

JOURNAL
- of the -
RAILWAY AND CANAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Vol. 4. No. 4.

July, 1958

PRESIDENT - C. R. Clinker
CHAIRMAN - C. F. Klapper

HON. SECRETARY
M. I. Berrill,
Grotes Lodge,
Blackheath Village,
London, S.E.3.

HON. TREASURER
F. G. M. Watson,
12a, Wilson House,
Albion Avenue,
London, S.W.8.

HON. EDITOR
J. G. Spence,
8, Stanstead Road,
Caterham,
Surrey.

LOCAL GROUP SECRETARIES:

London: P. Roos, 19b, Uxbridge Road, London, W.12.

North Western: A. P. Voce, 10, Danesbury Road, Bolton, Lancs.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS AT ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, 26 APRIL, 1958.

During the past twelve months - since we last met at York - I have had the pleasure of meeting many members of the Society in person and of corresponding with a number of others.

These contacts have brought clearly into my mind a realization of the great amount of solid and painstaking research which is going forward steadily all the time. It is as if some pattern - perhaps a fantastically large pattern - is being woven, the separate strands being carefully brought together to produce a finished, often definitive, result - a lecture, paper or book. This may deal with the life story of a single company or the detailed examination of some small piece of history, not of any special importance in itself but of value as part of the whole.

Of course, we all know that research is fascinating and generally rewarding in greater or lesser degrees. We know too, that the "research infection" is a very catching disease. It usually spreads rapidly and before we realize it, we find ourselves launched on a full-scale piece of work from which there is no turning back.

The research worker whose source material is to be found neatly assembled and housed in one building near at hand is indeed fortunate. Some of us have undertaken work where the necessary material is scattered about in widely separated repositories, in addition to which we have to do fieldwork on the site which seems to be almost invariably a long way from where we live and difficult of access except by car.

Now that members of the Society are to be found in almost all English counties at any rate - I could wish that we had more in Scotland and Wales - I think we might well consider whether our researches could usefully be carried out on a co-operative basis in certain selected suitable cases.

I have recently tried this on a very small scale. With the generous help of two members who examined the local newspaper files and the company's minute books respectively, I was able to explain to my satisfaction some rather mysterious happenings on the Northamptonshire-Lincolnshire border. My written account of this tiny fragment of railway history duly referred to the co-operative result and acknowledged the help of the members who had taken part in it.

There is, of course, ample evidence from other instances that members who carried out specific research for their own purposes, read local newspapers extensively, have noted down facts with which they were not directly concerned and passed these on to others whom they knew to be interested in the subject. I have received invaluable help in this way from extracts from newspapers and other contemporary material sent to me by various members and I take this opportunity of gratefully acknowledging their courtesy. In particular, a long series of such items which covered upwards of fifty years of two local newspapers was, and continues to be, of great help.

It may be that an attempt at co-operative research projects is not one that can be effectively organized by or through the Society but is best left to individual arrangement to fit each particular case. But, at the same time, I think it would be a step in the right direction if we made it our business to get to know the lines of research upon which our fellow members are working. We may then be in a position to offer help which might be appreciated, all the more for its being unexpected. Perhaps some scheme could be devised by which the interests of members embarking upon some new piece of research could be inserted in the Journal.

I am well aware that there is already a very considerable exchange of information between individual members; this was going on long before the Society was founded and has been expanded a good deal since. Such exchange is of great value, not only for the data which it makes available, but also for the avoidance of duplicated effort and the increased knowledge of subjects in which other members specialize.

It is pleasant to think that our membership, now almost 200, includes all the established railway and canal historians, with only one or two important exceptions; we still hope that these may eventually join us. But this fact is worth reflecting upon. These established historians, together with many others whose experience is shorter, form an immense fund of accumulated knowledge. Much of this is highly specialized - the history of individual companies, or of areas of various sizes, counties, towns and so on. Others have devoted

attention to such important aspects as bibliography, sources, statutory history, railway economic history, closed lines and stations and numerous ancillary subjects.

I sometimes ponder on the gaps in our specialist knowledge, particularly of company history, and wonder why these exist. There are, so far as I am aware, no historians with comprehensive knowledge of the Great Northern and London Brighton & South Coast Railways, for example, though the northern extremities of the former and London end of the latter have found devotees. It cannot be that the published so-called "histories" of these companies have already told us all there is to know of them - far from it. Likewise the Great Eastern, which still waits a full scale historical study.

