

Smiths Falls sub

Files seen

RG 43 box 344 file 5566

CTA - File 3878.568

RG 46 Accession Number 92-93/066 Box 17 file 15881.69

RG 43 vol. 667 file 21251

RG 46 vol. 1467 file 18640 Chaffeys station

RG 46 vol. 1467 file 18639 Bedford Mills station

RG 46 vol. 1467 file 18638 Perth Road station

RG 46 vol. 1467 file 18637 Portland station

RG 46 vol. 1467 file 18643 Dwyer Hill station

RG 46 vol. 1368 file 4205.1153 Portland station

RG 43 vol. 531 file 16626 Subsidies on Toronto Ottawa line - also contains material for the Beachburg sub.

RG 43 vol. 344 file 5586A Extension to Perth.

RG 43 vol. 344 file 5586 Route map of Toronto to Ottawa line.

RG 30 vol. 9334 file 1046-60-23 Malleable Castings siding at Smiths Falls

RG 30 vol. 9306 file 1046-26-291 Delay to CNR train No. 5 near Elgin

RG 30 vol. 9303 file 1046-26-219 Nolans

RG 30 vol. 9347 file 1046-62-29 Crossing of the CPR at Smiths Falls

RG 46 vol. 1470 file 18645 Station at Twin Elm.

RG 46 vol. 1470 file 18647 Station at Merivale.

RG 46 vol. 1470 file 18648 Approval of station layout at mile 174.5 twp of Storrington.

RG 43 vol. 649 file 20880 Mr. Good claim for railway running through property.

RG 43 box 344 file 5566

Great detail about choice of routes from Brighton to Ottawa - should it go via Smiths Falls, Perth, Carleton Place etc Detailed notes not taken.

File 3878.568

1913, December 8 CNR to BRC

Wish to open parts of the Toronto to Ottawa line. Harrowsmith to Sydenham has already been opened for freight. CNR now desires to open this section completely together with other sections with the exception of Sydenham to Ottawa (m. 169.54 to 256.14 reckoned from Toronto Union station)

which CNR wishes to open for freight traffic only.

1913, December 19 CNR to BRC

Line was inspected by the BRC Tuesday last. CNR will provide facilities for passengers but does not want to commence regular passenger service until next spring because don't

want to hamper the construction department in getting the line ready for high speed passenger service.

1913, December 26 Mackenzie and Mann to C.A. Mountain (Chief Engineer, BRC)
The large temporary trestle at m. 191.5 was filled to the stringers on Tuesday December 23 with the exception of three bents in the centre where the filling is about four feet below the stringers. I expect to have this trestle filled to the entire length up to the stringers by Tuesday December 30. Will then go ahead and fill the temporary trestle at the west end of the Rideau Canal Bridge, at Chaffey's Locks mile 182.6.

We will make a slight lift over the sink hole at m. 179.5 as you require.

1913 December 29 Note from Simmons

Inspected Ottawa to Sydenham December 16 1913.

Rail is 80 lb steel with good ballast.

At Merivale there is a crossing siding.

At Fallowfield there is a crossing siding.

At Richmond there is a nice no 3 station, water tank, freight shed, crossing siding and loading siding.

At Dwyer Hill there is a very nice no 6 station and crossing siding.

At Kilfoyle there is a no 6 station and a crossing siding.

At Smiths Falls there is a very handsome brick and concrete station, a good freight shed, water tank and sidings. The railway crosses the Rideau Canal at this point with a very fine Cherzer Rolling Lift Bridge.

Lombardy there is a no 6 station and a crossing siding.

Portland there is a no 3 station, water tank and crossing siding.

At Brockville Junction there is a station junction with the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway, the latter being owned and operated by the CNOR with very good section houses along the line.

At Elgin there is a no 6 station, water tank and crossing siding.

At Chaffeys Locks the railway crossed the Rideau Canal by a high level lift bridge (m. 182.6)

At Chaffeys Locks station there is a no 6 station and crossing siding.

Temporary trestle at m. 183.2 which they expect to complete filling inside of three weeks.

West from Chaffeys Locks temporary trestle one mile west. This will be filled up to the stringers by the end of the year but I recommend a speed restriction of 6 mph.

At Bedford Mills there is a section house used for a station.

Perth Road there is a no 6 station and a crossing siding.

Owing to sink holes trains should go carefully. Recommends 15 mph between Chaffeys Locks and Perth Road.

Perth Road to Sydenham would recommend opening for traffic at 25 mph.

At Sydenham they are using the Bay of Quinte Railway station which railway the CNO control.

From Sydenham to Harrowsmith, 4.3 miles, is a diversion of the B of Q Railway decided improvement. Recommends for opening at 20 mph.

Yarker to Harrowsmith is a diversion to get good grades and is in A1 shape.

At Yarker is a diversion with the crossing of the Napanee River and a new steel bridge. I would recommend this for opening for traffic.

The above with the B. of Q Railway will give them running powers through to Toronto.

Mileages from Toronto

Ottawa	251.2
Rideau Junction	244.7
Merivale	241.2
Fallowfield	237.8
Richmond	232.1
Dwyer Hill	224.0
Kilfoyle	216.9
Smiths Falls	209.6
Lombardy	202.7
Portland	193.3
Brockville Junction	189.3
Elgin	187.4
Chaffeys Locks	182.2

Bedford Mills	179.3
Crossing	173.6
Perth Road	170.7
Perth Road Pit	169.4
Sydenham	163.9

1913, December 30 Order 21122
Open for carriage with speed restrictions

1914, July 2 Order 22113
Relieves CNOR of speed restrictions imposed by 21122. 40 minutes between Chaffeys Locks and Perth Road Pit.

RG 46 Accession Number 92-93/066 Box 17 file 15881.69
CP bridges over the Smiths Falls sub at Smiths Falls
Mile 0.58 Belleville sub. - double track.
Mile 0.50 Chalk River sub. - single track.

1984 site inspection to look at the feasibility of putting in an interchange track and eliminating the bridges with the abandonment of the Smiths Falls to Napanee line. The interchange track would give access to CN customers in Smiths Falls.

