

L'Orignal subdivision

Files seen:

RG 43 vol. 349 file 5866 James Bay Railway location into City of Ottawa
RG 43 vol. 419 file 10281 Subsidy for line from Hawkesbury to Ottawa
RG 43 vol. 441 file 12028 Trestles between Hawkesbury and Ottawa
RG 43 box 632 file 20468 Station at Alfred Centre
Application to abandon the line between Hawkesbury (m. 47.5) and Hurdman (m. 104.1).
Application to abandon the line between Hawkesbury (mile 32.7) and Hurdman (mile 89.3), a total distance of 56.6 miles.
Merrilees Collection, National Archives, 84503/19 D 330, F2 Container 2000002705
CNR Blueprints showing lines abandoned.
RG 12 vol. 2494 file 3466-11
RG 46 vol. 493 file 39310.16 Abandonment file
RG 12 vol. 1347 file 3554-26 Abandonment
RG 30 vol. 9338 file 1046-61-32 Bridge over Greene's Creek
RG 30 vol. 9338 file T/1046-61-39 Bridge over Rideau River
RG 30 vol. 9334 file T/1046-60-7 transfer track with CPR at Hurdman
RG 30 vol. 9334 file 1046-60-13 Junction with the New York and Ottawa at Ottawa
RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-56 Highway crossings North Plantagenet township.
RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-57 Diversion and crossing of Montreal Road mile 28 west from Hawkesbury.
RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-59 Highway crossing Montreal Road, Cameron Street near Cumberland station.
RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-68 Road diversion at Greene's Creek.
RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-70 Highway crossings Township of Gloucester
RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-72 Highway crossings in township of North Plantagenet
RG 30 vol. 9376 file 1046-67-81 Spur line Riordan Pulp & Paper, Hawkesbury
RG 30 vol. 9306 file 1046-26-284 Dam and fills on Leonard's Creek
RG 30 vol. 9346 file 1046-62-14 Crossing of GTR spur to Edwards Mill at Rockland.
RG 30 vol. 9346 file 1046-62-12 Crossing of GTR at Hawkesbury.
RG 30 vol. 9225 file 1014 -80-24 Hawkesbury station fire 28 December 1904.
RG 30 vol. 9348 file 1046-62-52 Crossing of Ottawa and Prescott Ry. at m. 56.6 west from Hawkesbury.
RG 30 vol. 9337 file 1046-61-25 South Nation River
RG 43 vol. 649 file 20887 Sale of Stewart Property to RCMP

RG 43 vol. 349 file 5866 James Bay Railway location into City of Ottawa

Plan No. 492 received 18 June 1906

This is an excellent, very large scale plan showing the CNOR coming directly to its area near Hurdman and with a connection across Hurdman Road to join the CPR. The O&NY facilities, including turntable and shops and the CPR roundhouse are well shown.

16 Jun 1906 James Bay Railway to Dept. Railways & Canals.

We propose to cross the Rideau River south of the Isolation Hospital, putting a 20 foot cutting through the hill on which the hospital stands and providing for overhead crossings on Salisbury, Marlborough and Goulburn Avenues. On the flats between Goulburn Avenue and Nelson Street we propose to place a local freight yard so that Sweetland, Russell, Chapel and Blackburn Streets would probably be closed, if we can so arrange it, between Somerset Street and Templeton. If there is any advantage in providing access between Templeton and the streets to the south of Templeton, subways could be provided on Blackburn, Chapel, Russell and Sweetland Streets, since the main line running into the Union Station will be on a much higher grade than the terminal yards. Nelson, Henderson and King Edward Avenues will be accommodated by under crossings. Nicholas street will be carried overhead. You will remember the street rises quickly at this point.

12 Jul 1906 Hearing on the proposal

This was subsequently rejected.

11 Oct 1906 Letter CNOR to Minister of Railways and Canals

New map submitted dated 1 Oct 1906 (not on file).

Earlier proposal rejected because it intersected too many City streets and reduced the value of taxable property, also intersected Strathcona Park. The route now projected lies entirely within the Twp of Nepean beyond the south eastern limit of the City of Ottawa, and no streets are crossed or intersected except Gladstone Avenue (or Anne Street) and the Montreal Road (road to Hurdman's Bridge), both of which will be crossed by overhead structures.

Objection was also made to our former proposition on account of proximity to the Isolation Hospital. This does not apply in the present case.

Further objections were also made that connection with the Central Station yard at a point between Templeton and Somerset Streets and it was necessary to cross several sidings and practically the whole of the station yard before we could reach the main passenger tracks running to the Central Station. This difficulty is overcome in the present proposition by making connections at a point immediately north-west of the overhead crossing of Gladstone Avenue with the main passenger tracks upon which the CPR takes its trains to the Central Station.

It is proposed to carry the track across the yard of the NYC south of Gladstone Avenue and south west of the Montreal Road upon a trestle or other overhead structures giving a clearance of 21 feet. This elevation will be maintained from a point east of the Montreal Road to the junction of the passenger track aforementioned.

It has been suggested that our location should parallel the existing location of the CPR and GTR from the Rideau River to the head of the deep cut on the canal, that is, it should

be carried between Montreal Road and the CPR tracks. There are several reasons why this is impossible. The intervening area which must be crossed is exclusive railway property and is not held under lease or subject to control by government for access to Central Station yards. The spur of the NYC from its junction with the CPR tracks to its station premises north west of Gladstone Avenue run down a steep incline rendering it impossible for us to carry our line parallel and adjacent to the CPR without entirely destroying this spur and the usefulness of the NYC yards. In order to carry our line parallel and adjacent to the CPR it would be necessary to run through the CPR wye east of the Rideau River and it would be impossible for us to place a Y in the vicinity of Hurdman's Bridge or in the immediate vicinity of the CPR tracks east of the bridge. The Y is necessary in order that our trains to Montreal, Toronto and French River may obtain prompt clearance from the spur to the Ottawa Central Station. A convenient location of that Y is shown on the map submitted.

It has also been suggested that our Company could very easily obtain running rights over the present tracks of the CPR or the GTR from a point east of the Rideau River to the Central Station. This is open to the serious objection that all our passenger trains into Ottawa, whether running between Montreal and Toronto or Montreal and French River and all our local freight trains for Ottawa must run in and out upon the same track occasioning double user of the tracks for every train.

1 Nov 1906 Matter heard by the Minister.

15 May 1907 Matter heard by the Minister.

15 May 1907 memorandum

After the maps and plans submitted and Messrs. Drinkwater, Cowan, Gays, Latchford and others heard it was decided that the diamond should be kept east of the Rideau River and the CNOR join the GTR tracks near the GTR bridge. Mr. Wicksteed was instructed to prepare further data to show whether or not this could be effected. Hearing was adjourned to 27th instant.

17 Dec 1908 Matter heard by the Minister.

18 Jan 1909 CNOR to Department of Railways and Canals

The bridging of the Rideau River must be done in the winter season and the greatest expedition will be necessary in order to get the work done before the ice goes out. With the opening of parliament the Minister will be busy - concerned overlook the hearing.

18 Jun 1909 Matter heard by the Minister.

24 June 1909 Department to CNOR

Plan was approved by Minister on 13th June.

24 Jun 1909 CNOR to Department

I am attaching a plan (not on file) showing our line together with the transfer track crossing Hurdman's Road and connecting with the CPR near the head block of the switch leading down to the O&NY yards.

Here the file ends.

RG 43 vol. 419 file 10281
Subsidy for line from Hawkesbury to Ottawa

25 July 1908 Letter from CNoR, Toronto to Dept. Railways and Canals.

Applies to enter into a contract for the subsidy granted last session (Subsidy Act 1908, items 66 and 68

"68. To the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company for a line of railway from Hawkesbury to Ottawa not exceeding 60 miles"

1 August 1908 Reply from Department A route map of this section has been filed but no plan and profile for subsidy purposes has been submitted. Before anything can be done in this matter it will be necessary to furnish the Department with this information in triplicate.

18 September 1908 Letter from CNoR to Dept.

Plans sent by express.

31 October 1908 Letter from CNoR to Dept.

Beg to enter into a supplementary contract for double subsidy.

Estimate of quantities and cost (\$928,312.15) - 30 September 1908 - this is signed by Chief Engineer - A.F. Stewart.

Estimate of quantities and cost (\$785,821.48) Toronto 30 September 1908.

Statement of Material on Hand (\$160,052.33) - no date.

Statement of subsidy eligible (from CNOR)

- 57 miles @ \$6,400 per mile \$354,800.00

- Completed 55% = \$200,640.00

There is 40% of double subsidy retained so that amount now payable is \$160,512.00

Estimate of work done and material delivered to 30 September 1908 - \$792,011

5 October 1908 Letter from W.H. Grant, Manager of Construction to E.V. Johnson, Dominion Government Inspecting Engineer

The timber structure at station 1698 has 29 bents; and at station 1788, Fox Creek 22 bents as shown on the profile. At Greens Creek at the 52nd mile, we are putting in a steel viaduct 410 feet long, consisting of five spans 30 feet, 3 spans 60 feet and one span 80

feet. There is 140 feet of trestle to be built on the east approach and 340 feet on the west approach to this bridge. The trestle work is now under way and the concrete pedestals are now being built for the viaduct. The order for the steel bridge has been placed with the Hamilton Bridge Company and the contract calls for erection in December of this year.

18 December 1908 Letter from CNoR to Department

We have constructed a very considerable portion of the subsidized line and our accountants are anxious to obtain payment. The route map and location plan is approved to a point within three miles of Ottawa. It does not seem reasonable that the contract be held up pending the approval of the fragment of the mileage remaining.

Internal discussion

The line was constructed under the name of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway yet the subsidy is granted to the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway.

5 Jan 1909 Letter from CNoR Ruel, Chief Solicitor, to Department.

Can get around the problem by taking out the contract in the name of the CNQR and assigning it to the CNOR.

12 Jan 1909 Department asks for a legal opinion from Solicitor General

26 Jan 1909 No objection from the Solicitor General to the course proposed by CNoR.

9 March 1909 Order in Council PC 1909-455 see data base for details

Statement of quantity and rates (\$1,419,045.00) undated "this estimate does not include the cost of reconstruction of the South Nation River Piers.

24 March 1909 Letter from Inspecting Engineer to Chief Engineer of Department

Approximate estimate of the cost of the line completed from Hawkesbury to Ottawa is \$1,287,045 (changed to \$1,415,745) or \$24,838 per mile. There is a detailed statement attached.

30 March 1909 Department of Labour to Dept.

Attaches a Fair Wages Schedule to be inserted into the contract.

