

Citizen Control of the Citizen's Business

TORONTO'S CITIZENS CAN CONTROL TORONTO'S AFFAIRS ONLY
THROUGH FREQUENT, PROMPT, ACCURATE AND PERTINENT INFORMATION WITH REGARD TO TORONTO'S BUSINESS.

ISSUED BY THE



189 CHURCH STREET

TELEPHONE: MAIN 3620

White Paper No. 58

July 24th, 1922

Manāna, Zaftra, To-Morrow= The Day After To-day, Any Day But This, Never.

In 1853 the population of Toronto was less than
40,000

At that time, a railway engineer reported against level crossings along the water front as follows:—

"The Esplanade would be ruined, the railway service obstructed, whilst further, the City would be cut off from its water front on the Bay, except under the permanent hazard and embarrassment of crossing, say five lines of railway on a level."

Sixty-seven years later, in a City with a population of 535,000, thousands of Toronto citizens cross daily from 9 to 16 tracks along the water front, the Esplanade is ruined, the City is cut off from its water front, centuries are lost every year by citizens and by railroads, owing to delays in traffic and transportation, and since time is money, thousands of dollars are lost every day in increased costs and diminished business.

If the new Union Station were located in Madrid or Nijnigorod, we should quote it as an example of Spanish indolence or Russian procrastination.

Is it a good introduction to Toronto ?

THIRTY-FOUR YEARS OF CONVERSATION

A summarized chronicle, mostly from the address of Mr. E. L. Cousins to the Board of Trade, February 16th, 1921.

1888. April. Conference between members of City Council, civic officials and representatives of the railway companies for the purpose of devising ways and means of diminishing the dangers to life and property resulting from level crossings.
1889. Toronto Board of Trade engaged Mr. A. M. Wellington, C.E., of New York City, to report on this question. Mr. Wellington reported in favour of elevating the tracks above the streets along the mile of water front from York Street to Berkeley Street. He stated overhead bridges would be far better than nothing, but that under Toronto conditions, their use would be open to several serious objections. . . . "I judge that by the plans subjoined, the necessities of the existing situation and the reasonable wishes of all three of the parties interested . . . will be met more completely than by any other plan which has been submitted or has occurred to me, and it provides for elevating the tracks."
- 1889-1900. Quiescence.
1900. February 8th. Question of a Yonge St. Bridge discussion.
- 1900-1906. Quiescence.
1906. October. Alderman Geary's special Committee on level crossings "decided to recommend that the Dominion Board of Railway Commissioners appoint an engineer to report on the cost and advisability of erecting a viaduct for railway traffic from Logan Avenue on the East, to the Humber River on the West."
- 1906-1907. The Board of Trade, "as a result of the personal efforts of Mr. Hugh Blain, took the matter in hand in the interests of the general public."
1908. December 30th. The Dominion Board of Railway Commissioners passed the original viaduct order, providing in the main, for the elevation of four tracks from York Street to Cherry Street, bridges at John Street, Spadina Avenue, and Bathurst Street.
1909. May. Hearing of counter proposals by the railways providing for Subways at Bay and Yonge Streets.
1909. June 4th. Railway Commission ordered that Viaduct work as per original order should be proceeded with.
1911. March 25th. The appeal of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Privy Council against the Railway Commission's order was dismissed.
1911. April 25th. Railway Commission ordered that plans be filed by August 1st, 1911, and that work be completed within two years from date.

One would think that in a law-abiding community where the State is no respecter of persons, that, of course, the viaduct would be completed by August 1st, 1913. Naturally the Board of Harbour Commissioners and the City took it for granted that the Commission's order would be carried out and, therefore, in

- 1912 active operations for the development of the harbour front were begun.
1913. July 29th. A viaduct agreement was entered into between the railways and the City as a result of conferences between representatives of the City, Harbour Commissioners, C.P.R. and G.T.R., and was executed by all the parties thereto. This was the result of representations made by the railways that if a viaduct was desirable, the heretofore proposed location for it was not suitable and that they desired a revision of the plan.
1913. July 31st. Orders passed by the Railway Commission, validating agreement.
1913. Plans filed and much property expropriated.
- 1914-1920. Quiescence, except the partial completion of the Union Station at a cost of say \$4,000,000. The new Union Station is a real "white elephant" to everybody concerned. Parts of it are in use, as for P.O. purposes, but as far as offering facilities for the travelling public is concerned, it might as well be where the viaduct is. As a part of the general scheme, the old Custom House was demolished. The only concrete results are the inconvenience of the public and the increase in the total rents paid by the Government for outside offices. Besides, it is costing someone annually in interest and depreciation some half million dollars.
1920. August. The railways suggested a further postponement of viaduct construction for ten years and temporary provision be made for that period involving the retention of existing bridges with necessary changes, the building of four additional temporary bridges, the closing of three streets, the elevation of certain tracks to the east.
1920. The City and Harbour Commissioners made counter proposals providing for permanent grade separation between Bathurst and Bay Streets, temporary subways for Yonge, Scott and Church Streets, and for the completion of the remaining viaduct work, as far east as Logan Avenue, over a period of years to be agreed upon between the parties interested. The City and the Harbour Commission took the ground that under no circumstances could temporary grade separation for a period of ten years be considered.
- 1920-1922. Quiescence.
1922. In March, a deputation made up of representatives of the City of Toronto, Board of Harbour Commissioners, Toronto Board of Trade, Central Ratepayers' Association, memorialized the Government to proceed immediately with the construction of the viaduct as the successors of the Grand Trunk Railway, one of the parties to the agreement. Mayor Maguire assured the Government that the City was ready to fulfill its part of the contract. Mr. R. Home Smith, Chairman of the Harbour Board, stated that

his Board had proceeded on their programme in the firm belief that the agreement of 1913 would be carried out, and that unless an immediate solution of the water front problem were reached, the investments of both the City and Government would be greatly impaired.