30 Nov 1984. CPR letter to CTC
Estimated cost of replacing the two bridge structures with culvert and fill is \$178,000.
Estimated cost of repairing the two bridges is:
Chalk River \$360,000
Belleville \$660,000

21 Dec 1984 Notes of a meeting Hutchinson (CTC) and Brayne (CN).
Original intention was to run a connection in the south west quadrant skirting the back of a cemetery. CN will look at the possibility of constructing the connection in the south east quadrant - this has several advantages in that there is no road crossing and perhaps a quarter of the elevation differences can be achieved before leaving the CN centreline.

In view of the high cost of the connection, a minimum of \$300,000 plus \$150,000 to \$160,000 to fill in the two bridges, and the low traffic volume, estimated 40 cars per year, suggests subsidizing the transshipment of merchandise to the CPR team track.

RG 43 vol 667 file 21251
Marlmont Station

20 February 1922 from Herbert Campbell, Smiths Falls to J.A. Stewart MP
Wishes a spur line at Marlmont to ship wood, lambs and hogs. Much easier than by boat.

25 April 1922 from Canadian National to Major Bell, DM Department

The only application we have received for a spur track in this vicinity is from Merkleys Limited who desire that a spur track be put in at mileage 23.5 and we are ready to go ahead with this just as soon as we receive a remittance of \$729.68 from them, covering charges under the terms of our usual siding agreement.

It is only 7.1 miles between Dwyer Hill and Nolans. Marlmont is located 2.9 miles west of Dwyer Hill and 4.2 miles east of Nolans. I give below the earnings at these points during the past three years:--

	<u>1919</u>	<u>1920</u>	<u>1921</u>
Dwyer Hill	\$1,051	\$ 859	\$1,458
Nolans	504	1406	952
Marlmont	nil	3	nil

You will note that spur track facilities are not very urgently required to take care of the present business at least.

This was sent back to J.A. Stewart MP.

**RG 46 vol 1467 file 18640
Chaffeys station**

Plan

27 November 1911 Order 15484

1919 complaint about poor condition lodged by wife of the track foreman who is in charge of the section and who live in the dwelling portion. Not aware that his wife had made the complaint.

18 November 1922 complaint from residents using the station should be kept open during the winter.

13 April 1953 from CNR

We have a frame combination station building and freight shed at Chaffey's Locks that we propose to replace with a small frame shelter.

16 April 1953 order 81193 is issued.

End of file

**RG 46 vol 1467 file 18639
Bedford Mills station**

Plan

21 December 1911 Order 15666 is issued

End of file.

**RG 46 vol 1467 file 18638
Perth Road station**

Plan

21 December 1911 order 15664 is issued.

Plan of replacement

29 June 1953 order 81690 is issued.

End of file

**RG 46 vol 1467 file 18637
Portland station**

Plan

22 Jan 1912 order 15826 is issued.

End of file.

**RG 46 vol 1467 file 18643
Dwyer Hill station**

Plan

23 January 1912 order 15829 is issued.

12 May 1941 from CNR

Station building and freight shed at Dwyer Hill destroyed by fire. Apparently caused by spark from chimney of station which was occupied by trackmen.

Good plan

30 October 1943 order 64139 is issued.

End of file

**RG 46 vol 1368 file 4205.1153
Portland station**

26 April 1939 letter from CNR

Asks for authority to close the agency at Portland and appoint a caretaker. Saving will be \$1,700 per annum. Accounting for Lombardy is taken care of at Portland. This can be taken care of at Forfar if Portland is closed.

Attaches statement of revenues.

Opposition from the area. We admit the freight traffic has been cut into by trucks but there is still sufficient traffic to operate the station at a profit. Committee formed to try and build up the summer traffic. Will be a disadvantage if this is reduced to a flag stop.

2 May 1939 Opposition from E.H. Bolton, dressed lumber, shingles, cheese boxes. - if you don't value the business from this locality we have the boat service and the trucks to fall back on. I have had six cars already this year with an average freight of \$100.

Opposition from Eagle Island Club, Denison of Denison and Armstrong, Rideau Lakes Protective and Aquatic Club, Ontario Department of Education, R. Dowsett, I.B. Babcock, President, General Motors Truck and Coach, Pontiac Michigan, Many residents and summer cottagers.

14 June 1939 report from Inspector Bourgault.

Located at m. 51.34

Service is a mixed train in each direction, eastbound daily except Sun and westbound daily except Sat and Sun

Station building, (office freight shed, waiting room seating 16, living quarters for the agent fronted by a plank platform about 300 ft long. 20 car siding with stock pen.

Location of Portland, businesses. Held meeting with Reeve and merchants.

LCL is light. Main source of revenue is lumber and maple products, Bolton Lumber.

Claimed that withdrawal of the agent would react detrimentally to the summer business.

One of three old mica mines has been re-opened - expected one car per month to Boston.

Portland is dependent upon the summer traffic and withdrawal would seriously affect this traffic.

20 June 1939 Memorandum

Earnings for 1938 were approximately \$6,000 and the number of passengers for the whole of 1938 was about 50.

If the agent were taken away during the summer months the summer residents would be deprived of telegraph facilities, upon which they depend considerably.

Recommends that the company be permitted to remove the agent from Sept 15 to June 1 each year with the proviso that a caretaker be appointed for the remainder of the year.

23 June 1939 order 57639 is issued.

5 January 1946 from CNR

Asks that Board rescind 57639 and issue a new order authorizing closing of this station as an agency during the entire year on the understanding that a caretaker be appointed.

Earnings do not justify the retention of an agent.

20 February 1946 memo from Director of Operation

Earnings for first nine months of 1945 were only \$1,824.00 but the cost amounts to only \$562.04. Recommends that no changes be made because of the effort to attract tourists - convenience of telegraph facilities.

26 February 1946 letter to CN

Board does not feel it should order the railway to retain an agent but considering the convenience of telegraph facilities to tourists perhaps the company might see its way clear

to leaving the agent for the coming season as it is possible the revenue, now that the war is over, may show a decided increase.