7 April 1909 Department to CNoR (Ruel)

Attaches draft agreement.

8 April 1909 CNoR to Department

Returns agreement duly executed.

17 April 1909 CNoR to Department

Apply to enter into a supplementary contract for double subsidy.

24 April 1909 Department to CNoR

Until the transfer of the franchises is completed nothing can be done regarding a supplemental agreement.

11 June 1909 CNoR to Department

Encloses a list of stations. Details have been entered into the data base. Does not show Rivington or Hiawatha Park. W.Cs. to be built at each station. The only one to have been completed is Hawkesbury but those at L'Original and Longueil have been nearly completed.

23 June 1909 CNOR to Department

Encloses Engineers estimate of work done up to May 30 1909.

57 miles @\$6,400 per mile	\$364,800.00
Completed 87%	\$317,376.00

There is 40% of double subsidy retained so that the amount now payable is \$253,900.00

There is a detailed attachment showing quantities and cost 31 May 1909 (\$1,235,820.81).

30 June 1909 Inspection report (signature illegible) to M.J Butler Chief Engineer of Dept.

Inspection 9 June. Grading is practically completed from Hawkesbury to 54th mile, the road bed being in good shape with the exception of a few points where minor washouts have taken place consequent upon the exceptionally high water of the present season.

The track is laid to Greens Creek, 52 miles with 80lb new steel rails with angle plate joints, 60lb rails are used in sidings.

From Hawkesbury to the South Nation River 23 ½ miles the road is in good shape for traffic having one good lift of ballast, well surfaced, and lined and all structures completed.

The line is enclosed to about the 55th mile with a substantial fence of wire on cedar posts and all farm crossings are graded and supplied with steel frame and iron gates.

The telegraph line is erected to the South Nation River.

Lists station buildings - see data base for details.

Lists structures - see data base for details

South Nation River - the original piers were completed but failed owing to defective concrete and were all removed. New piers were built on the same line but moved 30' west, the 30' span being added. The whole structure is now in good solid condition.

Fencing consists of 7 strands No. 9 wire 54" high on cedar posts with 15' panels and 14' gates.

List of permanent structures - shown in data base.

25 September 1909 PC 1979 is issued - see data base.

29 September Mackenzie and Mann to Department

Pending the issue of double subsidy we would be glad to receive payment of single subsidy contract. Statement of work done as of 31 May 1909 is attached.

9 October 1909 PC 2085 is issued - see data base.

22 December 1909 PC 2422 is issued - see data base

5 Jan 1910 Letter from MacKenzie and Mann to Inspecting Engineer, E.V. Johnson.

Estimate of work done to 30 Nov 1909

Shows 98% completed on a total of \$1,393,919.50.

28 Jan 1910 Letter from Department to CNOR

Enclose cheque for \$250,982.40 (86% completed)

22 July 1910 MacKenzie and Mann to Department

Final estimate as of 30 June 1910.

Attachment shows \$1,554,268.30

less right of way through towns \$38,814.00 and cost of S.N. River and Greens creek bridges over \$25,000 each \$128,151.11 for a total of \$166,965.11 leaving a total cost of \$1,387,303.19.

26 September 1910 E.V. Johnson to Bowden Chief Engineer

Made an inspection from Hawkesbury to Ottawa on 27 July 1910.

The actual length of the line from Hawkesbury to the end of track at Ottawa station is 57.48 miles.

Whole road is now in good shape, slopes of banks and cuttings trimmed, right of way cleared etc.

Ballasting is completed with a depth of not less than 10 inches under the ties, the material being gravel and coarse sand. Track is laid throughout with 80lb steel rails and angle plate joints.

Line is enclosed throughout with standard "Page wire" fence on cedar posts and all farm crossings are properly graded and supplied with steel frame and wire gates.

The telegraph line is erected throughout.

All station buildings are well furnished, they are of a neat design and well suited to the business of the railway. The Ottawa station is a small wooden building, situated near the Rideau River crossing which is in use as a passenger station pending a settlement of the question of a permanent entrance to the city and is sufficient for the present business.

The bridge over the Rideau River is composed of 9 spans of 65' each, deck plate girdered on concrete piers and abutments.

All other structures are completed.

25 November 1910 PC 2379 is issued - see data base.

16 December 1910 Letter from Department to MacKenzie and Mann

Encloses cheque for \$116,889.60.

End of file.

RG 43 vol. 441 file 12028

Letter from Assistant Solicitor, CNOR in Toronto 27 Jul 1909

Pursuant to the provisions of the subsidy agreement regarding the CNOR line between Hawkesbury and Ottawa I beg to hand you herewith three copies of list of timber structures proposed to be built on the line showing details and to ask for the approval of the Minister.

First attachment shows the kind of timber to be used:

PILES – Tamarac, Cedar, Rock Elm, Spruce. Hemlock, Red, White or Norway Pine.

STRINGERS – White or Red Pine, Douglas Fir or Georgia Pine.

TIES – Red or White Norway Pine.

OTHER SAWN OR HEWN TIMBER – Red, White or Norway Pine.

SIKKS – Cedar or Tamarac

The main list was verified against data base, mileages on this list are measured from Hawkesbury and are to the middle point of the bridge. 54.54 has been added to them to make the mileage from Montreal. This listing only goes as far as the Butler's Creek trestle, it does not show the Rideau River crossing. A hand-written note indicates that this is about 76' per mile, they are all standard structures, of approved design, good material and workmanship.

The authority was dated 13 September, 1909.

RG 43 box 632 file 20468

Station at Alfred Centre

28 Jan 1920 CNR Vaughan to Bell, DM Railways and Canals.

On March 9 1919 the station at Alfred Centre was destroyed by fire. It was decided to place the new station at m. 70.2 which is two miles west of the old location because it was found that a station in that locality would serve a larger number of people. BRC sent

a representative to Alfred in connection with the site for the new station and he concurred.

Application to abandon the line between Hawkesbury (m. 47.5) and Hurdman (m. 104.1).

Judgement of 12 June, 1936. Order 53224 of same date.

Line was opened by the Canadian Northern Ontario in 1909. CNOR became part of CNoR in 1914 and it was acquired by the government in 1917.

In November 1930, the service in both directions between Hawkesbury and Hurdman consisted of a daily except Sunday motor car passenger train and a semi weekly wayfreight train. In November 1931 the passenger service was discontinued and the passenger traffic handled by a semi weekly mixed train until June 1932 when the passenger service was discontinued entirely. From that date until April 1933 there was a semi weekly wayfreight train and subsequently until the present a weekly wayfreight train was run in each direction.

Hearings were held in Ottawa on March 17, 1936. Rails were laid new in 1911 and are still in good condition, bridges are excellent, culverts are in good average condition, gravel is better than average, ties are in good condition and drainage good. Maximum grade eastbound is 0.5% and westbound 0.6% with little curvature, the maximum being 4°.

Year	Carloads	Loss
1932	304	21,501
1933	187	35,625
1934	266	12,432
1935	440	3,072

Nature of traffic was principally hay, oats and straw while construction material was for highway construction which parallels the line within a stone's throw for 25 miles. The CPR parallels the line several miles to the south and the Ottawa River has several ferries which serve the line in summer with carriage over the ice in winter. Motor bus and motor truck maintain regular service over the highway which is either decided upon or being contemplated as part of the TCH.

The objectors pointed out that the line was part of a through route between Ottawa and the new terminal at Montreal. Line needed no rehabilitation and only fair maintenance. In 1932 an overhead bridge had been constructed between L'Orignal and Hawkesbury eliminating a crossing at grade; a diversion was also made between Wendover and Clarence which partially eliminated two other crossings (they are not closed but are not

used for through traffic). A better, more frequent service would better serve the community.

Department of Highways contended that if the line were abandoned “it is of vital interest to us that we can build a highway on that line much cheaper than we can rebuild the present road.” There will be commenced in the near future a highway in keeping with the importance of Ottawa and Montreal and a highway along the CN between Plantagenet and Ottawa, about 25 miles, could be built about 40% cheaper than the present highway but the portion between Plantagenet and Hawkesbury will not be required.

Population has decreased slightly in the area. Rockland is most affected with the closure of the lumber mills with very little prospects in sight for a revival of the business. Rockland Chemical Co anticipate large export of alumina one of their products from the use of clay which would require inbound shipments of coal, salt and miscellaneous freight.

Application was dismissed considering the financial improvement in the past three years.

Application to abandon the line between Hawkesbury (mile 32.7) and Hurdman (mile 89.3), a total distance of 56.6 miles.

Heard by the Board on June 27, 1936

Judgement rendered July 8, 1939

Order 57728 issued July 10, 1939

Note variation on mileage between this application and the 1936 application.

Neither City of Ottawa nor Ontario Highways Department made any submissions.

CNR contended that the line was built as part of a through transcontinental route and could never have been justified on its local potential alone. It was built to high standards with an excellent roadbed with few, if any, grades or curves and is laid almost entirely with 85 lb rails. Rails are still in good condition but the bridges and culverts are only in “fair to poor” condition and in the near future will require considerable expenditure. If the road is to be kept in operation.

The railway passes through a well settled district where mixed farming is carried on. Through the district a substantial dairying industry is carried on and a large quantity of hay is produced annually. But in the town and villages between Hawkesbury and Ottawa there has been no industrial development of any kind. Rockland is an incorporated town and had a population of 4,000 at one time and was formerly the centre of a lumbering industry but the lumber mills are now closed and the population of Rockland since the 1931 census has decreased to about 2,000 inhabitants. Between Hawkesbury and Hurdman there are ten stations or stopping places for trains (the statement shows eleven).

Apart from Rockland and L'Original which has a population, according to the last census, of 1,121, these stations are at small settlements which might be described as hamlets.

There is a line of the Canadian Pacific running to the south of the CNR at varying distances therefrom and the approximate distances from the railway in question to other railways are set out in a statement furnished by CNR as follows:

Station	Miles *	Route
L'Original	4.0	Hawkesbury - CNR
Evanturel	4.5	Caledonia Springs - CPR
Laframboise	7.5	Alfred - CPR
	4.5	By highway and ferry to Fassett - CPR
Alfred Centre	6.5	Alfred station - CPR
	3.5	By highway and ferry to Montebello - CPR
Treadwell	6.0	Plantagenet Springs - CPR
	1.5	By highway and ferry to Papineauville - CPR
Jessop	6.0	Plantagenet Springs - CPR
	5.5	By highway and ferry to Papineauville - CPR
Wendover	8.5	Plantagenet Springs - CPR
Clarence	10.0	Bourget - CPR
	3.5	By highway and ferry to Lochaber Bay - CPR
Rockland	10.5	Hammond - CPR
	6.0	By highway and ferry to Thurso - CPR
Cumberland	8.0	Leonard - CPR
	2.0	By highway and ferry to Masson - CPR
Orleans	7.0	Blackburn - CPR

* distance from railway to nearest station after abandonment.

