to Board

Our location was discussed before the Board on 25 April last the question of local freight spur was considered and in opposing our application for approval of our main line through the south end of town it was urged by the town that such a location would not give facilities for either freight or passengers and we produced a tentative plan of our freight spur. A discussion followed...a definite statement was made by Mr. White that we proposed to build a local freight spur and put a local freight house down near the heart

of the Town. Williams was very sceptical and while the railway has carried out its undertaking it would appear the town is still not satisfied.

We have simply followed our undertaking before the Board that we would build a spur and locate a freight shed near the centre of town. The town's proposition is not fair to this company - they appear to desire that we construct trackage that in our opinion would not be justifiable at the present time - and that it is not fair to ask us to carry out any preconceived idea of interswitching and have the expenses put upon this company.

29 December 1913 memo from Inspector Simmons of the Board

I am of the opinion that the only feasible way to secure interswitching is by means of a spur track that the CNOR has applied for running down near the water front. The connection with the GTR at the crossing of that line by the CNOR could be made permanent, and the spur above mentioned could be connected with the CPR near the water front. Cars from the GTR to the CPR and vice versa would have to be shunted by the CNOR.

Plan showing spur to Pembroke Box Factory 16 July 1913

This is 56.5 cm north of the crossing with the GTR, 33.5 = 1 mile

It joins the Pembroke Box Factory, and CPR at mile 1.28 of the spur

2 February 1914 order 21323 is issued.

24 February 1914 from Board

The Pembroke Board of Trade desires interswitching and has suggested that interchange between the CNOR and CPR take place at the box factory and that the CNOR perform switching for interchange between the GTR and CPR. CPR strongly objects to interchange at this point and matter has been set down for a hearing on 17th March.

27 February 1914 to Temple from Oliver

Present application was for an industrial spur and we have this. CPR should not think that we are behind this to get interswitching. If necessary an interchange could be put in parallel to the CPR either on their property or along the edge of the Steel Equipment Company's property. A workable transfer could be put in - would have a 2% grade but this could be protected with a Hayes derail. A worse condition exists at Perry Sound industrial spur.

14 March 1914 from Peter White, Solicitor Pembroke to Temple

Pembroke Lumber oppose the building of our spur through their yard.

Pembroke Shook Mills oppose the spur.

Town will not make any move but may have some objection to a part of it being used as part of an interswitching layout. It might be more advantageous if the engines of all three companies had a right of way over the connecting track and this might be difficult unless the connection was neutral. This leaves out the question of who is going to pay for a neutral track.

3 March 1914 from Peter White, Solicitor Pembroke to Temple

CPR has been very busy in an attempt to obtain a rehearing because they see some connection between the spur authorized and interswitching and because they would like to prevent our sharing in the local freight lcl.

Certain property holders are urging the town to apply for a rehearing.

Pointed out at a town council meeting yesterday that the Board had made construction of this spur a condition of the location of the main line.

The instructions of the town to their solicitor is to represent the town at the Board meeting to interswitching only.

Simmons felt that if we were to build the spur it would offer a very easy solution of the interswitching problem.

Reference to orders issued at Brandon which are similar. Not satisfactory because switching is carried out by BS&HBRy which does not have a full time switch engine so they have to rely upon main line locomotives doing the work.

Positions of the various parties. Pembroke Board of Trade pointed out that Pembroke Box shipped in 300 carloads from GTR and 335 carloads to GTR that had to be moved by horse and wagon to and from GTR. Board of Trade would like this to be done at a cost of \$2.00 or below which CNOR found ridiculous.

CNOR approach is that it has no interest. It has an interchange with the GTR and proposes to build a line which will be available for interchange with the CPR. What happens between the GTR and the CPR the CNOR has no concern.

20 June 1914 to Board from CNOR

The matter is becoming a serious one for the company. Buildings are being erected upon the line of the spur to the box factory already approved but which the Board intimated we should not build until the question was settled. Wherever a peg of ours appears the land is being occupied, so that if this line is eventually approved the cost will be greatly increased to the company.