12 March 1946 from CNR

Willing to continue the temporary agency at Portland for the 1946 season after which the situation will be reviewed.

21 March 1947 from CNR

Attaches statement of revenues for 1945 and 1946. Telegraph earnings decreased. Renews application to remove the agent year round and appoint a caretaker.

22 April 1947 order 68860 is issued.

20 February 1968 CNR application to remove the caretaker and to remove the station.

22 February 1968 No objection from township council. But wish to retain Forfar.

26 April 1968 order R-2168 is issued.

End of file.

**RG 43 vol 531 file 16626
Subsidies on Toronto Ottawa line
also contains material for the Beachburg sub.**

29 May 1913 from Mackenzie Ltd to Jones, ADM Railways & Canals.

Encloses statements of accounts.

J.P. Mularkey contract for both Toronto and Pembroke lines. Subcontractors Girouard & McGuigan on the Toronto Ottawa line (west of Smiths Falls) while Leamy & Co. on the Pembroke line, but also Smiths Falls (Sydenham to Smiths Falls).

Several accounts remaining unpaid.

Accounts for explosives from Canadian Explosives Ltd, Montreal.

Girouard - Rideau Ferry
Leamey - Chaffeys Locks.

10 October 1913 from J.P.Mullarkey to MacKenzie & Mann Co.

If I had been notified of the account for explosives from Canadian Explosives I could have deducted the amount from the progress estimates. The work contracted for by Leamy has been finished and I do not owe them anything. I am informed that Chas. Leamy of F.A. Leamy & Co is worth considerable money. Why doesn't Canadian

Explosives collect whatever there may be due them from F.A. Leamy. In any case I am not responsible for debts of this nature.

Many accounts unpaid by Leamy for local supplies, eggs, milk, soap etc. from the Elgin district, Chaffeys Locks.

11 February 1914 Three claims settled by Mullarkey

Mileage covered by Leamy & Co was at about the boundary line between the counties of Frontenac and Leeds and extending for about a mile or so on either side of this line.

Some of the accounts were for personal items for Leamy such as slippers.

2 March 1915 from Department to CNOR

Department has received a claim from M.G. Henninger for \$18,644.04 against Mullarkey. There was a later additional claim of \$1,495.44.

Henninger subsequently settled for \$8,943.42.

Part 2 of the file starts in June 1922.

There is a full set of papers including a copy of an agreement between Bonneville, subcontractors under Mullarkey and Henri Christin & O.E. Lemay. This includes an itemized statement as well as the following:

At the time the contract was taken, in the spring of 1911, it was represented to us that the right of way had been all purchased and that grading could be proceeded with diligently; proof can be brought to show that it was not all purchased until very late in the summer and early fall.

This precluded any possibility, on our part, to do our work economically; at times, our outfit was idle for days at a stretch, whereas, in other cases, we were spending eighty per cent of our time going down one Concession Line and up the next Concession Line because farmers would not allow us to cross their fields before they received payment from Company for their land. In due course, the fall rains set in and the material became one mess of mud and sticky clay, which increased the cost of the work five hundred fold.

At a point about eight miles from the beginning of our contract, there were two big Cuts; the Engineer and ourselves could not agree on the classification thereof, so we called upon the Company, who sent their representative, and, this Officer immediately acknowledged that our claim was legitimate; he stated that such material was not covered by our contract, but since we were already on the ground with our plant, he felt that we could do the work as cheaply as anybody else could do it. He then directed us to go ahead and that we would get paid for our outlay; he emphasized the fact that he did not want One Dollar's worth of work done and pay only Ninety Cents for it. These two cuts could

hav been taken out much cheaper than they were, had the Engineer allowed us to follow our plan; for instance,

Through these two cuts there is a heavy down grade going west, our first move was to start to dig a narrow gullet from the west end coming easterly, the intention being to keep the Cuts dry, because most of the material had to be hauled easterly. Well, the Engineer stopped us doing this, with the result that no proper plant could be used to take out the Cuts. At times, there were two feet of mud in the pits, and this, we had to bail out with pails and buckets, as it was too thick to come through a centrifugal pump. Moreover, the mud and water, in the pits, made it impossible for us to dig our "coyotes" down to sub-grade, and, we had to leave a bottom, ranging all the way up to three feet, which we had to take up the following year at a very large expense.

Reverting to the non-purchase of the Right of Way, this special case is worthy of mention:- at a place, called Boyce's Creek, the right of way was not purchased until late in the summer of 1911, after which, we immediately diverted our best energies to complete this particular section, that is we installed our Camp, moved our plant from other parts of the work, (for which we purchased new plant) etc. etc. We had no sooner been well under way when the Engineer advised us that a diversion of the Creek necessitated his interviewing the County Council, relative to the flow of water; this matter was settled only after the frost had settled in hard, it was therefore impossible for us to do anything further at this point, and, we had to postpone operations until the following spring... this was a matter of great expense to us. When the work was completed, we secured the opinions of several prominent Civil Engineers, of high grade practical experience, among whom was Mr. Arthur H.N. Bruce, ex-Chief Engineer of the Quebec & Saguenay Railway, who reports as follows:-

"On the 18th of May 1914, I again visited these Cuts, accompanied by Mr. Stewart, Chief Engineer of the Canadian Northern Railway. The specifications, as show me by Mr. Stewart are very unusual, and, this is the first time I have known for them to be adopted in twenty five years' experience in railway building in Canada. In cuts such as these, it is customary, after the cut has been opened, for the Engineer in Charge and the Contractors to agree upon a classification for the whole Cut; in these cases, this was not done. To my mind, this was very unfair to Christin-Lemay, as their price for other material was only eighteen cents, which was low for the best of scraper work, and, even then, only with the best of weather conditions."

Mr. Stewart, after having examined the Cuts during the trip referred to above, expressed himself to the effect that our claim was not out of proportion to what he would judge would be the actual cost of doing the work.

In submitting the attached statement, we wish to point out that the figures shown thereon are those taken from our books and they represent the actual amount required by us to meet out just debts in connection with the Contract. We trust you will appreciate the fact

that so fr, we have avoided you all annoyance from our Creditors, not one claim has been filed against us with the Government. Upon the completion of the contract we had every right to place a lien against the railway but we were advised otherwise by our solicitor, Honourable T.U. McGarry, K.C. who promised us to settle the case immediately with Sir William Mackenzie personally.