All of these stations are within reasonable distance of the Ottawa River which is navigable at these points and there is also on the north side of the Ottawa River another line of the CPR. The evidence concerning ferries and water transportation was conflicting and indefinite. The current ferry service would not be adequate to meet the needs of the district. Highway 17 is kept open summer and winter.

The train service is limited. There is only one freight train per week and for a number of years there has not been any passenger or express service. The abandonment of the line would mean only the cutting off of one freight train and no changes to the passenger and express service.

System Loss

Year	Carloads	Loss
1932	304	21,501
1933	187	35,625

1934	266	12,432
1935	440	3,072
1936		13,336
1937		12,035
1938		26,007

Maintenance charges vary considerably from year to year. For a line of this standard these should be around \$28,000 per year but they are considerably less than this.

Summary of Inward traffic (number of cars) (1932 data added from file 39310.16)

Station	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
L'Orignal	36	52	16	18	19	24	16
Evanturel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Laframboise	-	2	8	1	1	-	-
Alfred Centre	5	4	5	-	1	1	1
Treadwell	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jessop	-	13	1	-	1	-	1
Wendover	4	13	1	-	1	-	1
Rockland	71	72	43	46	43	47	42
Cumberland	19	4	6	2	3	2	2
Orleans	7	2	7	5	6	4	4
Clarence Ck	3						
Total		149	86	72	74	78	66

Summary of Outward traffic (number of cars) (1932 data added from file 39310.16)

Station	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
L'Orignal	9	8	11	69	33	23	1
Evanturel	3	5	27	36	46	50	11
Laframboise	22	3	42	109	71	82	29
Alfred Centre	84	1	22	41	32	67	15
Treadwell	8	-	6	6	12	12	1
Jessop	3	1	8	11	17	9	-
Wendover	4	4	20	12	27	57	8
Rockland	4	4	29	27	18	41	12
Cumberland	5	-	7	1	2	3	-
Orleans	1	-	1	-	-	5	1
Clarence Ck	37	11	7	56			
Total		26	173	312	258	349	78

Those opposing pointed out that there were problems with the roads in winter and that Cumberland could become a dormitory suburb of Ottawa.

Since the coming into force of the amendment to the Railway Act in 1933, (section 165A) the Board has jurisdiction to decide abandonments. It has decided that the railway must not only show a loss but that the community will not be unduly inconvenienced. In this case the losses to the railway will far outweigh the loss or inconvenience to the community. The railway is not in a position to convey clear title to the land because the railway undertaking, including the right of way, is subject to a trust mortgage in favour of bondholders. Counsel for the railway said the company would facilitate the transfer of the use and possession of the right of way to adjoining proprietors so far as it was able to do.

Merrilees Collection, National Archives, 84503/19 D 330, F2 Container 2000002705
CNR Blueprints showing lines abandoned.

RG 12 vol. 2494 file 3466-11

CNR application - PC 1939-2449 see wording. The reason for the running rights agreement was to cover the interests of the mortgage holders of the Canadian Northern in the event of a breach of the covenant compelling them to take possession of the railway and operate over the Canadian National lines in place of the lines abandoned.

RG 46 vol. 493 file 39310.16

Abandonment file

18 January 1935 from CNR

Application to abandon between Hawkesbury, mile 47.5 and Hurdman, mile 104.1 and the Clarence Creek Spur between Rockland, mile 0.0 and Clarence Creek, mile 4.6. Included are a general description of the line, special industrial relationship, revenues and expenses October 1930 to September 1931 and for the calendar year 1933, analysis of freight traffic, map of territory through which the line runs.

System loss \$65,980 (October 1930 to September 1931)
1933 - \$35,625

Present train service (timetable Jan 6 1935) - wayfreight once a week in each direction, westbound Thursday and eastbound Friday.

No passenger service since June 1932.

Timetable Oct 1 1930 Motor train daily ex Sunday

10.25 lv Hawkesbury arr 18.45

12.12 arr Hurdman lv 16.58

Timetable Apr 26 1931 Motor train daily except Sunday

10.25 lv Hawkesbury arr 18.55

12.12 arr Hurdman lv 17.05

Mixed train twice a week in each direction throughout period (i.e 1930 and 1931).

Protests from Cumberland, Rockland, C.W. Hall Co. (hay and grain shipments),
L'Orignal, Clarence, Prescott and Russell county, Alfred, Hawkesbury,

No objection from Post Office

8 February 1935 from CNR

Arranging one of our Quebec business cars to this inspection. Suggest you leave Ottawa on train #2 Wednesday morning next, 13th instant, for Montreal where you will be met by our representatives and proceed to Hawkesbury by special train.

22 February 1935 joint report of Operating and Engineering Inspectors.

Very detailed - they met with a number of groups along the line (we also stopped at Cumberland and Orleans which are both flag stations but no one showed up. Cheese factories in the area. Many suggested that the line be continued for a few years and they would see if additional business could be generated.

Physical conditions of the line proposed are:

Rails 85 lbs laid new in 1919, their condition good. Trestle bridge in good condition. Culverts good average condition, gravel ballast. Ties said to be good condition but there would have to be a large number of renewals. Drainage is said to be good and therefore the line would not cost a great deal to put it in first-class condition.

The Clarence Creek spur is not in good condition. The steel varies from 65 to 80 lbs. Considerable work would have to be done to put this branch in proper running condition. The mixed train only runs over this line when there is sufficient hay and straw offered at Clarence Creek.

There are four section crews with a foreman and two men at present on the line.

L'Orignal - 30 car siding, 3 creameries, 1 sawmill, station consists of waiting room, freight shed, steel water tank.

Evanturel - caretaker, passing track and 6 car siding

Laframboise - Flag station, 49 car passing track

Alfred Centre - Caretaker and 9 car siding, station and freight shed

Treadwell - Flag station - 42 car passing siding track and 6 car siding

Jessop - flag station, 8 car siding

Wendover - flag station, 44 car passing track, 6 car siding

Clarence - Flag stop no siding

Clarence Creek - on branch line siding for loading hay

Rockland - Agent - 67 car passing track and 46 car siding, station, waiting room, freight shed in good condition

Cumberland - flag station - 44 car passing track, 6 car siding

Orleans - flag station, 44 car passing track, 6 car siding.

Suggest line be kept in operation for a year to determine the increase in business that might occur or that the matter be set down for a hearing.

5 April 1935 notice of hearing to be held 16 April 1935 at Ottawa Court Room

30 May 1935 from CNR Commission Counsel Rand to Board

The hearing was put off at the request of Mr. Chevrier MP.

Last fall at the urgent request of the traffic department which indicated that 100 loads of revenue freight would be furnished from Clarence Creek spur temporary repairs were made at a cost of \$250.00. No extensive tie renewals were made however and we find the line is unsafe for operation and if we continue to operate during the coming summer it will be necessary to put in not less than 500 ties at a cost for labor and material of approximately \$600.

The service on the branch is presently given by a side trip of the way freight but as Clarence Creek appears in our tariffs we must accept freight to and from that station in the absence of an embargo.

Asks leave to discontinue the service over this spur branch and to issue an embargo. This is on the understanding that should the Board not grant the application for abandonment we will immediately make such repairs as are necessary to permit operation to renew the spur service.

1930-31 heavy shipments outbound October to April. In 1933 earnings were \$909.00, 11 carloads outbound. For 1934 the total revenue was \$1,856 consisting largely of cheese, hay, straw and oats.

Do not feel there would be any serious public inconvenience.

This was forwarded to Chevrier MP who discussed it with clients who do not consent to the abandonment of the line and spur asked for.

26 June 1935 from Cartwright (Board Secretary) to CNR

Service must be continued pending decision of the Board.

5 September 1936 from Ontario Department of Highways

Interested in the abandonment of tracks from Hawkesbury to Hurdman.

2 October 1935 notice of hearing to be held 22 October 1935 at Ottawa Court Room

10 October 1935 from Rockland Chemical Co.

Expect to get a large project underway soon. Limestone quarry, secured half interest in Clarence Woollen Mills. Keogh Process, clay, salt, coal, sulphuric acid to produce aluminium sulphate, soda ash, hydrochloric acid and silica for fertilizer.

11 October 1935 from Chevrier

Asks for a postponement, hearing is set about one week after the federal election.

18 October 1935 notice of hearing to be held 26 November 1935 in Ottawa Court Room.

16 November 1935 Memorandum

Aurelien Belanger MPP has been trying to arrange a further postponement, Has been working among municipalities to have them withdraw their objections. Further postponement will bring it past the date of the municipal elections.

20 November 1935 notice of hearing to be held 16 December 1935 in Ottawa Courtroom.

Chevrier sick and will not be strong enough to argue the case until February.

6 December 1935 notice of hearing to be held first week of February 1936.

17 February 1936 notice of hearing to be held 17 March 1936 in Ottawa Courtroom.

6 March 1936 from township of Cumberland

The CNR is not of as much importance to the farmers of the township as an improved provincial automobile road system. Recommends the removal of the railway tracks provided the dominion and provincial governments build a branch provincial road running southerly between conc. 4 and 5 Russell twp. then on southerly to the village of Embrun or Russell.

12 March 1936 from Napoleon Paquette, trustee of Cumberland.

Not in favour. When a parlour car was put on employees of the McLaren Company would come across the river and join this train because the timing of the CPR did not suite their taste.

18 March 1935 from Rockland Chemical company

Have purchased all the land of W.C. Edwards who ceased operations and demolished their two mills (land between the highway and the river).

9 April 1935 from Ontario Department of Highways

Wants to know when a decision will be made as abandonment would change our plans completely. Anticipate rebuilding east of Ottawa following the old railway line.

28 May 1936 from CNR

Clarence Creek spur. In May 1933 the wooden trestle, 8 spans, 86 feet at mile 3.64 became unsafe and the line was closed until August 1934 when that portion from the crossing north of this trestle to Rockland was put into condition for handling cars. In October 1934 sufficient repairs were made to the trestle to enable shipments of hay from Clarence Creek and the line was kept open until May 1935, when it was again closed to traffic being considered unsafe for operation. In October 1935, after tie renewals between Rockland and mile 3.64 the line was opened for use up to this point, but beyond mile 3.64 it has remained closed.

13 June 1936 order 53224 is issued - refuses abandonment between Hawkesbury and Hurdman but approves abandonment of Clarence Creek spur.