It may be, of course, that the quantity of the source material is so great as to frighten away potential students. If so, it is understandable. The mere thought of reading 715 minute books as a prelude to writing a history of the London & North Western is a terrifying prospect. Our Victorian forbears seemingly had the time for such work but not the facilities; we have the facilities but not the time.

Is not this a case where we might attempt something on a co-operative or group basis?

I spoke just now of a very small experiment in this method of conducting research and assembling the results. If it will not sound too egotistical, I think you may be interested in two larger experiments - one nearing what I think will be a successful conclusion and the other still being proceeded with.

Both are being carried out by small groups of extra-mural students of the University of Nottingham. In each case these students are the hard and enthusiastic core of those who have been through two successive winters' courses. The first series of 24 lectures dealt with the history of the more important lines of railway in the British Isles area by area, with some early "background" and parliamentary procedure. The second series, consisting of 36 lectures, discussed sources and their value and use with, I hope, some helpful information on putting the results into readable form.

It was then decided to try some practical work. One group adopted the suggestion to work on a company history - the Midland Counties Railway - and the other chose an area, Nottinghamshire with small parts of adjoining counties to form a cohesive whole.

In the case of the Midland Counties Railway, every available contemporary source was painstakingly examined. About 1,500 local newspapers were thoroughly combed column by column and every detail carefully extracted uniformly on sheets. The minute books of the municipal corporations were thrown open to us and, of course, the company's books and other documents. The group also had the benefit of the parallel

research being carried out at Nottingham so far as it affected that end of the line. The area task is lengthier because, as a basis, about 80 years of the local press must be read to begin with; this work is still proceeding.

Extracting is laborious, but not difficult, work. Piecing the story together in chronological order proved much less easy. Despite the mass of data collected, all of which cannot be used from limitations of space, gaps in our knowledge inevitably appeared and we had to re-search in some cases to try and bridge them. Conflicting dates from two, or even three, different contemporary sources had to be re-checked and a fair conclusion arrived at. Some exasperating and puzzling historical discrepancies had to be cleared up by discussion and resolved where possible. One or two of these seem likely to remain, along with at least one major problem on which there is insufficient evidence to provide a definite answer. I feel we shall never know what happened in this particular case, try as we will.

I could say much more of interest about these experiments, but time will not allow. You will, I hope, read the published results in due course and be able to judge whether they are successful or not.

If you think they have been worth doing, then I commend the idea of similar work to you as a promising way of achieving in co-operation with others more than you can hope to do by working on your own. You will not, I think, lose anything of the satisfaction or pride which one, quite rightly, feels when a task is properly and satisfactorily accomplished. I am convinced there are great possibilities in this method, given a suitable combination of research talent and careful organization. I hope that we, in our capacity as members of this Society, may seriously consider attempting some such work.

* * * * *

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE BRADFORD CANAL

By Gordon Biddle

Continued from p. 54.

Author's copyright reserved.

On 10 June 1865 there was presented before Lord Chief Justice Cockburn "the important case of liability of the canal company for a nuisance created by their introducing into it the polluted water of another stream." The plaintiffs had decided in the interim that it was impossible to indict the Company for illegally using the back water owing to its having been tacitly recognised both by the Council and in legislation. The question now was solely one of whether or not the Canal Company were responsible for the nuisance. The Company, meanwhile, had thought of another defence, and submitted that they had a public duty to remain open for carriage of goods, and would be acting

contrary to their Act of Incorporation if they closed, the only alternative if the beck waters were denied them. The Judge disagreed, saying that "no obligation could be imposed upon them to remain open in such circumstances and that nothing could contravene the law of nuisance." A decision was given in favour of the plaintiffs, but the Company was permitted to appeal.

Losing no time, the victorious committee filed a suit in Chancery for an injunction restraining the canal from using the beck water, which was heard on July 27th. The bill was held over, but in the meantime the Company was ordered to cleanse the basin every two weeks by "flushing". Presumably this meant opening the lock sluices to let out the foul water and allowing the canal to fill again. They were further charged to ensure that the flow of water into and out of the basin did not cease for longer than 36 hours.

On November 7th the Mayor of Bradford presided at a public meeting in the Exchange. The prosecuting party was running out of funds, costs so far having amounted to £1,500. The motion that proceedings be continued was carried with great vigour and unanimity despite a warning that if the case were to go to the House of Lords another £2,000 would have to be raised.