November 1924 Petition of Right

Christin & Oscar E. Lemay. Claim \$73,762.28 as arising from a contract between J.P. Mullarkey and CNOR for the construction of a portion of a line of railway in Ontario.

15 March 1918 detailed assessment by A.F. Stewart Chief Engineer.

Options were obtained on practically the whole of the right of way between Jock River and Rideau Junction before the end of 1910 and the work was not commenced until June 1911.

23 December 1924 CN memorandum to S.J. Hungerford

The work Christin & Lemay did was in the vicinity of Rideau Junction on the Sydenham - Ottawa line. Work was commenced in July 1911 and completed in the fall of 1912 although their contract with Bonneville called for completion of the work by 15th December 1911.

Attached is a statement showing the prices paid by Mackenzie & Mann and the prices received by Christin & Lemay which are considerably lower.

End of file 1935.

RG 43 vol. 344 file 5586

Extension to Perth.

16 March 1907 from Kellog to department

Inquires about the CNOR route to Perth.

Correspondence - Minister to hear CNOR application for whole route including entrance to Ottawa and Toronto on May 15th 1907.

Record of hearing

Smiths Falls town was anxious to get the line - they had been waiting for 18 years for the Kingston, Smiths Falls & Ottawa -believed the GTR was behind the KSF&O but had been unable to get any confirmation of this.

Perth by diverting the proposed line at Newboro and crossing the Rideau waters at Narrow Locks - via Perth, a shorter route to Ottawa could be had.

Lanark strong plea for the line to pass through Lanark. Smiths Falls was already well served. Lanark was without any railway. A route by way of Lanark would involve building through 35 miles of rough country while there would be but 20 by the proposed line.

Ottawa Entrance After the maps and plans submitted had been examined 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.
Adjourned until 28th.

25 May 1907 from Wickstead (Chief Engineer for CNOR)

The Lanark route would be expensive - 35 miles of Laurentian Country with little or no traffic as opposed to 20 via Smiths Falls. The summit to be overcome is roughly 100 feet higher. The country near W. Rideau Lake is almost impracticable and not only would a main line be prohibitive in cost but so would the extension of the B&W to meet it and this Brockville connection is of great importance to not only ourselves but to the country. The rise from Westport to junction would be 150 feet or more over very rugged ground. We should have two separate crossings of the CPR instead of one at Smiths Falls and that at Perth seems highly objectionable. If we cross west of the station there is a very considerable rising grade on the latter. If east we are compelled to make a swing bridge over the Tay Canal.

We are debarred from making the cut off in the future from Portland to Montreal direct which is one of the string points of the present location.

We have only the traffic of Perth as against that of Westport, Newboro, Portland and Smiths Falls.

3 June 1907 from Richard Cartwright, Acting Premier

We should have an engineer go over the three routes and advise definitely which one is in the interests of the railway itself. Greatest good to the greatest number etc.

17 June 1907 to J.G.G. Kerry, 447, St. Urbain Street, Montreal

Sets out details of the study he is to undertake.

What is wanted is a report indicting which of these three lines is the best from every stand point - distance, grades, curvature and prospects for business.

10 July 1907 OIC 1591 is passed.

18 May 1908 Kerry Report

17 July 1909 from D.D. Mann (CNOR) to DM department

If a subsidy is granted we will build the branch from our main line to Carleton Place and Lanark.

It is not a line that the Company is particularly anxious to construct.

Cannot understand on what grounds the Department refused to approve our present location and why there is any disposition to divert the Company's line to a route that is longer, more expensive to construct, and which will not yield such good traffic returns.

22 July 1909 from DM to Mann

I was authorized to approve the route map through Smiths Falls provided you gave an unqualified promise to build a branch line through Carleton Place and Lanark: but no proviso will be made by the Minister that a subsidy will be voted for the branch in question. At the same time, Mr. Graham stated that he was quite willing to have your claims for subsidy taken into consideration, at such time as Parliament might see fit to vote railway subsidies.

15 July 1912 from Department to William Thorburn MP

There is no plan in the department showing the approval of a branch line of the CNOR from Smiths Falls to Lanark although the records contain a letter from Mr. D.D. Mann which was apparently discussed at the time that the route of the main line was approved through Smiths Falls. Attaches copies of letters.

12 June 1914 petition from ratepayers of Lanark twp

Asks that decisive action to compel CNOR to build a railway into Lanark.

Main line is practically completed and a freight service established thereon.

1918 - further pressure to have the line built to Lanark via Perth**1 February 1919 from Mitchell, VP Canadian National**

A great many branch lines were in prospect prior to the war but conditions have so changed that some of these have been abandoned and others have necessarily been deferred. The policy of the company for the present is to complete lines which were actually started prior to the war.

2 April 1923 from Alex McIntyre, Lanark

There was a clause that before the CNOR could have their charter a branch line must be built to Lanark village. Had the Laurier government not been defeated you would have made the CNR live up to that agreement.

Surely we deserve something.

Perth is our nearest station.

Now that the liberal government is back in power -- the people of this area have always held steadfastly to Liberal principles, moreover voted for them. Asks for a railway.

15 June 1923 from Alex McIntyre

Disappointed to see that no branch line to Lanark is in the list of grants.

22 June 1923 from department to McIntyre

Only such branch lines are constructed as are recommended by the CNR Board. Get in touch with Sir Henry Thornton.

15 July 1923 from Alex McIntyre to Graham Minister

Disappointed. Will not trouble you any further, our people are disappointed.

6 May 1926 from Alex McIntyre to Minister Dunning

Similar letter - promises etc.

18 May 1926 from CNR to Major Bell, DM of department

President wrote to McIntyre on 19 May 1925 to the effect that we could not recommend the construction of the branch at that time, and the situation has not changed since.