In the judgement it notes the highway improvements and emphasizes the increase in revenues in the last year.

30 June 1936 from Ontario Department of Highways

We save some money for the present at least. As we have closed down all work east of Ottawa because of the decision, you will be interested to know that both federal and provincial members are having a bit of grief.

Text of a letter from C.D. Howe, Minister of Transport - in part, correspondence with Belanger MPP

The Dominion Government believes that the line should be abandoned as it has become completely useless as a carrier.

I trust you can arrange with the ratepayers and businessmen that abandonment is in their best interest. If so I will arrange that the right of way be made available for highway purposes whenever the provincial government wish to commence work.

24 April 1938 application for abandonment by CNR.

31 May 1939 Rockland Chemical (St. Johns PQ)

We are still interested in the Rockland site but it would be useless to establish there is your decision is to abandon. In the interim we have secured a very valuable site and property in St. Johns QC. We expect to be in production the latter end of June.

Letters of protest (Wendover, Treadwell)but also of support. City of Ottawa no opinion. Department of Highways still interested.

11 June 1939 hearing to be held 27 June 1939 in Ottawa Courtroom.

10 July 1939 order 57728 is issued also judgement

26 July 1939 from CNR

The second clause is clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Board to control the disposal of the lands of a right of way upon abandonment. If this clause is not withdrawn from the order it will be necessary for me to submit a formal appeal for a reconsideration.

End of file.

RG 12 vol. 1347 file 3554-26

Abandonment

2 April 1936 parliamentary question from Deslauriers MP.

1. Has the government decided to dispose of the railway line between Ottawa and L'Orignal or Hawkesbury?
2. What is the distance between the two cities?
3. Has the government ever had the intention of electrifying this line and did any companies offer to electrify it?
4. Was it ever suggested to the government that the result obtained on the Montreal-Granby line was possible on this Ottawa-Hawkesbury line?

30 April answered - unrevised debates page 2104

1. The CNR has an application before the board of Railway Commissioners, therefore the matter is sub judice.
2. The distance between Ottawa Union Station and Hawkesbury is 59 miles.
3. The CNR never had any intention to electrify this line, and neither the management nor the government know of any offer to electrify it.
4. The financial result of the operation of the Montreal to Granby line being a heavy annual deficit, it has not heretofore been suggested as a model for the operation of the Ottawa-Hawkesbury section.

11 June 1935 order 53224

10 July 1939 order 57728 and Judgement

RG 30 vol. 9338 file 1046-61-32

Bridge over Greene's Creek

26 August 1908 from CNOR to Board

Requests authority to construct a bridge over Greene's Creek mile 52 west from Hawkesbury.

Hamilton Bridge Co. blue prints and diagrams.

11 November 1908 order 5584 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9338 file T/1046-61-39

Bridge over Rideau River

3 July 1909 CNOR application for authority to construct a steel bridge over the Rideau River at mile 56.9 west from Hawkesbury.

15 July 1909 order 7503 is issued.

Hamilton Bridge company.

2 September 1909 order 7945 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9334 file T/1046-60-7

Transfer track with CPR at Hurdman

24 September 1909 CNOR application to the Board for authority to construct a transfer track connecting the approved line of the CNOR north of Hurdman's Road with the tracks of the CPR south of Hurdman's Road at mile 57.17 west from Hawkesbury. In the covering letter - this matter was partially dealt with at the hearing of the location plans running into the City of Ottawa but was withdrawn since the connections had not been agreed upon with the CPR. Since it is understood that the connection as proposed is satisfactory to the CP our company agreeing however to construct gates at the crossing of Hurdman's Road and to place a signal north of Hurdman's Road so as to prevent trains from being stalled upon the road.

24 September 1909 from A.J. Stewart, Chief Engineer, MacKenzie, Mann & Co to Ruel, Assistant Solicitor

In case I don't get back tomorrow morning I am confirming what I telephoned you - and adding one item which I forgot.

Mountain agrees to our connection with the CPR as we originally proposed, that is with their siding, immediately east of the switch leading to the NYC yard. The Board will require a signal to be placed on our line to govern trains entering, preferably placed on the east of Hurdman's Road. It was understood between the CPR and Mr. Barclay that an operator will be kept at point of junction, this will necessitate a small office, but it will still be a much cheaper connection to make than the other one proposed.

Mr. Gays tells me the NYC will not oppose this connection, though they would oppose the other, the one crossing their tracks. But his Company will require an agreement and small rental for the corner of their property crossed by our connecting line - we cannot avoid crossing this.

I may say that Mountain prefers the junction with the CPR siding, to the one proposed by the CPR which would cross the NYC tracks into their yard.

Should we not take up with the municipality the crossing of Hurdman Road? If their consent can be obtained it will make matters easier before the Board. I would suggest that Mr. Moore tackle that, as I think he can do more with them than any other, and more astutely avoid giving too big a "quid pro quo".

Mr. Gays tells me that his company has not had any proposals made to them for accommodation in their yard, roundhouse and freight shed, since Barclay met with him last June and that if any is wanted the company should let him know, as if it is, new tracks will have to be laid, and some additions made to the roundhouse and freight shed. The season is getting late and there is only the accommodation required for the NYC there now. His consent to our crossing their property is in no way dependent on our using their yard facilities, but he wants to know whether the Company desires to use these or not.

Our track is now to the O&P (Ottawa and Prescott?) track, we expect the diamond to be put in today, (presume this is the diamond at Rideau Junction, not Hurdman) and if what I am told is correct there is no reason why we should not run trains over our temporary bridge by the end of October at the latest if arrangements are made with the CPR and GTR for entrance to the Central Station. I am going out on the line today and will know more definitely by tonight - I think trains could be brought in now via our connection with the O&P track which is in.

Will you please see Mr. Mann about these matters.

File out of chronological order

13 September 1909 from W.D. Barclay, General Manager to A.F. Stewart Chief Engineer of Construction, MacKenzie Mann

I saw Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Leonard today regarding the junction with their line at Ottawa.

Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Leonard are of the opinion that we could join their line as shown by red line on the sketch that I enclose you. (missing from file) He said that we could bill this track parallel to their line, 14 ft. centres, joining their line 500 feet west of the west switch. In this way we could cross the spur going into the New York & Ottawa Freight station alongside of their tracks, and be on the same level as the other tracks are.

My proposition to Mr. Leonard was that we join near the switch of the New York and Ottawa so as to avoid a crossing and run through the switches into their main line, our maintaining an operator at the switch to get orders for the movement of our trains between the switch and the central station. He says, however, that he would be willing to do this, but the Board of Railway Commissioners will not allow it, that they would compel an interlocking plant at this point, which would be difficult to operate, as it would require a derail on each of the side tracks as well as their main line, and he considers that this would be more expensive to operate than if we placed the proposed junction 500 ft.

west of their west switch. He says though, that if you could arrange with the Railway Board to allow us to join as I proposed, on their siding just east of the New York and Ottawa switch and run through the switches into their main line by maintaining an Operator there, and avoid putting in an interlocking plant, he will have no objection to our doing it in this way. So you can decide what to do in this matter.

2 October 1909 to Beatty from CNOR

I find that Barclay on the 13th of September reported to Mr. Stewart, our Chief Engineer, that he had gone over the line with Sullivan and Leonard I that day and a connection had been proposed running through the Ottawa and New York tracks and connecting with your line at a point nearer the Union Station than that shown on the plans last submitted. The final paragraph of his report reads this way-

He (that is Mr. Leonard) says though, that if you could arrange with the Railway Board to allow us to join as I proposed, on their siding just east of the New York and Ottawa switch and run through the switches into their main line by maintaining an Operator there, and avoid putting in an interlocking plant, he will have no objection to our doing it in this way.

Accordingly, Mr. Stewart went to Ottawa last week and went over the ground with the Chief Engineer of the Board. Mountain was apparently willing that the junction be made near the east end of the New York and Ottawa switch, as mentioned by Barclay, provided we placed an operator at the junction and a signal on the transfer track north of Hurdman's Road. This we agreed to and made application accordingly. I assumed that Stewart would communicate with Barclay and Barclay with Leonard accordingly, but apparently this has not been done.

1 June 1914 from Wicksteed to Temple

I send you hereto attached plan and profile of proposed transfer track with the CPR near Chaudiere Junction. I wish to say that this is asked for as a substitute for the existing transfer track at Hurdman's Bridge and it is believed to be in the interest of both railways that the changes should be made. Mr. Hills was to have taken up this question with his peers of the CPR but I am doubtful whether he has done so. If not I will help you as far as I can with the arguments to be used if any opposition develops.

RG 30 vol. 9334 file 1046-60-13

Junction with the New York and Ottawa at Ottawa

1 October 1910 CNOR application for authority to connect its lines and tracks with the lines and tracks of the New York and Ottawa Railway near Ottawa, mile 57.17 from Hawkesbury, by means of a transfer track.

The present idea is to file a plan showing the connection with the NY&O striking out the portion relating to the junction with the CPR.

4 October 1910 from CNOR Ruel to Board D'Arcy Scott

With respect to this Company's application to cross Hurdman's Road and to connect our existing tracks with the tracks of the CPR and the Ottawa and New York Railway south of Hurdman's Road; I beg to advise that the present application is intended to cover temporary facilities only, pending the conclusion of negotiations with the City and other interests for permanent terminal passenger and freight facilities in Ottawa sufficient for the needs of the Ottawa-Toronto and Ottawa-Montreal connections now in course of construction. The present station facilities used by this company in Ottawa for both passenger and freight traffic are temporary, insufficient for present needs, but it seems inexpedient to design or construct permanent terminal facilities, on other sites, until the Company's traffic more fully warrants it and until present negotiations are completed.

Under these circumstances we have to request approval of our present application as temporary expedient, the crossing of Hurdman's Road being protected by watchmen at the Company's expense. I understand that the City will not withhold its consent to the temporary crossing of Hurdman's Road pending a development of some permanent scheme.

October 6 - plans returned to CNOR from Board for the purpose of amendment.

14 October 1910 Answer from the O&NY

The Ottawa and New York Railway is willing to consent to the proposed connection, subject to the usual terms provided the point of connection is the SOUTHERLY boundary of Hurdman's Road, that being the NORTHERLY boundary of the land owned by the Ottawa and New York Railway.

The Ottawa and New York Railway Company will itself build the portion of the line in question running from the point of connection as shown on the plan filed with the application, to the SOUTHERLY boundary of Hurdman's Bridge Road, that being the portion of the proposed line being located on land owned by the Ottawa and New York Railway.