--

Possibility that we should build the freight and passenger spur as originally proposed crossing the Indian and coming down between it and the Muskrat to Mary Street and the industrial spur possibly abandoned for the present. Should be serious getting options quietly on the properties wanted before we bring the matter to the Board.

End of file 28 October 1914.

RG 30 vol. 9374 file 1046-67-45

Land for Ballast Pit spur.

This appears to be the expropriation documents for the Uplands Spur.

CNOR intended to lease this for five years for hauling ballast.. Proceedings started in September 1913.

Rideau Front, Gloucester township. All parcels seem to be in concession 2 Gloucester township.

25 September 1913 to Mr. Stewart (Engineer) from B?

In connection with the above line I am informed that it will be necessary for you to cut through several properties and carry the soil obtained therefrom to other properties. Several of the owners, in fact, nearly all of them, would settle with our offer, if we compensated them for the earth that we will have to remove for the purpose of railway construction. Would you, from your own plans and profiles, give me, if possible a rough estimate of the amount of soil which you will have to remove from each lot, in order that we may discuss the terms of settlement.

24 October 1913 from B? to Mr. Robins

After the spur had been located the same was abandoned and an entirely different location taken.

RG 30 vol. 9335 file 1046-60-31

Transfer facilities at Ottawa (Chaudiere)

2 April 1913 from Spaidal (Supt. Montreal) to Temple, Solicitor

As additional transfer track facilities with the CPR at Ottawa are necessary and not having sufficient room to provide this near the Ottawa station it will be necessary to do so near the crossing of our line and the Prescott Branch near Chaudiere.

Asks for plan to see if transfer tracks can be put in at that point.

6 April 1913 Spaidal to Temple

Thanks for tracing showing land at Chaudiere Crossing. I note that there is only the right of way at this point, no extra land for transfer tracks. It occurs to me we may be able to get transfer tracks between the CPR and our line at some point between the NY&O Jct. and Chaudiere Crossing. Asks for blueprint showing our right of way where it adjoins the CPR from Chaudiere crossing to Sussex Street line.

7 October 1914 Memo to Temple

The original plan filed with the Board covering our diamond crossing of the Sussex Street branch by the old Ottawa-Hawkesbury line also included a connection with the Sussex Street branch. This was approved by 7490 of 6 July 1909. There was nothing in the plan nor order to indicate that this connection was temporary but of course it was meant to be so as it was our means of getting construction material from the CPR to our new line. Order 7597 of 24 July 1909 authorized the use of this crossing and connection pending the installation of the interlocking plant.

Our main freight terminal will be located at Rideau Jct. Mileage 244. The mileage of the crossing of the Chaudiere Branch is 247 or 3 miles distant from Rideau Jct. The mileage of the present transfer is 250.4. The distance therefore from our permanent freight terminal to the transfer track at Chaudiere Jct. Would be less than half the distance from

the present location to the terminal.. The great majority of our transfer business will be to the factory district of Ottawa which is of course closer to Chaudiere Jct. Than to the present location and if the present location is adhered to it will simply mean the hauling of cars from Rideau Jct. to the present transfer track, 6.4 miles, picking them up by the CPR and hauling them back to Chaudiere Jct., 3.4 miles and thence to the various plants. In other words, retaining the transfer means the hauling from Chaudiere to that point and return, a distance of 6.8 miles which is absolutely/unnecessary mileage and will keep the public that much longer from the use of their consignments.

8 October 1914 from Temple to Board

Applies for approval of proposed connection with the CPR near Chaudiere Jct. Uses arguments set out in previous memo. We have endeavored to get the CPR approve of the plans but have been unable to do so. Request that the matter be set down for hearing.

22 October 1914 from Beatty (CPR) to Board.

We object to the location of the present interchange track being changed. It is on a purely switching run on which no regular passenger trains are operated and the one proposed involves a connection with our main line out of Broad Street Station. Moreover the point of intersection of the proposed interchange track is on a heavy grade i.e. 7/10 of 1% and it would also necessitate the construction of an additional track across two public highways.