So far as a line from Smiths Falls to Perth is concerned it would amount to a duplication of the CPR, a condition which is not looked on with any favour. Although MacKenzie and Mann seem to have obligated themselves to build a branch from Smiths Falls to Lanark etc the circumstances have now so much changed that I feel the CNR could not sponsor such a proposal.

A response in similar vein went to McIntyre.

RG 43 vol. 344 file 5586

Route map of Toronto to Ottawa line.

19 April 1906 James Bay /Canadian Northern Ontario Railway submits detailed route maps

Applies for approval.

Location into the city of Ottawa not shown as the exact route has yet to be determined. Proposed to effect a junction with the Company's line between Montreal and French River near Ottawa.

Ten route maps attached and on file.

Advice is sent out to interested railways

8 May 1906 from Kingston Smiths Falls and Ottawa

We are ready to build as soon as the subsidy is revoked. For GTR. Seems that the two lines both wish to run between Ottawa and Smiths Falls.

10 May 1906 from GTR

The plans do not furnish sufficient detail for us to comment but there will be 10 crossings of the GTR (including)

South of Carp

East of Rideau River bridge

Rockland

Hawkesbury

Asks that CNOR pay all costs of crossings.

Revised route locations.

Set for hearing with the Minister 16 January 1907

16 December 1906 from J.F. Graham to Sir Wifred Laurier

What has to be done to make Newboro a divisional point. I am a poor boy and would like to do something to improve our town.

Petitions.

Much paper but little of import.

Hearing set for 15 May 1907

3 July 1907 Ottawa, Brockville & St. Lawrence Railway desire to be heard.

Hearing set for 18 June 1909 (Toronto - Ottawa) then 30 September (Scarborough & York.)

Route approved by Minister on 30th October 1909 from crossing of Bay of Quinte Ry to junction with line from French River.

Trenton, Belleville and Smiths Falls wanted the railway.

Much correspondence covering west of my study area. i.e. west of Harrowsmith.

RG 30 vol. 9334 file 1046-60-23

Malleable Castings siding at Smiths Falls

12 June 1912 to Temple

Sending plan of proposed connection with the CPR through Malleable Castings Company at Smiths Falls.

20 June 1912 from CNOR Temple to H.A. Lavell, Barrister, Smiths Falls

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of 19th instant re our temporary connection with the Malleable Castings Company's siding. I note that the Company has no objection to our application provided a definite term is fixed for the use of their property and that they are willing to enter into a lease until the 1st of October 1913 at a rental of \$10.00 per month, but would also like the assurance of the Railway Company that the property at the end of that time will be restored in as good condition as when the railway entered upon it.

I can undertake on behalf of the Railway Company that the latter condition, as to leaving the property in as good condition as when we enter on it, will be carried out. Our Engineer states that very little work will have to be done on the property. With reference to the leasing of the property I am instructed that we will likely not require the property until the date mentioned and would suggest the right to make the connection be granted to us provided we pay as rental \$10.00 per month for as long as the Railway wishes the property and until the track is removed provided that such time shall not extend beyond the 1st of October 1913. I think the simplest way to cover this agreement would be to have these two conditions embodied in the Board's order and of you will write to the Secretary, Board of Railway Commissioners, Ottawa consenting to the terms as I have

suggested them and ask him to embody these conditions in the Order he will do so. This will be satisfactory to the Railway Company.

I am much obliged to you and the Malleable Castings Company for the consent.

Out of chronological order

19 June 1912 from Lavall to Temple, CNOR

This morning your Resident Engineer and Mr. Wm. Frost of the Malleable Castings Co. met me by appointment. No objection

(note is this a later name for Frost and Wood?)

21 June 1912 from Temple to Board

Applies for authority to connect its lines and tracks temporarily with the lines and tracks of the Malleable Castings Company's siding in the town of Smiths Falls and to construct lines and tracks across Elmsley, Tierney, Maitland and Moore Street in the said town.

3 July 1912 from Beatty, CPR to Board

Objection to the proposed order.

This company consented to a temporary connection between the lines of the Applicant Company and this Company's siding to the Canadian Cooperage Company which was for the purpose of enabling them to secure construction materials.

This one connection is quite sufficient to serve the purpose of transferring their construction materials and there is no need of the additional connection now proposed.

10 July 1912 from Temple to the Board

We are advised by our Engineering Department as follows:

It is true that we have a connection through the Canadian Cooperage Siding but this one runs toward Ottawa while the Malleable Castings connection will give us a chance to work towards Belleville. There are several important bridges which we wish to get in - the road crossing, for instance, quite adjacent to Smiths Falls - besides other construction material. The CPR, as you know, are making the undercrossing themselves and as this is not yet completed, it is impossible for us to pass under the CPR tracks and get to the south with the use of the connection we have with the Canadian Cooperage Company. For this reason, we are asking the Malleable Castings Company's connection. It is simply to give us a chance to work both ways from Smiths Falls until the CPR complete our undercrossing.

15 July 1912 order 17043 is issued.

RG 30 vol. 9306 file 1046-26-291

Delay to CNR train No. 5 near Elgin

27 March 1920 from Inspector Harris to George Spencer Chief Operating Officer

I wish to draw your attention to the excessive detention of CNR train No. 5 leaving Ottawa 13.30 March 26th. This train arrived at a point near Elgin, Ont at 2.45 p.m. where

it stopped on account of a large piece of rock which fell over the track, This piece of rock was outside of track projecting over outside rail towards the centre of track.

The facilities for handling this work on the CNR are certainly not by any means up to date. The section men undertook to drill a hole in this rock with a defective drill, and then had to go about 4 miles for dynamite and fuse, and when they put the charge in they found the fuse was not good and were sent on a hand car another 4 miles for some more fuse. When they got a piece of good fuse, the dynamite was no good and merely burned away. Finally, after about five hours delay, they got some good dynamite and blasted this rock, a large portion of it falling between the rails on the track. This rock could easily have been moved by the engine of train No. 5 with very little effort, and after the blasting was done the sectionmen tried to move the pieces with bars and hand spikes, until Conductor Woodroffe came from the west end and moved the rock with a tie and engine of train No. 5.