21 October 1910 Answer from the City of Ottawa

The corporation of the City of Ottawa objects to the said order being made upon the ground that the said connection, as shown on the plan filed with the application, involved the crossing at grade level of Hurdman's Road, a public highway in the City of Ottawa.

25 October 1910 memo from Assistant Solicitor

I went to Ottawa yesterday to see Messrs. Mabee and Scott to ascertain what their understanding was with reference to the crossing of Hurdman Road.

I saw Mr. Scott first as Mr. Mabee was not in town. He says that during his discussion with Mr. Mackenzie he only had reference to a crossing of the road by one set of tracks but possibly Mr. Mackenzie may have thought that he referred to two sets of tracks. Mr. Scott said, however, owing to the fact that we proposed to place gates at the crossing and that the application was only for authority to make the connection for about a year he

would have no objection personally to two tracks but that he would like to see Mr. Mabee first. He saw Mr. Mabee later in the day and when I called advised me that their decision was that we would have to inform the Board definitely that negotiations were going on foot with the City of -- divert Hurdman's Road northerly along the river to connect with Gladstone Avenue, placing a subway under our tracks. I telephoned to you because he said that if we could give them this statement that he thought that there would be practically no objection to the hearing from the Board.

Mr. Mabee returned to the office later in the afternoon and I saw him and asked what his understanding with Mr. Macckenzie was. He said that you were present at the interview and that there was no discussion at all of two tracks; that he never intended that we should lay two tracks. He said that there was very little encouragement to help the Canadian Northern because if you gave them an inch they took a yard. He said he objected to two tracks crossing the road, even temporarily because if the tracks were once laid the Board would not be able owing to public opinion to order them removed. He said that at his interview with you and Mr. Mackenzie it was stated that negotiations would be started with the City as to the diversion of Hurdman's Road but that after two or three months nothing had been done. I then asked him whether he could not see his way to let us put in the application for two tracks because owing to the closeness of the tracks and the fact that we would have gates there would be no difference as far as danger to the public was concerned. Mr. Mabee said of course there was nothing to prevent us putting in an application to cross with six tracks if we chose but that if we asked him what his understanding with Mr. Mackenzie was he could only say it was for a crossing with one set of tracks. In accordance with your instructions, therefore, I re-filed the plans showing the crossing with one set of tracks only to connect with the Ottawa and New York Railway.

29 October 1910 from CNOR to CPR Beatty

Mr. Phippen arranged with the Chairman of the Railway Commissioners to bring in an application to cross Hurdman's Road for the purpose of joining with the Ottawa and New York for freight purposes. Subsequently the President saw Commissioner Scott and while I understand nothing was definitely settled it was presumed that the application would include not only the joining with the Ottawa and New York but also a junction with your sidings for the purpose of running into the Union Station. This not being in accordance with Mr. Phippen's original understanding with the Chairman, Mr. Phippen would not in the absence of Mr. Mackenzie countenance the filing of any application which would look like a breach of understanding with the Chairman. Consequently the application which I understand comes up on the 3rd instant relates only to the junction with the New York and Ottawa, the possible junction with your own line remaining in abeyance.

The contemplated junction with the Ottawa and New York will be made at a point on the Ottawa and New York constructed tail track which lies about half way between your embankment and the south side of Hurdman's Road. It is not proposed to touch or in any

way interfere with the transfer track running down the north side of your embankment and connecting your tracks with the Ottawa and New York,

6 December 1910 order 12751 is issued.

14 October 1912 from Spaidal to Temple

It occurs to me that our right to cross Hurdman Road making connection with the O&NY is only temporary and expires next December. Our interchange with the O&NY averages now four or five cars each way per day and would not like to be compelled to discontinue this connection. Please advise.

16 October 1912 memo to Spaidal, General Supt, CNQR Montreal from Temple

12751 - no limit placed on this connection. The order approving of the crossing of Hurdman's Road, 12723, - tracks must be removed by 1 December 1912 under penalty of \$100 for every day the company is in default.

18 October 1912 from Temple to Spaidal

On average how many movements are there a day across Hurdman's Road and if possible whether you could reduce these to say two, one delivering the cars to the O&NY and the other taking them from said railway and whether it would be possible if called upon to do this interswitching, say at nighttime.

19 October 1912 from Spaidal to Temple

It is not impossible to do this switching over the Hurdman Road at night time but neither the Ottawa and New York or ourselves have an engine working at night time at Ottawa. It would mean considerable extra expense and the payment of a full night's wages for every night's work transferring few cars.

I would prefer the movement be restricted to say two or four movements per day of twenty four hours without any restrictions as to hours. However, if it is found impossible to continue the crossing unless restrictions are placed, compelling us to do the work at night we must agree to it as it would be a very great hardship if the crossing were discontinued.

22 November 1912 from Spaidal to Temple

I note order that tracks crossing Hurdman's Road must be removed by 1st December 1912 under penalty of \$100 for every day the company is in default after that date. Will you please secure extension of time. We cannot possibly move those tracks now. We are getting winter's supply of coal via New York and Ottawa Ry. amounting to five or six cars per day. Have not heard any complaint on account of the crossing. Through rates have been put in via Ottawa and NYC and traffic is established. Our interchange amounts to about ten cars per day.

End of file.

RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-56
Highway crossings North Plantagenet township.
15 December 1908 order 5855 is issued

RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-57
Diversion and crossing of Montreal Road mile 28 west from Hawkesbury.
Plan and profile
22 December 1908 order 5940 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-59
Highway crossing Montreal Road, Cameron Street near Cumberland station.
Plan and profile shows Cumberland station grounds.

Application was dismissed by 5838

New application.

Township concerned about the condition of crossings - CNOR replaced crossing planks.

22 January 1909 order 5983 is issued.

6 February 1909 order 6178 is issued

7 February 1909 order 8015 is issued

RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-68
Road diversion at Greene's Creek.
29 October 1908 from A.F. Stewart, Assistant Chief Engineer CNOR to Mr. Barbour

Mr. Sykes proposed to build an overhead bridge at this point, instead of the road diversion which we had contemplated; but on making an estimate of the cost of construction and maintenance of this bridge, I find it would be so expensive that we could better afford to make the diversion proposed in your memo of 17th instant, if we could purchase the land, payment of damages, and construction of the road for about \$2,000. I would suggest you find out whether council would agree to the diversion proposed by you, and also whether the turnpike trust would object. If they did, possibly their objection might be removed if we moved the toll-gate eastwards to near the point where the new road would come in to the Montreal Road. The Board of Railway Commissioners might object to having the toll-gate so close to the crossing of the Railway.

18 November 1908 from A.B. Greene to J. Barbour, CNOR

The directors of the Ottawa, Montreal and Russell Consolidated Road Company have authorized me to deal with the matter of your changing the side road immediately east of Green's Creek to a point further east.

If you are in the city any time soon I will be pleased to meet you.

30 December 1908 from Barbour, Right of Way Agent to Greene

Accept your offer in connection with the closing of the cross road at Greene's Creek and the Company will substitute a road on the property of Joseph Cosgrove and pay you the amount asked viz. \$300.

27 January 1909 agreement between CNOR and consolidated road company.

Plan included.

19 May 1909 from Consolidated Road Co to CNOR

The crossing over our road near Green's Creek Bridge has not been properly graded and that the planking between the tracks are not quite long enough to render the crossing of the tracks by passengers along our road conveniently. Will you kindly notify the men in charge of the work of this matter.

25 May 1909 from Sykes, Division Engineer

The crossing of this road was made up last winter while the snow was on the ground and is somewhat steep, but as soon as we can get there with the ballast train we will make it up with good material and top dress with broken stone.

Three lengths of planking were put down last winter but Dan MacKenzie took up one length to fix up Mrs. Coombs crossing. At present we cannot reach there by train, but hope to have all fixed up at an early date this one included.

The crossing was in passable condition the last time I was there.

RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-70

Highway crossings Township of Gloucester

17 December 1908 Highway crossings in the township of Gloucester

45.26 County line, road between Counties of Carleton and Russell.

49.52 Side road between lots 5 & 6 conc.1

51.63 Montreal & Ottawa public road E ½ lot 13 con 1

51.81 Public road between lots 13 & 14 conc. 1

52.37 Side road between lots 15 & 16 conc. 1

52.56 Concession road between concs. 1 and 2

53.65 Public road between lots 20 & 21 conc. 2

There has been no construction work done beyond mileage 53.5 and the line as located is subject to change beyond mileage 54.

11 March 1909 order 6503 is issued

15 March 1909 order 6518 is issued.

24 July 1909 order 7606 is issued

24 July 1909 order 7607 is issued

24 July 1909 order 7608 is issued

RG 30 vol. 9320 file 1046-58-72

**Highway crossings in township of North Plantagenet
5 June 1909 orders 7167-7167-7169 are passed.**

**RG 30 vol. 9376 file 1046-67-81
Spur line Riordan Pulp & Paper, Hawkesbury
31 March 1917 application for authority to construct and operate a spur line to
serve Riordan Pulp and Paper Co. at Hawkesbury.**

3 April 1917 order 26005 is issued.

**RG 30 vol. 9306 file 1046-26-284
Dam and fills on Leonard's Creek**
5 February 1920 Application to Board of Railway Commissioners
Plan showing Dam and Mills on Railway Fill, Leonard's Creek
J.H. Cardinal erected a grist mill about 29 years ago and a saw mill over 12 years ago.
From 1908 to 1918 the railway crossed the creek on a wooden trestle. In the summer of
1918 the railway erected a concrete culvert 15'x15'x100 and in June 1919 the trestle was
filled in and the culvert covered with earth. This restricts the flow of water during the
spring. This could flood the sawmill yard and has depreciated the value of the property.

26 March 1920 Answer from the railway

As there is a highway bridge with exactly the same area of opening 700 ft. upstream and
as this highway bridge has always passed all of the water without trouble there is no
doubt that our culvert is sufficient to take the same amount of water.

Nothing further.

**RG 30 vol. 9346 file 1046-62-14
Crossing of GTR spur to Edwards Mill at Rockland.**
4 July 1906 CNOR application to cross GTR at Rockland between m. 36 and 37 west
from Hawkesbury.

9 July 1906 from T.L. Simmons to Ruel
I notice that the line runs through the village of Rockland taking nine out of eighteen
houses/ I would be glad to know if it is absolutely necessary to locate the line as shown
on the plan. Might not these houses be avoided?

11 July 1906 From Ruel
The difficulty at Rockland is the existence of the GTR. Sending a blueprint of the
crossing map which will show the situation better. We are not partial to running through
house sites if it can be avoided.