The case was heard again before Vice-Chancellor Sir W. Page Wood on March 22nd 1866, and an injunction restraining the Company from diverting the beck and other sewage into the canal in perpetuity was granted from 6th November of that year. The penalty for infringement was £10,000.

The Company had almost eight months' grace before closure would be forced upon them, but they had already decided that they could not continue an independent existence. Some years earlier, in 1853, the Leeds and Liverpool had unwisely leased the carrying side of its operations to the London and North Western, Lancashire and Yorkshire and Midland Railways, jointly, who had promptly raised the tolls to a near uneconomic level in order to divert traffic to the rail. This had equally affected the Bradford Canal and seriously reduced its income. Consequently, the injunction was to the proprietors something in the nature of a final blow, and while the legal proceedings had been going on the directors had been busy. Negotiations were entered into with the Leeds and Liverpool, they having the only other source of water readily available. The Bradford Company desired to close the last quarter mile of their waterway, sell the land to speculative builders, and transfer the remainder to the Leeds and Liverpool. The latter, however, wanted to take over the canal as a going concern and, if the land had to be sold, sell it themselves. As they had already paid one third of the Bradford Company's legal expenses they saw no attraction in taking over a truncated canal requiring brand new wharves and warehouses. Terms could not be agreed, and they went their separate ways.

In November 1866 two Parliamentary Bills were deposited, one by the Leeds and Liverpool and one by the Bradford, each setting out their respective solutions to the problem. The first sought to lease the Bradford Canal, cease taking water from the beck, close the canal from the basin to Northbrook Bridge, and pump water into the summit pool from the Leeds and Liverpool at Shipley. The other Bill sought powers for one of the following alternatives: stop up the canal from the basin to Northbrook Bridge and sell the land; stop up all the canal and sell the land; or lease the canal to the Leeds and Liverpool.

In order to allow the Bills to be heard before the injunction came into operation, the Bradford Company applied for and was granted an extension until May 1st 1867. The Bradford Bill was heard in Committee on March 12th 1867, and the Leeds and Liverpool the following day. The Leeds and Liverpool, on being questioned how they intended to obtain water, stated that they would pump it from Shipley either from lock to lock or direct to the summit pound by means of a pipe beneath the towing path. Bradford Town Council opposed both Bills. They had no wish to see the upper portion sold to speculative builders without provision for their own plans to widen Canal Road and culvert the beck. Also, the Borough Engineer considered the pumping arrangements insufficient to prevent stagnation, and as neither Bill proposed an immediate cessation of the nuisance it was felt that the effect of the injunction would be weakened. Both Bills were rejected, the Leeds and Liverpool's because the preamble was not proved, and the Bradford's because so many alterations would be required to make any of the alternatives practicable "as would not be warranted by the general scope of the preamble."

Towards the end of April notices appeared in the press advising traders to withdraw their vessels from the canal. It was dredged, and then on May 1st 1867 the sluice gates were shut, the lock paddles were opened, the water ran out and so it closed.

The quarry owners of the district now found themselves without transport for their stone, output of which ran to the tune of some £350,000 a year. The canal had been well suited to their needs and they were unwilling and in many cases unable, to go to the expense of arranging for rail transport. They therefore opened negotiations with the Bradford and Leeds and Liverpool Companies and the Town Council. The Bradford Company, impoverished by the long litigation and declined receipts, must have been heartily wishing they had accepted the Leeds and Liverpool's earlier offer. They were now ready to make a deal with anyone who would take the canal off their hands, and agreed to sell the entire concern. The upper part went to builders for an unspecified amount and the lower portion to the quarry masters for a nominal £2,500. The Council received land for widening Canal Road, gratis, together with £1,000 towards the cost of culverting Bradford Beck, all rights to which the new proprietors forfeited. The Company was wound up under a Chancery Order on March 21st 1870, which directed that an Act should be obtained in order to clear up doubts as to the legality of the sale.

The purchasers, eleven men from Bradford, Leeds, Shipley, Calverley, and Keighley, floated a new company called the Bradford Canal Company, Limited, with themselves as directors. A Leeds engineer was engaged to report on the water supply problem and he stated that he could obtain sufficient from three streams and two reservoirs to feed the canal for nine months of the year. During the remaining three he proposed to use water from the lower pounds by means of pumps at Windhill and Spinkwell Locks at an estimated cost of £650 a year. A new wharf was to be built to accommodate 43 boats. The share capital was £35,000 and the time required estimated at two years. The Bill passed through the Commons fairly peacefully. The two years were increased to three, in order to be on the safe side, and the Leeds and Liverpool and Aire and Calder Navigations were given the option to purchase at £2,900, plus a suitable figure for any improvements, if the new company failed to carry out the work. The Act received Royal Assent on July 24th 1871.