I am of the opinion that the conductor of train No. 5 showed very poor judgement in not trying to move this rock without blasting, as it was clear of the rails, although it was overhanging the track on the lake side and it could have been done very easily as was proven by the movements of the second Conductor when he came along.

Instead of being delayed here for eight hours, the work could have been done easily in 45 minutes by using the engine and a little common sense. The CNR should make some arrangements to have blasting material and a cable, as well as proper drills for this work in this locality, as I understand the rock cuts extend for several miles in this vicinity. The sectionmen did not even have a maul hammer for striking the drill and he advised me that he had one on order for the last 12 months and had not yet received it. The train crew did not have a jack for the purpose of jacking this rock, neither had they a cable or chain for the purpose of pulling it away, and it is a disgrace to hold a train up for such a small casualty as the present case. No wonder people are dissatisfied who travel on this train to see 2 locomotives and 18 or 20 sectionmen looking at a rock and 2 men drilling a hole in it when the Conductor should have made some attempt to push it out of the way. Left point of accident at 10.20 p.m.

This train arrived at Toronto at 5.20 this morning instead of 9.30 last night.

28 April 1920 response from CNR

Our investigation shows the delay in removing the rock from the track was on account of the poor condition of dynamite stored in the magazine at Perth Road and defective fuse and caps. Train No. 5 on this date was equipped with two chains and a jack, but the conductors and crew of Nos. 5 and 108 considered it impossible to move this rock which weighed approximately 50 tons, until it was broken.

Positive instructions have been issued that section men in the vicinity of Elgin must be equipped with a good drill and sledge hammer for use in such emergencies, and that the

dynamite stored in the magazine at Perth Road and at mileage 175 be examined frequently to see that it is in proper condition for use in such emergencies.

RG 30 vol. 9303 file 1046-26-219

Nolans

Complaint that Nolans had a station but no trains stopped at it.

Effective Monday December 3 1917 Nolans was made a flag stop for trains No. 8 and 11.

RG 30 vol.9347 file 1046-62-29

Crossing of the CPR at Smiths Falls

1906-1910 various plans prepared

17 February 1910 CNOR applies to the Board for authority to cross the CPR at Smiths Falls

23 February 1910 from CPR to CNOR

Our objection is entirely to the location of the crossing and we will have to oppose it entirely, unless your company is content to go overhead. The point of crossing is just at the entrance to our yards and there would be a great deal of shunting over it.

Refers to crossing at Milverton and the Guelph and Goderich company was forced to construct an overhead crossing over the Grand Trunk for the same reasons.

Mr. Leonard tells me an overhead crossing is perfectly feasible and would in addition help you in connection with the street crossings.

29 March 1910 Answer from CPR

Objects to the crossing applied for on account of its location and the physical nature of the respondents tracks. Surveys indicate that at separation of grades is quite feasible at this point.

31 March 1910 from Wicksteed, CNOR Chief Engineer

Separation of grades at the point in question would be impracticable from our point of view. Not only would the fill to the south of the CPR crossing be a mile long with an average of 20 feet in depth but the station would be elevated in the air by that amount and inaccessible to the public.

As the CPR pulls backwards and forwards on this in shunting it (the grades) cannot be so bad. If it is then the level shunting track we are offering them is a great boon to them, and will save them much steam and wear and tear, but in any case it is apparent from a glance at the profile that it would cost infinitely less to practically eliminate this grade than to elevate our line for a mile to a height of 20 feet or more.

New survey being made - would be worthwhile to delay.

30 April 1910. Reply of CNOR to answer of CPR

Separation of grades at this point is not feasible as the fill for such separation to the south of the crossing of the respondent's track would be about one mile in length with an average depth of twenty feet. This fill would make it impossible to build a station for the town of Smiths Falls or to furnish any railway facilities therein.

4 May 1910 from CPR

I was surprised not to see you in Ottawa yesterday. The chairman was inclined to be a little drastic in his treatment of your cases in your absence and dismissed those relating to your locations in the county of Lanark and street crossings at Smiths Falls etc. Neither the town nor ourselves asked for this to be done.

(CNOR had not been there because the engineer could not get back in time from a trip.)

Commissioner Mills dissented and refused to initial the orders because it was the first time that he had known the CNOR to fail to put in an appearance. Thought the action discourteous.

10 June 1910 from Wicksteed to Ruel

Hearing was held on 7 June. Depressing our grade dangerously close to highwater level in the drowned land, that we could not get away from the proposed crossing with our standard grade without lengthening our distance say 2000 feet and increasing our total curvature.

Discussed with CPR, Sullivan, and have come to the conclusion that a scheme of grade separation if reasonable and feasible but could not subscribe to the CPR claim that CNOR should pay all of the additional cost of CP's elevation over and above the moderate lift, which they shew as being absolutely necessary for the proper adjustment of their yard trackage. Encloses a statement which claims that the abolition of the grade crossing means a saving to the CNOR which capitalized would amount to \$75,000.

Should submit the question to the Railway Commission.

In regard to capitalized values, the elimination of the interlocking plant may be possibly worth to us in the future \$40,000 to \$50,000 but at the present time we would prefer to have the cash.

While there is a gain in the abolition this gain is more than offset by the damage to our line, a curve introduced in a formerly straight station yard obstructing our view of the swing bridge and more curvature and extra distance in the line between Smiths Falls and Ottawa. It seems to me therefore that the outside limit of our endurance would be reached if we were called on to pay as our contribution the actual cost of the concrete and steel for the two subways, the Brockville line to be built for one track and the Havelock for two as at present existent.

23 February 1911 Further application to the Board.

20 March 1911 from CPR to the Board

Consents to the undercrossing. However in addition to the double track main line at the point in question sidings both on the north and south side of these main lines are now in contemplation and CPR will in all probability require to have at least three or four tracks ver this crossing before the end of the present season.

Any order which is to be issued should provide that it is without prejudice to this company's rights as the senior road in respect of such future tracks.

22 March 1911 memo from Wicksteed.

At our first application the CPR made objections on the ground that they had been considering for some time extensions of their yard. We took their word for it, withdrew our plans and are now submitting new ones which meet the objections. That the CPR, in the meantime should discover further improvements which they can make and should ask us to bridge the cut again seems very paltry and pettifogging, and is quite inconsistent with their standing as the premier road of Canada.