Plan and profiles, shows two alternative crossings. Station at Rockland near mile 36.

26 October 1906 Answer from GTR

An overhead crossing would be preferable of a passenger line. Our interests are not sufficient to cause us to press for one.

8 November 1906 from George Mountain.

On November 7 I made an examination of the proposed crossing. While an overhead crossing is feasible it is not a good location in the interests of the town. Application by CNOR for a crossing at grade should be granted subject to at least interlocking semaphores without the derailing device, at present. To be installed and operated by the CNOR although I am of the opinion that it may be necessary to keep men for that purpose.

29 November 1906 order 2031 is issued.

24 July 1908 From Stewart, Asst Chief Engineer to Ruel.

We expect to commence laying track at Rockland within a week or so and I shall be glad to know that our crossing order for this spur is secured so that we can go ahead without delay.

25 August 1908 From Stewart to Ruel

I wrote Mountain on 15th inst. enclosing white prints shewing the arrangement we proposed at the GTR crossing at Rockland. This plan shewed semaphores on both lines instead of only on our line as called for in order 2031. His reply was that it was not necessary to change the order as the Chief Engineer can arrange the details by simply stamping the plan corrected, but he suggests we send a blue print to the GTR.

3 November 1908 order 5569 is issued.

28 November 1908 from CNOR to Board.

Order 5569 allowing us to cross the GTR for construction purposes expires December 3. Our material yards are on the east side of the crossing and we have still to construct our tracks from Rockland to Ottawa on the west side of the crossing, so that we shall require additional time for construction purposes before we are ready to operate, or before we can have protective devices installed. Applies for an extension of 3 months. This is only a spur we are crossing and no serious inconvenience will be caused to the GTR..

GTR wished CNOR to take a lease of the tower site on its land.

4 December 1908 Ruel to GTR

Will you not call off your dog. This has never been customary as far as I am aware.

3 December 1908 order 5749 is issued.

7 December 1908 CNOR to Board

Grand Trunk Superintendent disregarding Board's order extending time of Rockland construction order and blocking our operations. Please issue instructions to obey orders.

7 December 1908 CNOR to GTR

Re Rockland crossing Donaldson disregarding extension order. Please instruct him to obey it.

11 December 1908 Cowan GTR Legal to CNOR Legal

The company will not insist on the CNOR signing our usual form of lease for the occupancy of our property for your signal tower at Rockland.

19 December 1908 from Stewart to CNOR Legal

The interlocking plant at the above crossing is completed and I shall be obliged if you will apply for inspection as soon as possible.

21 December 1908 CNOR to Board

Applies for inspection .

27 December 1908 from N. Cauchon to CNOR

Will be at Rockland Tuesday forenoon to inspect interlocker. Please inform contractors.

28 December 1908 from CNOR to Cauchon

Our Mr. Sykes will reach Rockland noon tomorrow. Have informed contractors.

31 December 1908 from Cauchon to CNOR

I inspected on 29 December.

It is very stiff in operation and requires adjustment. Further than this I think the stiffness, especially at the diamond, is due to one of the stock rails being considerably twisted, so that the foot of the point rail rides up on the twisted foot of the stock rail and therefore this point is too high in the air. This will have to be replaced in the spring before regular traffic is allowed to run over the diamond without stopping.

The distant signal on the GTR coming from their station. This signal is too short by probably six or eight feet, as it cannot be seen when immediately approaching same, owing to the approach of the GTR being on a curve through a deep cut which hides the view of the signal when immediately approaching same for a distance of probably 600 or 800 feet. I reported this matter to Mr. Mountain.

Your Mr. Sykes advised me that it was the intention of your company to only run for another couple of weeks before closing down for the winter, when he would take out the pints and put in straight rails on the GTR. If this be the case I think it would be just as well to go on the strength of the present order for construction purposes which is extended for three months. If, however, your company wanted an order to operate this plant without coming to a stop I cannot see my way to recommend it for more than a month in its present condition.

31 December 1908 from Cauchon to Mountain

I inspected the above on 29th inst.

The slip switch arrangement at the diamond is very satisfactory with the exception that in the present instance it works extremely stiffly. This is due to the fact that one of the stock rails when being bent for the required angle has been twisted, and the point which comes against the rail is raised too high on account of the overlapping of the foot of the point rail on that of the twisted stock rail. This, however, is a matter of adjustment. The plant is what is called "lever locking". It would have been preferable to have had latch-locking. The disadvantage of ordinary lever locking is that when the latch is pulled on any one of the levers the full leverage of the lever can be exerted against the lock, and though it cannot move the interlocked signal, it is liable to cause a good deal of strain on the locks. I would further note that the locking bars at this diamond are only 25 ft. long on each side of the points of the diamond. There is a horizontal distance between end of one bar and beginning of the other on the opposite rail of about three feet. With long coaches it would be possible though hardly probable that one of these locking bars would be quite clear of the wheels of the coach, although the other bar would be caught by one end. Under such circumstances a man could hardly throw the points, but could possibly exert enough pressure on the locking bar reversed (?) bend the locking bar, which was only caught by one end.

There is one signal post on the GTR around the curve, No. 5 on the plan. This curve is through a deep cut in a hill and a GT train approaching from this direction can see the signal quite a way off, but when within a short distance of it, it is completely hidden from view by the hill for some 600 or 800 feet. In my opinion this signal should be put up on the bench in the cut. Five or six more to the mast at the time it was put in would have obviated this trouble. The hill is not a high one.

Mr. Patton of the GTR strongly objects to the operation of the diamond in its present condition with the twisted stock rail. Mr. Sykes of the CNOR claims that he has no trackmen on hand now who can fix this, or bend a new stock rail for it. I recommend that the CNOR be allowed to put this interlocker in operation in its present condition for not more than a month, that before the same is used again in the spring the twisted stock rail should be replaced by a proper one, and signal on the GTR towards their station should be put up on a bench on the hill so that it could be seen continuously when being approached.

The order extends the time for three months. Perhaps it would be better to let them remain under that condition till they close down work, which Mr. Sykes advised me would be in a couple of weeks, and that the company be advised to make good the deficiencies mentioned in this report before proceeding to put the plant in operation for general traffic purposes.

9 January 1909 from Stewart to CNOR Legal.

Union Switch and Signal asked to have the machine overhauled and correct the adjustment. We will get a new stock rail put in to replace the defective one and submit a plan showing proposed position for the GTR south signal where it will be visible. I would be prepared to take out the crossing and give GTR unbroken rail but the Hamilton Bridge Co will be erecting the viaduct at Greens Creek and we must be in a position to get a locomotive to them in case of need. The only traffic we expect to have

over the crossing this winter is the transport of materials and supplies to Greens Creek for the Hamilton Bridge Co.

It will not be amiss to point out that the signal on the GTR line is merely a freight spur on which trains should be at all times under control, especially as it crosses a public highway close to our crossing, and that though the signal is not continuously visible from engines approaching the crossing it is visible at a sufficient distance out to stop them before they reach the crossing.

11 January 1909 letter similar to that of 9 Jan sent to N. Cauchon.

12 January 1909 from Cauchon to CNOR

I note what you say about replacing the defective stock rail and moving the signal. Mr. Sykes was in this morning and submitted a plan for removing of this signal, which is quite agreeable to us, he has assured us that in the new position it will be clearly and continuously visible above the hill for any train approaching the signal. As to the taking out of the crossing altogether and giving the GTR an unbroken rail, this is immaterial to us and is matter for your convenience. I stated in the presence of Mr. Donaldson of the GTR and Mr. Sykes that as the Board has given you the extension of three months for operation of this crossing for construction purposes, you are entitled to so operate it with a flagman for that time. The only stipulation I made was that if you wanted to operate it with the signals from the tower you would have to comply with my recommendations regarding the changing of the signal and replacing of the stock rail.

As regards your last paragraph pointing out that the GTR line was merely a freight spur on which trains should at all times be under control etc. In answer to this I might say that it is not good practice to have the signal intermittently visible, and that the Engineering department have taken the position that it should be arranged as recommended in my report.

15 March 1909 From Stewart to Ruel.

Will you kindly arrange for the extension of the Rockland crossing order, for 60 days longer?

It expired on 3rd instant and we have still to put in the new stock rail and move the signal mast.

18 March 1909 from CNOR to Board

Requests an extension for 60 days. Necessary to remove a signal mast and replace a stock rail and in order to do this work efficiently we wish to wait until the frost is out of the ground.

I might mention that at present our traffic is practically suspended and is likely to remain so with the exception of an occasional work train.

18 March 1909 order 6551 is issued.

19 May 1909 from Stewart, CNOR to Mountain, Chief Engineer of the Board

The objections raised by Cauchon, position of the signal and the stock rail have now been remedied. The signal has been moved to the top of the cutting as suggested by Cauchon and the stock rail has been replaced. I have asked Mr. Ruel to apply to the board for inspection and approval. The Ottawa River, however, is very high so that the GTR cannot run trains along that line and Mr. Sykes informs me that the water is up around some of the carrier posts for the semaphores so that inspection at present will probably be difficult. Mr. Sykes also says that the water is loosening the ground around some of these posts. I have instructed to have stone put around them to hold them firmly as soon as the water will permit, and have asked him to let me know as soon as the water is down so as to make inspection convenient. It is only construction trains that we have crossing here and not many of them. I am asking Mr. Ruel to apply for permission to use the crossing until your inspection can be made.

19 May 1909 from Stewart to Ruel

Attaches copy of letter to Mountain re. Our crossing under hand signal which has expired, asks to apply to the Board.

22 May 1909 order 7058 is issued.

22 June 1909 from CNOR to Board

Interlocking plant is completed and asks for an inspection so that an order allowing them to use the plant without coming to a stop can be issued.

24 July 1909 order 7621 is issued.

Interlocking diagram. Undated.

This shows a signal cabin to the north of the crossing.

Apparatus in cabin - 4 levers for signals, 1 lever for two moveable frogs and 1 lever for 4 facing point lock bars, total 6 levers.

Moveable frog fitted up with Detector bars 50 ft. long.

Lever	Description
1	GTR southbound home signal 380 ft. from crossing.
2	CNOR westbound home signal 800 ft. from crossing.
3	Moveable frog.
4	Facing point lock bar.
6	GTR northbound home signal 800 ft. from crossing.
7	CNOR eastbound home signal 800 ft. from crossing.

Note - there is no number 5.

Moveable frog angle 9° 46'.

7 December 1914 from Spaidal, General Superintendent to Fritch Asst to President.

It is not a full interlocker, only home semaphores fitted with detector bars.