Statement of cars delivered (441) and received (434) from CPR Jan-Sept.

18 December 1914 from Beatty to Board

Our statement is slightly different from the CNOR. Jan-Sept. This shows 18 cars to Broad Street, 174 for Sussex Street, 238 construction material. The CNOR also included cars which are in transit through Ottawa. These should be eliminated from any statement relating to interswitching. More than half the traffic delivered to the CNOR was construction material for its own line which traffic will entirely cease when construction is completed.

18 January 1915 from Temple to Fritch (Asst. to President)

At the hearing (3 November) Mr. Leonard stated that the real object of our company in asking for a change of the point of connection was to come within the limit for interswitching. No written judgment was given on our application but the Chairman said verbally that our application would have to stand until the whole matter of rates to be paid for interswitching service was settled by the Board.

24 February 1915 from Temple to Board

Understand an inspector has thoroughly investigated the points raised and wants to know if there is any likelihood of obtaining an early decision.

8 February 1915 from Fritch to Temple

The Ottawa Board of Trade has made application to the Board for this interchange in place of interchange at NYO Junction.

19 February 1915 from Inspector Lalonde

Made an investigation as to the necessity of changing the location of the interchange track to Chaudiere crossing, 3.51 miles from Broad Street and about 3 miles from Rideau Jct. and also about 3 miles from Henderson Street station, where it is intended to make the connection for interchange of traffic.

Rideau Jct. is the point of separation of the Toronto line with the north west line. where a station is already built and intended to make a regular station as soon as the through lines are completed.

The location if the interchange (about $\frac{3}{4}$ mile west of Chaudiere Jct) is good and does not offer any difficulty if the connection is made at the east end of the siding known as the Peerless Brick and Tile Co. Ltd. n the CPR to a point west of the diamond on the CNOR. Otherwise the west point of the interchange will be near the top of a heavy grade 7/10 of 1%. At other points it will require quite a lot of filling.

Etc

In my opinion the application should be granted as applied for.

7 May 1915 from Temple to Board

The matter has been heard but no decision.

Letter from W.H. Dwyer & Co. point out that the point of interchange exceeds the distance of four miles and for such service CPR extracts 2c. per 100 lbs. whereas if the point of interchange were within the four mile limit the expense would only be 1c. per 100 lbs.

Submit that it is not only in our interests but that of all shippers in Ottawa that the point of interchange be moved to a more convenient location.

18 September 1915 detailed memo to Temple

Salient points

- present interchange with CPR is on Sussex Street sub. across from bridge over Rideau River.
- Significant traffic from Edwards Rockland to Sussex Street
- Some traffic to GTR which is handled via CPR and to GTR at Preston Street.

20 September 1915 detailed letter Temple to Board

4 October 1915 From Board with memo from Spencer Operations, Board

I am still of the opinion that the point chosen by myself, namely just west of the GT diamond would be the best point especially in view of having in mind the interchange of the GTR and CNOR which has been practically agreed upon.

12 October 1915 from Temple to Board

It will be impracticable for us to establish an interchange at Ottawa Junction where the present interchange is being made because this interchange is being made on our main line and we will have to discontinue this interchange at once. Best place is Chaudiere Jct.

Broad Street is most important and that business at Sussex Street is falling badly. Broad Street means interchange at Chaudiere Jct.

Correspondence from shippers supporting the proposed change to Chaudiere Jct. J.R. Booth, McAuliffe-Davis Lumber.

9 June 1916 Judgement by Board allows the application

17 August 1916 order 25111 is issued

There was a need to take land from Barrett Bros.

Much correspondence.

28 November 1916 Temple to Board

even if we were not putting in any transfer track at all no private spur could be put in to connect with the CPR closer to the diamond crossing than the point where our lead connects with the CPR. Our lead connects as close outside the home signal as it is possible to do and no closer connection could be made without bringing it under the interlocking arrangement which would add very largely to the expense and make operation very unsatisfactory.

Question was a spur for Barrett and apportionment of cost.