23 March 1911 from CNOR to the Board

In order to meet the CPR objections that they had been considering for some time extensions to their yards we withdrew our plans. We submitted new plans that met their objections. We do not think that the CPR present intentions should be considered since they may keep on indefinitely discovering further improvements that may some time in the future which might hold up the approval of our plans for a considerable time. Asks to be heard before an order is issued.

2 May 1911 from Wicksteed

The understanding with Mr. Sullivan was that the CPR were to lift their track to the new grade on receiving reasonable (say 60 days) notice of our intention to go ahead with our work and they were to leave an opening to be spanned by a girder which we are to furnish and which we are to carry safely, as the excavation goes on underneath it until such time as the permanent abutments can be put in. As there is very little soil on top of the rock at this point, I don't see why we cannot put these in immediately and before any rock excavation is done.

26 April 1911 from Assistant Solicitor to Stewart [out of chronological order](#)

The Board approved the proposition on the following conditions:

1. that we should leave room for the crossing for two main line tracks and a side track of the CPR.
2. That we should pay so much of the cost of raising the CPR tracks over and above what they were to have done themselves according to their own plans.

Before drawing a proposed draft order I would like to know the way in which the proposed work will be carried out. [See previous memo from Wicksteed](#)

25 May 1911 from CPR to CNOR

I have not yet received the plans.

In connection with the grade reduction upon the Havelock section it was not the intention to lift the Carlton (sic) Branch to any extent but rather divert it sufficiently to permit of the Havelock section being raised.

In order to proceed with the grade reduction which is now under way it will be necessary either to lift or divert the Carlton Branch immediately.

The latter would be the more economical were it not that the question of your crossing is involved.

30 May 1911 from Chief Engineer of Construction to Asst Chief Engineer CPR

When you are raising your grade you would leave an opening across the line and carry your tracks there on temporary work, so laid out as to leave openings for the building of the concrete abutments of the bridges to carry your tracks; that as soon as your grade was raised, we would build these abutments founding them on the rock outside the slopes of the cutting on our line; that the bridges would then be put in place on your line and when the traffic was carried over them we would take out the cutting on our line underneath the bridges.

--

It is my intention to use spans of not less than fifty feet to carry your tracks, so that the abutments may be founded at a safe distance back from the slopes of the cutting and your track completed over the bridges instead of carrying them on temporary work while the excavation is being made on our line. I also want to have span enough on the bridges to enable us to double track afterwards without any interference with the bridges. The cutting will be almost entirely in rock, so that it should be quite sound construction to build the abutments in that way.

Correspondence with the Board - at variance with CPR. What is the correct plan?

29 June 1911 from CPR to CNOR

Encloses draft order. The contractors on our new double track are just at the point of crossing with their track and will have to shut down if the order is not issued as proposed by us. Attached is a plan and profile dated 14 June 1911.

28 November 1911 order 15496 is issued

14 December 1911 order 15600 is issued

28 August 1912 telegram from CNOR to CPR

Absolutely necessary transfer engine across your tracks at Smiths Falls to take delivery our material on west side. We have switch connections with your line both sides. Simply means switch movement of engine across your tracks. Am informed your general

superintendent has refused to allow this be done. Understand Leonard away. Would you kindly take mater up with proper officials and ascertain what is causing trouble.

RG 46 vol. 1470 file 18645

Station at Twin Elm

12 February 1912 Application for approval of location of station grounds at Twin Elm.

16 March 1912 from Chief Operating Officer

The proposed location of shelter and siding is between two highway crossings, shown as a side road and a public highway.

The station should be located about 600 ft. west of the crossing, and when constructing the station at this point, it would probably be well to consider the advisability of diverting this highway to cross the track at right angles.

25 March 1912 CNOR memo

We note recommendations of Chief Operating Officer and in reply can simply say that we sent our traffic man through this district to interview shippers and obtain information which would enable us to locate our station at the most advantageous point for handling freight and passenger traffic. The location in question was strongly recommended by our traffic man.

Location is best suited to the interests of the public and railway company. -- This is not a crossing siding, simply an industrial siding with 300' in clear length.

Suggest Chief Operating Officer visit the location.

Plan of Station Grounds

19 April 1912 Nepean Township approved Board proposed change

6 May 1912 Board asks CNOR to prepare a plan as they propose.

31 May 1912 CNOR ask for a hearing.

Revised plan of station grounds. Shows the side road diverted and the public highway altered to cross the railway at right angles.

9 September 1912 objections from property owner.

2 October 1912 Inspector Clark (?)

Inspection on Tuesday October 1. Convinced that the plan of the white print be adopted as it will do away with one crossing. Will add to the safety of the public as the crossing west of the station on the public highway is a skew crossing and a dangerous one. Side road is not heavily traveled.

6 November 1912 order 17859 is issued.

Shows a shelter station.

16 June 1913 CNOR request for authority to take land for the diversion.

18 August 1913 order 20110 is issued.

Application for a station at Twin Elm

1 June 1916 from CNOR

We were under the impression at the time that there would be sufficient traffic at Twin Elm to justify putting in a shelter and loading track. Our Traffic department has reported that there is not sufficient business at this point to justify this extra stop. It is only 2.8 miles from Fallowfield and 2.9 miles from Richmond.

23 June 1916 Nepean township requests CNOR for a flag station at Twin Elm
CNOR replied that there wasn't sufficient business. Township replied that the Company knew what they were doing when they prepared the plan and asked to know "If they did not intend to establish a siding at this point why were the plans filed with the Township Council".

18 July 1916 Hearing

CNOR not represented because of a misunderstanding.

A train stopped at Twin Elm during the construction period, also while the gasoline car was operating it stopped at this point for a time.

Special reason was that people desired to engage in the milk business. At present there are two cheese factories which operated about 5 months in the year and produced about 60 tons of cheese. If people could ship milk to the city this would give a business extending over ten months of the year. Richmond and Fallowfield are both inconvenient for this.