GTR movements consist of one or two per day and at present we have two trains in each direction daily. The GTR maintain a day and night signal man for operating semaphores and moveable frog at our expense. We are the junior line.

With our present freight and mixed train service we might save the expense of about \$90 per month in wages if the Board would modify their order permitting trains to stop clear of the diamond and trainmen operate the signal. You may wish to refer the matter to our legal department.

9 September 1914 from Fritch to Temple, CNOR Legal.
Agrees with Spidal - asks to follow up.

17 September 1914 from Legal to Fritch
Board may not have jurisdiction to issue this order and if GTR oppose it is likely that it would fail.

22 December 1914 from Coleman, GTR Superintendent to Spidal.
The only objection I have is that I don't like the idea of our trainmen operating the diamond, when it is used by your main line trains, as some of the men may not have sufficient experience to handle the interlocking tower.
Would it not be possible to leave the plant lined up for our line and have your men work it when your trains wish to go over? In this manner, if anything went wrong your men would be responsible which is as it should be in view of the fact that all of the saving is effected by your Company.

8 January 1915 from CNOR legal to Board.
Applies for the change.

20 January 1915 from Board to CNOR Legal
Can you and the GTR agree on a draft order?

21 January 1915 from CNOR Legal Temple to Spidal
Get in touch with the GTR to see if they will agree to operate the tower with their train crews so as not to delay our passenger trains, we could indemnify them for claims arising from the proposed operation.

16 March 1915 order 23418 is issued.

11 March 1915 Agreement between GTR and CNOR.

1. GTR crews to operate the interlocking.
2. CNOR shall light to semaphore and other signal lamps.
3. CNOR shall be responsible for the proper operation of the interlocking and shall be responsible for all risk of accidents, loss, injury etc.
4. CNOR before dispensing with towermen shall apply to the Board for an order.
5. CNOR will restore towermen upon request of GTR in writing.

19 April 1916 order 24910 is issued.
Traffic is increased and order 23418 is rescinded.

End of file.

RG 30 vol. 9346 file 1046-62-12
Crossing of GTR at Hawkesbury.

3 July 1906 CNOR application to cross the GTR

18 July 1906 Answer from GTR

1. Owing to grade and curves on their line at the point of crossing in the immediate vicinity a crossing at the point proposed would greatly increase the cost of operation of GTR trains.
2. View would be restricted as to render the crossing dangerous and a menace to public safety.
3. The proposed crossing lies between the terminal and the Relief Yard of the GTR at Hawkesbury.

10 September 1906 reply to GTR answer

1. No reason given why the cost of operation would be increased for GTR.
2. Signals can be arranged to secure the safety of the public and the fact that the crossing lies between the terminal and relief yards is not a disadvantage as all trains of the GTR would be under control.

8 November 1906 from Mountain.

I went to Hawkesbury November 7.

Line proposed by CNOR is the most suitable. The line suggested by GTR would still be a level crossing and would throw the CNOR into unnecessarily heavy work and not a very good crossing of the Main Street at Hawkesbury and would not be any more advantageous.

This is a branch line of the GTR which terminates about one half a mile further north than where the proposed crossing is.

Recommend the crossing be ordered at the point proposed by CNOR.

12 November 1906 order 2030 is issued.

28 November 1906 from CNOR to Board

You forgot to include the temporary construction clauses in the Hawkesbury order. Can you rush out a temporary order. The GTR has stopped our work.

30 November 1906 Spencer (MacKenzie and Mann) to Ruel
Delay serious. What are prospects?

30 November 1906 Ruel to Spencer

Mountain won't issue temporary crossing order until town satisfied respect street crossings then apparently only for movement construction materials.

30 November 1906 Spencer to Ruel

Have had talk with McGuigan's office and he has wired Supt. Donaldson to allow the crossings to be put in at Hawkesbury and Rockland.

19 December 1906 from Garden (CNOR Engineering?) to White, Mackenzie and Mann
Donaldson wired section foreman to close fence across Higginson Street, teams have to go round by station.

20 December 1906 Ruel to Lawlor, barrister Hawkesbury

Investigate through garden and town authorities right of GTR to close Higginson Street. If no right suggest join with town immediate proceedings prevent closing.

20 December 1906 from Lawlor to Ruel

This same parcel of land was formerly the crossing of the Central Counties (CAR) across the line of the projected Montreal and Ottawa Railway... CAR started construction in this section prior to that of the M&O. CAR without having received any permission from the then owner, Mr. Higginson, took possession of the crossing at night time and started work upon it. Mr. Charlebois, Manager of the M&O came up here and a deed was drawn by myself, by which the owner conveyed the right of way, including the parcel in question, to the Montreal and Ottawa Railway. This was done 23 September 1891. Afterwards, Higginson, who owned all the land in that section, conveyed the necessary right of way to the CAR, but reserved from his conveyance the land heretofore granted to the M&O so that title to the crossing still remained in Higginson. Nothing further was done in reference to completing title. There were no streets or surveyed lots in that locality at that time.

In 1899, the line having been diverted to its present location, via Vankleek Hill, Higginson obtained a conveyance of the land granted by him to the M&O, including the crossing in question. Subsequently the old right of way was laid out as Higginson Street and lots surrounding the same were laid out. ...Higginson Street is shown as opened up as far as the west side of the CA right of way, the easterly portion has never been opened up but in the conveyance from J.G. Higginson to the Great Northern Ry. this section is described as Higginson Street. Nothing further was done with reference to the easterly section until Monday last when, at my request, the Town Council passed a by-law establishing Higginson Street a High way, and I wrote a letter, signed as Town Solicitor to Mr. M. Donaldson, GR Superintendent, advising him of the passage of the By-law and requesting him to remove obstructions and comply with the Railway Act with reference to road crossings. His answer to this has been to instruct employees to restore the railway fences along the crossing.

Are we bound by the Railway Act section 186. Action of the GTR has impressed everyone here very unfavorably and I think I can obtain the co-operation of our town council in any reasonable way.

21 December 1906 from Ruel to Lawlor

Town would have to apply under section 186. Railway company, from facts stated in your letter is senior at point of crossing.

28 January 1907 order 2523 is issued

11 November 1907 order 3869 is issued.

Only require to operate west of GTR to obtain access to a siding in Riordan's mill.

11 January 1908 from GTR to CNOR

It has been reported to us that you intend to use wire instead of pipe connection at the interlocking. As we have had two serious accidents and considerable trouble where wire instead of pipe connections are used, as the extreme sudden changes in temperature causes the wire to contract or expand to such an extent that the correct indication is not given to the home signal, the GTR must insist that the crossing be protected by an interlocking plant modern in every respect and not one having wire instead of pipe connections.

16 January 1908 from CNOR to GTR

The interlocking which we propose to install is the same type now in use on our other railway crossings, including those of the GTR and they do not think there is any necessity for a better type of crossing on a branch line than is used on a main line.

17 January 1908 from GTR to CNOR

Please let us know at what crossings of the GTR these obsolete interlocking plants have been constructed. The fact that obsolete interlockers have been installed on other points of the GTR is not a very good reason why that practice should be continued but rather a reason why they should be changed to modern interlockers.

20 January 1908 from GTR to CNOR

"Obsolete" was used by Manager of Transportation, "up to date" by the Second Vice President.

Unfair of me to claim the credit for the "strenuous allegations" which have caused you amusement.

While apologizing for having even suggested that anything which the Canadian Northern proposed to use was obsolete or that pipe connections with semaphores was more up to date than wire, I would be glad if you would give me the information asked for in my letter, namely, at what crossings of the GTR the obsolete interlocking plants had been constructed.

24 July 1908 from Stewart to Ruel

Kindly apply to the board for a temporary crossing order. There is a bank of from four to twelve feet on our line just west of the GT track and we cannot get material to make up this bank except by train filling, nor can we put in the interlocking plant until the bank is made up.

29 July 1908 order 5112 is issued.

Needed to have telephone communication between GTR Hawkesbury station and the interlocking in order to avoid delay to GTR trains.

10 December 1908 from Cauchon to Ruel

I recommended you get an interim order allowing both companies to operate their trains without coming to a stand. When you send this order to your local authorities you advise them that the blades must be put on the semaphores before they make any attempt to operate the plant.

I was in Hawkesbury on 8th instant on other business and noticed from the tail end of the train as we were pulling out of Hawkesbury that my recommendations with regard to boxing of wires under the track and of the working parts had not altogether been complied with.

Some of the chain wheels were exposed to view. I object to this both on the grounds of trouble in maintaining the plant and of the danger to trainmen or others having occasion to run along the track. Give strict instructions etc., also every effort be made to expedite the placing of the repeaters and that I be advised immediately on the installation of same.

3 December 1908 order 5798 is issued.

25 January 1918 order 26931 is issued.

End of file.

RG 30 vol. 9225 file 1014 -80-24

Hawkesbury station fire 28 December 1904

Shows list of freight destroyed. This is a claims file.

RG 30 vol. 9348 file 1046-62-52

Crossing of Ottawa and Prescott Ry. at m. 56.6 west from Hawkesbury.

28 June 1909 applies to cross the Ottawa and Prescott

6 July 1909 order 7490 is issued.

24 July 1909 order 7597 is issued.

6 October 1909 from CNOR to Board

Encloses copies of plan showing the installation recommended for the interlocking. Shows additional dwarf signals at each end of the transfer track. Plan not included on the file.

6 June 1910 order 10787 is issued.

17 February 1915 from CPR to CNOR

We do not need to use our Sussex Street subdivision at night except in case of emergency and I do not see any objection to taking off the towerman between the hours of 7.00 p.m. and 7.00 a.m.. Prepared to join with you in an application to the Board.

27 February 1915 order 23373 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9337 file 1046-61-25
South Nation River

31 October 1906 from Resident Engineer to Ruel

Three blue prints (not on file) of Canada Foundry strain sheets for South Nation River crossing. Need approval from Ottawa as want to order the steel.

6 November 1906 from CNOR to Board

Request approval, needs an order in council - 23.6 from Hawkesbury

4 December 1906 from Department of Public Works to Ruel

The portion of the river which you intend to cross is navigable from its mouth to a point about 2,500 ft. above the proposed bridge. At that place there is a saw mill and wharves for shipping the products of the mill by barge to Montreal and other ports. A freight steamer, also tugs and barges, use this part of the river. The sawlogs of the Rideau Lumber Co. are towed upwards from the Ottawa River to the mill mentioned, and the products as sawn lumber, is shipped by barges to Montreal and elsewhere, so that ample provision should be made for the free and uninterrupted passage of the "bands" or "pockets" of sawlogs, when being towed up to the mill, as well as for the tugs and barges, and the steamboat carrying freight to and from the wharves above the bridge site.