2 December 1916 order 25707 is issued.

Plan of Interchange in the north west quadrant

13 November 1916 Agreement

Barrett accepts \$900 for 30/100 acre, portion of land required to make the connection with CPR.

CPR to have rights over this land to put tracks into our property at any future time.

RG 30 vol. 9335 file 1046-60-42

Connection between the Toronto-Ottawa and Ottawa-Montreal lines.

6 August 1914 from Temple (CNOR) to Board

Application for a proposed connection between the Toronto-Ottawa line and our Ottawa-Montreal line, which involves a crossing of the Ottawa-Prescott Branch of the CPR.

Telegram from Leonard, CPR:

"Will not object to Board making order necessary for temporary track connection in lieu diamond conditional all expense construction maintenance operation and protection being on your company"

Anxious to obtain approval of application as any day we may be called upon to move troupes (sic) direct to Quebec and without this connection such movement would be impossible and Mr. Leonard's telegram refers to the method that we proposed to him, that

is, instead of placing a diamond we propose to use switches temporarily until the diamond can be obtained, as it is not possible to get a diamond without delay. In the meantime movements across the CPR will be controlled by a flagman, and as soon as possible the crossing will be connected up and interlocked with the existing plant at the crossing of the Ottawa-Prescott branch by our Ottawa Montreal line.

Urgent etc.

Crossing and connection has already been approved under order 21333, the present crossing being slightly to the south of the crossing approved.
(N.B. this is definitely in the Hurdman area, not Ellwood, as the order refers to Hurdman's Bridge).

RG 30 vol. 9335 file 1046-60-38

Application for a connection track with the GTR in Ottawa

24 June 1914 from Temple to Board

Application for connecting track with GTR near Ottawa.

26 June 1914 order 22136 is issued.

Terms of consent are that the connection is not to be operated until the agreement is signed.

8 February 1915 from Fritch (Asst. to President) to Temple

Under an arrangement with the GTR we were each to put in our own tracks, the GTR to provide its own and the CNOR to provide its own but the GTR has refused to make the interchange. Ask the Board for an order.

Memo

The Board has held that interchange between railways is to be granted not because it is in the interest of one of the railway companies to have interchange but to suit public convenience.

Support from the Ottawa Board of Trade.

5 April 1915 list of industries with sidings on the GTR

Breeze Hill

Oliver, J. & Son Furniture

Bronson Ave.

Fraser, W.F. Lumber

Catherine Street

Barrett Bros. Lumber & coal

Butterworth, J.G. & Co. Coal

Capital Cut Stone

Heney, John & Sons Coal

Imperial Oil Oil

Low, J.& C.
 Marshall Warehouse Co.
 National Manufacturing Foundry
 Ottawa Construction
 Slinn-Shouldie, Ltd Flour
 Union Construction Co.
Central Depot
 Corby, W.J. & Co. Fruit
 Dominion Fruit Exchange Fruit
 Dominion Warehouse Co.
 Major, L.H. & Soulbieri Ltd Liquors
 Ottawa Cold Stores (Matthews-Blackwell Ltd)
Chaudiere Yard
 Booths
Chaudiere Branch
 British American Oil Oil
 Castle, F.J. Co. Ltd Wholesale grocers
 Continental Bag & Paper Paper
 Edwards, W.C. & Co. Lumber
 International Marine & Signal Buoys
Concession St. Yard
 Booths
East Rideau River
 Sheppard Morse Ltd. Lumber
 Watson & Todd Lumber
Fraser Street Yard
 Booths
Isabella Street
 Ballantyne siding at Ottawa East Coal
 Library Bureau Ltd Office furniture
Nepean Street Yard
 Booths
Ottawa East
 Silicate Brick Co. at Ottawa Brick
Preston Street
 Export Lumber

Complaint by Dwyer they pay double charges because all traffic between CNOR and GTR has to be handled by CPR who charge 2 cents per 100 lbs. while GTR charge 1 cent per 100 lbs.