13 June 1914 - request to change the name to Goodwood - rejected because there was already a station by this name on the GTR and Post Office would object.

18 July 1916 CNOR intention to construct a station.

3 October 1916 History of the matter

Timetables show as follows:

#34 July 18 1914 not shown

#35 October 19, 1914 westbound flag at 4.47 p.m. (train 19); eastbound flag at 9.09 a.m. (train 20) - motor service.

#36 December 14 1914 westbound flag at 12.51 p.m. (train 11); eastbound flag at 6.26 p.m. (train 12). Toronto-Ottawa day trains.

#37 - missing

#38 April 5 1915 as #36.

#39 June 12 1915 westbound flag at 1.21 p.m. (train 11); eastbound flag at 6.11 p.m. (train 12); westbound SuO flag at 9.51 a.m. (train 19); eastbound SuO flag at 9.31 p.m. (train 20) The latter two trains named are Subday Specials to Chaffey's Locks.
#1 September 8 1915 westbound flag at 12.51 p.m. (train 11); eastbound flag at 6.41 p.m. (train 12).
#2 November 1 1915 and all changes since - station not shown in the timetable.

18 October 1916 from CNOR if we are ordered to stop trains at Twin Elm we will not be able to make the scheduled times of our passenger trains.

Problem was that there were no local trains.

5 October 1916 order 25509 is issued.

8 November 1916 from CNOR

We do not have enough men or materials to complete the work by 31 December. Not enough passenger or freight business to justify the facilities ordered.

21 November 1916 order 25654 is issued

30 April 1917 from Board to CNOR

Advised that no action has been taken to comply with the order. Required to be completed by 31 May.

2 May 1917 from CNOR

Cannot put up facilities because have no men. Will arrange to stop the trains at the road crossing at Twin Elm and will put in a platform, shelter and other facilities when we are able to get the men to do the work.

27 May 1917. From CNOR will stop trains eight and seven on flag at Twin Elm effective May 31.

17 August 1917 From CNOR Hope the Board will not make us install a siding at this time. The way freight will stop and load the stock any time it is necessary and there is absolutely no need of the siding. Impossible to get rails and switch material. Please note that the adjacent sidings at Merivale and Fallowfield had no outbound shipment in the last two months and but one car forwarded to Ottawa last fall.

30 August 1917 Inspector McCaul

I inspected facilities at Twin Elm yesterday.

A shelter and platform have been provided, also a platform for loading milk. However, no person could receive or load LCL freight or place milk on the milk platform on account of the height of the station platform and milk stand above the ground. Before any business can be done a roadway will have to be graded and the approaches to the station and milk platform raised at least 6' or more.

The stockyard has been built east of the station. Loading and unloading will have to be done on the main line. This is unsatisfactory. Cattle shippers have to prepare cars before loading. The cattle would have to be driven along the right of way to reach to stock pen with no protection by way of fencing from the track.

There are two cheese factories within one mile of Twin Elm which have to ship at Richmond.

Comment from staff - the CNR are just fooling with this matter

Copy of report sent to CNOR

Reply from CNOR - no justification. Pleads hardship - lack of funds, wartime.

File and September 1918 No indication whether a siding was ever installed.

**RG 46 vol. 1470 file 18647
Station at Merivale.**

14 November 1911 CNOR applies for approval of location of station grounds at Merivale.

14 March 1912 order 16125 is issued.

Plan 13280 of 14 Nov. 1911.

27 Sept 1916 Memo

Township applies for a flag station.

The plan filed shows a number 4 station. An inspection reveals that instead a box car body is serving the purpose of a shelter at that point.

Until November 15, 1915 Merivale was a flag stop for train No. 11 westbound at 12.38 p.m. and train No. 12 eastbound at 6.54 p.m. With the advent of timetable No. 2 on November 1, 1915 Merivale was discontinued as a flag stop. In other words, the village was taken off the map.

Notwithstanding that Merivale is only 3 ½ miles from Rideau Yard at which point all passenger trains stop and that business is very slight, the number of passengers during 4 months was 132 and was sufficient to warrant stopping the trains.

6 November 1916 from Board to CNOR

Kindly arrange to have your train Numbers 11 and 12 stop at Merivale tomorrow to accommodate Inspector McCaul who is investigating train and station facilities.

9 November 1916 Report of Inspector McCaul

Population is urban, no stores, no village or other places of business. 75 farmers and families are tributary.

Met Geo. Bryce, Mulligan, James Davidson, and 25 others. Company promised them a station when the line was under construction. In response to claim that revenue was low they said that there was no station accommodation whatsoever and that on numerous

occasions the train failed to stop. The roadway has never been graded and there is no access to the station except by crossing the siding and main track.
Recommends that CNOR be directed to provide station facilities.

Problem is that the company doesn't provide a local train, doesn't want to stop its through trains

6 December 1916 from CNOR

We cannot provide these facilities owing to winter and scarcity of labour.

Would dislike stopping trains 8 and 11 as they are fast trains in competition with other lines.

The platform and facilities at Merivale were provided to take care of summer traffic and trains 19 and 20 stopped at this point when flagged.

Application by township of Nepean for an order.

12 January 1917 order 25805 is issued.

28 February 1917 from CNOR

Asks to retain the present shelter in view of the small amount of business. Will be difficult to obtain material and labour.

2 March 1917 order 25913 is issued

Changes station 2B to 1B.

Excellent plan and elevation of station 1954.

15 April 1954 CNR applies for approval of proposed new station

26 April 1954 order 83604 is issued.

End of file.

RG 46 vol. 1470 file 18648

Approval of station layout at mile 174.5 twp of Storrington.

Plan 12 September 1911

27 November 1911 order 15483 is issued.

Revised plan 14 Mar 1912

23 April 1912 order 16376 is issued.

RG 43 vol. 649 file 20880

Mr. Good claim for railway running through property.

May 1920 Asks CNR to look into claim.

2 July 1920 From CNR

Mr. Good was fairly dealt with. Money paid into court because Good refused to sign the deed and title was cleared in that manner.

Much correspondence - nothing more seems to have been done.