In order, therefore, to provide sufficient space for the passage of sawlogs etc., upwards to the mill it is suggested that you so amend your plan that the span between piers 3 and 4 over the steamboat channel be increased from 100 ft., as at present proposed, to 150 ft. centre to centre of piers. Will you, in consequence, send me another set of three copies of plan of proposed bridge showing the amendments suggested? On receipt of this amended plan the department will be in a position to make the necessary recommendation to council for its approval.

8 December 1906 from CNOR Ruel to Department of Public Works

Engineers have reported that a span of 150 ft. in length is, in their opinion, unnecessary at this point, and that at the outside the span should not exceed 120 ft. They claim they have

examined carefully all the conditions in respect of the crossing and have satisfied themselves upon this point, I would be glad if the matter could be further considered.

9 January 1907 from CNOR Ruel to Department of Public Works

Encloses three white prints on linen (not on file) dated January 8, 1907 showing variation of the crossing by providing for two deck girder spans of 100 ft., three deck girder spans of 90 ft. and one through girder span over the channel of 120 ft. Would be glad to receive an order in council ASAP.

The order in council was lost in the department.

18 February 1907 from resident engineer to Ruel

Encloses revised strain sheets for approval.

2 February 1907 order in council is issued.

3 April 1907 order 2764 is issued.

22 July 1908 from Acting DM of Marine and Fisheries

Complaints have reached the Department that a cement pier built by your company in the South Nation River last year has fallen directly across the channel of navigation and that a serious interruption to the navigation of the river is caused thereby.

I have to call upon you to remove the wrecked pier as promptly as possible.

24 July 1908 from Stewart to Ruel

I measured the depth of water over the fallen pier last week and there was a minimum of 14 ft. The ordinary depth of channel at low water is from 12 to 15 ft. and as far as I could learn on the spot, the deepest draught boat that goes up the South Nation river draws only 9 feet. The base of the pier does lean a little into the channel, but it is marked by a bush securely fastened to it and does not, I think, offer any menace to navigation.

We will have the obstruction caused by the fallen pier removed at an early date, before low water.

27 July 1908 from Ruel to Marine and Fisheries.

19 August 1908 from Rideau Lumber to Marine and Fisheries

We beg to advise that at the present time this pier is showing above the water and we that we cannot take in a tow of logs.

26 August 1908 from Department to CNOR

Encloses a communication from Rideau Lumber. Unless your company removes any obstruction they have caused to the channel, this Department will be obliged to send an engineer to remove it at your company's expense.

18 September 1908 from Ruel to C.H. Rust, City Engineer, Toronto

In building the line between Hawkesbury and Ottawa, our contractors, Schell and Kennedy, constructed either by themselves or by some sub-contractors, the piers of a bridge over the South Nation River. Shortly after construction two of these piers were reported out of line and subsequently, before the steel work was contracted for, one of the piers fell over into the river and another was found so much out of line as to be useless. A recent examination by our Engineering Department has led to the condemnation of all of the piers, seven in number. If the railway is to be built on the same location they will have to be removed and reconstructed.

Before destroying the piers, our Engineering department wishes to have the work examined by competent independent engineers and they have requested our department to apply to you to act in this capacity and to name another independent Engineer, or other qualified person who could be present with you when examination is made.

19 September 1908 from Rust to Ruel

Can get away provided I can set my own time. Would suggest Mr. E.H. Keating or Mr. C.B. Smith.

26 September 1908 from Rush to Ruel

Mr. Kerry and myself yesterday examined the concrete piers constructed by your company on the Ottawa and Hawkesbury line, crossing the Nation River, and as a result of the examination we are of the opinion that your Engineering Department were quite justified in condemning the piers.

1 October 1908 from CNOR to Department of Public Works

The substructure of the bridge was duly constructed in accordance with this Order in Council, but owing to defective concrete work on the part of our contractors, our Engineering department, after obtaining competent independent engineering inspection and advice, has decided to condemn all piers as unfit for railway service, and it is consequently proposed to remove the old piers and construct new piers on the same alignment but shifted westerly towards Ottawa. The same span is shown on the proposed revised plan as was shown on the plan originally approved, the channel span being 120 ft. as specified in the Order in Council referred to.

Asks for a new Order in Council.

7 October 1908 detailed report from Rush.

One of the main piers had fallen over and was completely under water. The other river piers had settled materially out of their original positions: these settlements could be immediately detected by the eye.

Have examined the material in the piers themselves.

This concrete was built, as is customary, with an outside facing four or five inches in thickness of higher class material and an interior, which is the mass of the pier, of a

cheaper mixture. The concrete deposited under water appears to have been of the same quality as that used in the interior of the piers.

It was evident to us that the concrete neat the water line was simply dissolving away under the action of the water of the river.

We therefore made openings at various points in an endeavour to ascertain the cause of this peculiar and unusual disintegration.

We found that the outer, or face concrete, was fairly well mixed, homogeneous in character and able to withstand weathering influences. It varied in quality being better in some piers than in others, but, in general it was so much below the standard usually required for this class of work that we question whether the materials were of the proper quality and whether they were used in the proper proportions. We also question whether the proper and usual precautions that should be taken when laying concrete in winter, were taken in this case, and we understand that it was a piece of winter construction. To pass a final opinion upon this face concrete, we will require to study the evidence that we refer to further on in this report. The face concrete is certainly not the cause of the failure of the structure.

The interior concrete we found to be altogether defective and we question whether any of it would withstand the action of water. We could, of course, only examine the interior concrete at a few points as it was necessary to break through the facing to get at it and this proved to be a work of some difficulty. We have no hesitation in describing the interior concrete at the points where we made entry as the worst concrete, if it can be so called, that we ever saw. Much of it was unset and could be readily pried out with a lumberman's peavy and the cement mortar in the mixture was not nearly sufficient to fill the voids between the stones, it being a criterion of good concrete that the mortar must be present in such quantities that it will more than completely fill these voids. There has evidently been some reason for economizing in the use of both cement and sand and in places we found the so called concrete to consist of nothing but a mixture of stone and clay, the latter being the one common material which should be carefully excluded from concrete. At such points the whole interior was, of course, loose and wet.

It was inevitable that such a mixture would disintegrate under exposure to water and its use justifies the condemnation of the piers.

As the result of our examination, we desire to say that we fully approve of the action of Mr. Stewart in absolutely condemning the concrete masonry in this bridge as unfit for railroad service.

We made entry into the west abutment and into two of the river piers with the same result in each case. If it is desired to obtain legal evidence of the quality of the concrete it should be examined by a competent inspector during the entire progress of demolition.

We noted some waste broken stone on the work but no waste sand and throughout the concrete there is evidence of a scarcity of this important material.

In case of a law suit, we imagine that the defence will be that the piers are falling because they are resting upon insufficient foundation, and there is insufficient truth in this claim to make it necessary for us to study all the circumstances connected with the construction very carefully. The foundation according to our present information is insufficient and although we do not hesitate to condemn the masonry on account of its character we are now prepared to say that a defective foundation is not accelerating the fall of the piers.

If therefore you consider it probable that a law suit may be entered into and if you wish us to be prepared to give definite evidence in this connection, kindly furnish us with the following information, the bearing of which on the question at issue is very plain.

1. Contract and specifications covering the work.
2. Plans of the piers as built.
3. Record of all foundation borings.
4. Record of orders for piles and particulars of pile driving.
5. Record of tests of materials.
6. Statement of engineer or inspector covering methods proportioning quantities and of mixing, weather conditions, precautions taken to overcome effects of temperature, sources of supply of material and methods of handling and depositing together with any comments he may desire to make.
7. Copy of any orders issued to the contractor about this work.
8. Some samples of both the face and the interior concrete for testing.
9. Record of the movements of the piers as determined by CNORY engineers.

We would also suggest that when the piers are demolished an inspector representing us should be on the ground to make a further examination of the material.

Yours truly,

Signed by Rust and Kerry

6 November 1908 PC 2327 is passed.

21 November 1908 order 5659 is issued.

23 July 1909 from Rideau Lumber

The South Nation River between the two piers through which navigation enters there is, and has been since last Fall Coffor Dam obstructions which has cost us a lot of money. Each time we send a tow through there, the extra expense is something like \$25.00. This we are sending you a statement and bill of.

Your engineering department has been requested for months to take this away. At the present time we doubt if a tow can be gotten in at all, which will be a serious matter if our mill is obliged to stop for this reason.

Several additional bills from Rideau Lumber

13 October 1909 from F. Stratton, Jessops Falls to A.F. Stewart

I am in receipt of your of yesterday's date and hear with the time taken by tug getting booms through the piers on Nation River, since I came here, The first I saw was on sept. 5th when it arrived at bridge at 1.40 p.m. and was all through a few minutes before six, just over four hours. The next was on December 3rd, when it commenced pulling through at 1/15 and was all through at 5 p.m. 3 3/4 hours.

I have made inquiries of one who knows something of it and he tells me they are charging up a longer time for detention than is strictly right and that you will be able to see it is so by comparing the times I here give you by the time charged. I can vouch personally for the time I give being correct. As I sat on the bridge and watched them through, it being Sunday each time.

My informant does not want his name mentioned, I am sure you can safely rely upon what he says.

There is no question but the delay was caused by the booms getting caught by planks that were driven outside the cribs. If I obtain any further information will report to you at once.

15 October 1909 from Stewart.

I herewith attach letter from our timekeeper, Mr. Stratton.

5 October 1909 from Stratton

The S.S. Ida passed through the mill Friday night, I had a conversation with a man on board named Beaton, father to the captain. He says "We have never had any difficulty in passing through with the Ida, the difficulty has been with the booms, and even that might have been considerably obviated.

"On or about August the 30th we towed down a string of booms, only one driver was sent, which was not sufficient to handle them when passing under the bridge, he (the driver) hung around some hours and finally left them on the north side, I made the offer to Mr. Anderson to get them all through myself for \$2.00 by cutting the booms, there was fresh favourable wind and I claim they could have been got through in an hour".

There is general opinion around here that there has been needless delays, and a longer time than actually taken by delay at the bridge.

19 October 1909 from Stewart

Further letter from timekeeper Stratton.

End of file.

RG 43 vol. 649 file 20887
Sale of Stewart Property to RCMP

22 June 1920 from CNR

Have received an application from RCMP for sale or lease of 29.2 acres of land, part lot F Concession D twp. of Nepean, known as the Stewart Property.

This was acquired in 1909 as a freight yard, balance is now available for sale.

Want to sell for \$3,000 per acre.

12 July 1920 PC 1596 is passed.