16 September 1915 Temple to Board

Applies for approval of transfer track

5 November 1915 order 24416 is issued

11 November 1915 from General Manager to Temple

The interchange track was put in as a spur because we do not wish to spent the money to put in a double ended track. It will only be necessary to make a switch and as far as the operation is concerned there will be no difficulty in handling it. There is the possibility of extending this track in future and it would be unwise for us to put in a connection at the west end and later have to remove it.

15 December 1915 to Board

Application for authority to connect tracks of its Montreal Ottawa line with the GTR.

8 January 1916 from GTR to Board

Referring to the application, does not state for what purpose the CNOR desire to use this track, but presumably it is to operate their Montreal-Ottawa trains into and out of our central station. This would necessitate putting the double track in operation between Rideau Junction and Gladstone Avenue which we discontinued sometime ago on account of the CNOR declining to pay the wages of the switch tender. There will also be required an interlocking plant to take care of the proposed connection as well as the existing connection, including the double track switch west of the Rideau River.

If an order is made it should specify that the CNOR are to pay the entire expense of installation, maintenance and operation and agree to pay our bills within thirty days after presentation.

13 January 1916 from CNOR to Board

Order 24416 authorized CNOR, at its own expense, to construct an interchange track for the purpose of allowing transfer of cars. This connection has been installed but the GTR refuse to accept cars delivered to them at this point. We would be obliged if the Board would instruct the GTR to accept transfers at this point, so that effect may be given to the above order.

15 January 1916 from CNOR to Board

The connection is necessary to the CNOR in operating its through passenger trains between Montreal and Ottawa. The matter of necessity for putting double track is not a part of this question and when the time comes when our business is sufficiently heavy, necessitating the use of double track, the matter will be taken up with the GTR direct.

24 January 1916 from GTR to Board

Strongly opposed to being put to the expense of providing facilities or privileges for the CNOR which will increase the amount of indebtedness to this company.

We have not received any payment in regard to the use by the CNOR of the Ottawa Terminal since August last.

31 January 1916 memo to Temple

As the switch comes of the interlocked zone it will have to be controlled by the tower.

Application for crossing Russell Road. The CPR crossed the same road about 400 ft. north of our proposed crossing. No gates at that point and none at the point where the CNOR and Ottawa-Prescott line cross this road south of the proposed crossing. Train movements will be slow due to curvature and to the fact that all trains must stop for orders at the junction of the grand trunk line. This will be purely a passenger movement while both others have to cover both freight and passengers. Only the Ottawa-Montreal trains will pass over this crossing.

7 February 1916 memo to Temple

The only outstanding bills are those covering the months of July, October, November and December. July was returned on 17 January for correction. October bill has never been received. November bill was received January 3 and December bill January 19. Both expected to be paid shortly.

Draft agreements for use of Central Station

5 April 1916 order 24861 is issued.

11 April 1916 order 24888 is issued.

RG 12 vol. 3710 file 4606-85-71

Bridge over the Rideau River at Hogs Back.

Plan of proposed bridge - mile 5.30

17 November 1910 CNOR applies for approval.

Order in council was issued on 11 April 1911 (PC 1911-805) but CNOR questioned the need for the lease of the right of way.

Plan of Feb 6 1911 approved by PC 1911-805, both on file.

18 May 1911 order 13668

CNOR claims that the department has nothing to lease.

Much correspondence and traces. CNOR agreed to a lease but wanted to pay for ten years at a time whereas the Department wanted \$1 per year.

19 November 1914. Deputy Minister of Justice

Take such proceedings as may be necessary to compel the Company to remove its bridge over the Rideau Canal above Hogs Back station.

24 November 1914 Minister is taking up the matter with Sir William MacKenzie.

27 November 1914 from Wm. MacKenzie to Minister Frank Cochrane

Matter has never been brought to my attention, I will look into it.

4 December 1914 Summary

Feb 16 1911 plan submitted

Apr 20 1911 approved by Order in Council 805

May 19 1911 approved by BRC

Draft lease was forwarded Apr 20 1911

June 13 1911 Ruel for CNOR took exception to lease. Department does not own any land at the point of crossing and that they do not touch any of the lands owned by the Department. The river may be called a canalized river but there is nothing in the act compelling them to take out a lease for the privilege of crossing a canalized river.