In June, Mayor Maguire sent a telegram to the Premier protesting against further delay. The telegram closed as follows: "Our patience is about exhausted and I hope your Government will realize this and will give us some relief."

On June 28th, just before the official opening of the bath-house and amusement park at Sunnyside, Mr. R. Home Smith stated to the City Council that "the whole Harbour Board scheme was built on the assumption that the railways would in good faith carry out the provisions of the viaduct order made by the Railway Commission and the terms of the solemn agreement into which they entered with the City of Toronto and the Toronto Harbour Commission in the year 1913."

The possibility of the Harbour Board development paying their own way and of the City and Dominion getting full value for the \$19,000,000 expenditure already incurred, depends, therefore, among other factors, on the final settlement of the water front problem.

WHAT FAITH IN A SCRAP OF PAPER HAS AND MAY COST THE CITY

1. "The Harbour Commission, upon the execution of the Viaduct Agreement on July 29th, 1913, revised their Water Front Development plans of 1912 and immediately proceeded to prepare in detail, plans for the development of the inner harbour water front between Cherry and Bathurst Streets, a distance of approximately two miles. As a result of the Viaduct Agreement, it was decided to extend the pier head or harbour head line a maximum of some 1,100 feet in the vicinity of York Street, and to proceed immediately with the dock development between Cherry and Bathurst Streets; also to reclaim an additional 295 acres of property along the inner harbour water front, in addition to the reclamation of some 1,000 acres of property known as the Eastern Harbour Terminals, which was prior to 1912, Ashbridge's Bay Marsh.

"The Commission have proceeded absolutely along these lines in accordance with their undertaking, and they and the Dominion Government have to date expended approximately \$19,000,000 thereon, reclaiming in the inner harbour to date 60 acres of new land and constructed three miles of modern dockage, of which 27 acres of land is now under lease and option. In the Eastern Section 450 acres have been reclaimed and 4½ miles of dockage constructed, and 250 acres are now under lease and option. New industrial plant and equipment in the newly-developed sections have been erected by private capital to the amount of approximately \$8,000,000.

"The main entrance to the Eastern Harbour Terminals is, as is well known, via Cherry Street, at which point there are 16 tracks, on the level. The Viaduct Order provided for the elevation of these tracks,

and it was with the expectation that this would be done that the Harbour Commission undertook the reclamation and improvement of the Eastern Harbour Terminals. Our tenants are still confronted with the necessity of having to use this dangerous crossing, and times without number are subjected to unreasonable delay by the blocking of the crossing by freight trains and switching movements. Furthermore, the district is subjected to an added premium as regards fire insurance on account of the Cherry Street level crossing.

"All of the above monies have been expended by the Harbour Commission in perfectly good faith, and the interest and sinking fund charges have to be paid thereon from the revenue received as a result of the improvement, and, if these properties are to be subjected to temporary approaches, plus the closing of one of the main arteries, viz.: Bay Street, then there will be ninety acres of property in the inner harbour water front, between Simcoe and Church Streets, valued at over four million dollars, a large amount of which will remain idle for many years . . . Why? Because the railway companies refuse to carry out their portion of an agreement made between them, the City and Harbour Commission. The effect will be strangulation of inner harbour water front improvements." Mr. E. L. Cousins, 1921.

2. "Furthermore, as a condition of the agreement, water front properties being improved were to be provided with proper access thereto, and I have no hesitation in saying that the work would never have been proceeded with by the Commissioners had it been anticipated for one moment that the agreement of 1913, solemnly executed by all parties, would not be carried to completion." Mr. E. L. Cousins, 1921.
3. Unless the Harbour improvements are given a chance to become revenue producing, the annual deficits will have to be met in the long run out of the general taxation of the City.

EXHIBITS

- A. An Old Union Station which nobody wants and which is a blot on the City.
- B. A New Union Station which serves principally as a source of exasperation to the travelling public who can see it but can't use it, and as a source of mirth to visitors, who ask the inhabitants sly, "When are you going to open it for business?" How much "Booster" advertising of the City will it take to counterbalance the advertising received by the City from the mausoleum known as the New Union Station? Toronto is not responsible, at least not mainly so, for the present impasse. But the visitor thinks of us as that kind of City which will put up for years with an old, filthy station, when a block away a beautiful new station stands unused, at least as far as transportation is concerned.

A SUPPLEMENTARY EXHIBIT.

- C. A vacant lot where the Custom House used to be, the former building having been torn down in 1919, and the work of the office scattered among rented offices, to the great inconvenience of the public.

WHICH WILL COST MORE MONEY TO THE RAILWAYS THE CITY AND THE DOMINION?

To build the viaduct and put \$25,000,000 or
\$30,000,000 of investment already
made to economic use

or

To leave things as they are, with millions of investment lying idle and accumulating debt charges, and with conditions at the Union Depot and on the Harbour Front becoming steadily more intolerable and more dangerous to life?

*There is no citizen of Toronto who can not do
something to help bring about a*

UNION STATION-WATER FRONT
CLEAN-UP

If you can not find time to write personally, will you sign the enclosed letter, place it in one of your own envelopes, and forward to the Minister of Railways? An additional letter to the Premier or to the Member of Parliament from your riding would be advisable.