In reply dept of Justice pointed out that approval of the GIC may be on terms as the GIC may determine.

5 January 1914 Ruel replied that while not agreeing with the attitude taken, not worth further discussing further. They asked that the lease be modified for them to make payments for 10 years instead of making annual payments of \$1.

23 January 1912 department replied insisting upon the lease being executed as drawn up.

16 Jan 1913, no word having been received from CNOR asked Justice what they should do. Justice replied that they had instructed their agent to take such proceedings as may be necessary to compel the company to remove its bridge or to come under the lease.

The necessity for the lease is important only as a record. I would suggest however that the draft be amended by striking out the charge of \$1.00 per annum and again be submitted to the company for execution.

22 December 1914 department to Ruel

Department is willing to accept annual payment of \$1.00 in advance for 10 years.

6 January 1915 from Ruel to Department

Encloses lease duly executed.

2 December 1929 from CNR Asst Comptroller to department

We have recently unearthed a copy of the Order in Council dated April 20 1911 and lease between the Department and CNOR dated January 12 1915 effective June 1, 1911 in respect of the erection and maintenance of railway bridge over the Rideau Canal above Hogs Back lock which calls for a rental of \$10.00 for ten years payable in advance.

I can find no records of any payments having been made on this account and as the railway is still enjoying the privilege and I can find no record of cancellation of this payment, if you find same to be in order and will send me a bill for \$20.00 covering the two payments due June 1, 1911 and June 1, 1921 I shall be glad to arrange prompt payment.

December 4 1929 Memo to dept Comptroller

There are no arrears but in stead it is paid in advance to May 31 1931.

31 March 1932 from CNR

Asks for a renewal.

26 April 1932 PC 932 is passed.

Renewal for 21 years at \$1.00 per annum.

6 June 1955 invoice for 12 months rental.

RG 30 vol. 9346 file 1046-62-18

Crossing of CPR near Bell's Corners

5 October 1906 encloses plan of proposed crossing with CPR. Plan on file. This appears to be a crossing at grade and is precisely where a creek crosses the CPR.

9 December 1907 application to the Board.

10 January 1908 from CPR

No objection provided:

1. In the event the CPR reduces the grade at this point the CNOR will pay the extra expense.
2. Crossing to be protected by an interlocking.
3. Signaller to be appointed by the CPR.
4. CPR to have precedence at the crossing.
5. Plans to be submitted to the Board.
6. The whole cost of construction, maintenance and operation to be borne by CNOR.

11 January 1908 CNOR to CPR

It is not our intention to have a grade crossing.

10 January 1908 from CPR

Overhead clearance is not enough.

23 June 1908 order 5642 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9348 file 1046-62-46

Crossing of CPR at Pembroke.

12 November 1912 Plan 2672 shows bridge.

13 September 1912 order 17474 is issued.

Much correspondence about the rights of senior railways.

15 January 1913 order 18525 is issued.

Bridge was built by Canada Foundry

5 September 1913 requested a temporary trestle crossing.

15 September 1913 order 22540 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9281 file 1046-14-24

Opening for traffic Rideau Junction to Pembroke.

20 November 1915 Application to Board.

23 November 1915 order 24473 is issued.

RG 46 vol. 1490 file 3561.120

Bridge across the Ottawa River at Fitzroy Harbour.

Many plans on the file

30 September 1912 PC 2600 is issued.

8 October 1912 order 17676 is issued

24 September 1913 PC 2383 is issued.

6 October 1913 order 20499 is issued.

RG 46 vol. 1430 file 20394

Station at South March

10 July 1912 CNOR application for approval of location of station grounds at South March. Includes plan.

23 September 1912 order 17557 is issued.

1920 becomes a summer agency.

9 October 1959 CNR intention to remove the building

17 November 1959 Board to CNR

As the municipal authorities have advised they have no objection to the removal of this station building and freight shed, the Board in turn does not object to your Company's proposed action.