The Committee's prudence in the matter of time proved to be unnecessary as less than twelve months later the canal was almost ready. Two new basins had been dug at Northbrook Bridge with 880 yards of wharf and two slipways. The maximum width was 16½ yards and three feet of sludge had been removed to restore the canal bed to its original depth. The works were carried out by Naylor & Co. of Cleckheaton, at a total cost of £25,000. Water was obtained from two streams which joined Bradford Beck lower down the valley, and engine houses and pumps were being built at each lock to supplement the supply.

On the fifth anniversary of the closure, May 1st 1872, the public re-opening took place, although the entire length was not quite ready. the horse-boat "William" left Windhill Lock at 3.30 p.m. with the directors and a number of women and children aboard, entertained by Saltaire Band. The chairman drew the first clough at the lock and the voyage proceeded to Oliver Lock, where the chairman declared the canal open as far as this point. After speeches and the singing of "Rule Britannia" the boat returned to Frizinghall Wharf, where the directors (practical men!) heartily set to work to load the boat with the first cargo.

Although it had been fully opened for some time, the grand ceremonial opening was held on Easter Tuesday of the following year, April 15th 1873. The engine and boilers, supplied by Greens of Leeds, and the pumps by Gwynnes of London, were all installed, although only the highest one, at Spinkwell Lock, was in constant use, in order to keep the summit pound filled. The remainder were reserved for times of low water. According to the "Bradford Observer", which had performed an astonishing literary about-face and delightedly supported the venture, between 15,000 and 20,000 spectators lined the canal to witness the event. The 26 h.p. twin screw tug "Enterprise" had been hired from the Leeds and Airedale Steam Tug Company and renamed "Liverpool" for the occasion, although its true name seems far more appropriate.

Great play was made with the fact that it was the first steamer to enter Bradford and the "Observer" went so far as to suggest that Bradford might now call itself a seaport. The tug left Shipley with the directors on board, towing the stone barge "May-day", crowded with guests. The more practically minded suggested that it might have been better to have put the pumping engines in steam, as several boats had preceded the official party, using up water at each lock, with the result that the two vessels frequently ran aground, to the great entertainment of the crowd. A band was taken on board at Oliver Lock, but as it increased the draught a number of people had to get off. The party eventually reached Bradford Wharf, where the band played "See the Conquering Hero" and everyone cheered himself hoarse. That evening the new proprietors invited fifty guests to dine at the New Inn, Bradford.

The jubilation was short. For all that an outlet for the stone traffic had been secured, the five years of dereliction had forced other regular traders to look elsewhere and the railways had not been slow to take advantage. General merchandise did not return to the canal in anything like the volume anticipated and wool in particular kept to the rail. Mineral traffic was substantial but that alone was not enough. Of the £35,000 capital, £25,000 had been paid up and spent on restoring the navigation. Pumping was a costly item, added to which was the expense of paying the Leeds and Liverpool for water taken at Shipley. A £5,000 mortgage loan was raised. Things got worse.

In 1876 the proprietors approached the Leeds and Liverpool Canal Company and the Undertakers of the Aire and Calder Navigation, who agreed jointly to purchase the Bradford Canal for £27,000 as a going concern, and pay off the mortgage. The transfer took place on January 1st 1877, but as the time limit for the option in the 1871 Act had long since expired a new Act was necessary to make the sale legal. The Bradford Canal (Transfer) Act received Royal Assent on June 4th 1878, authorizing the sale to the Leeds and Liverpool and empowering the Aire and Calder to become joint owner by paying half the purchase price. The Leeds and Liverpool agreed to permit the taking of water from Shipley free of charge, although the pumping charges continued to be entered in the Bradford Canal accounts. The Bradford Canal Company Limited was wound up and a joint board of three members each from the Leeds and Liverpool and Aire and Calder was set up under the Act. The chairmen alternated yearly, and the Leeds and Liverpool's bye-laws were held to apply to the branch canal, as it had now become.

The new owners set about building three large warehouses at Bradford, fronting on to Canal Road, and the canal passed beneath them so that direct loading could take place. Completed in the early eighties, they afforded the best warehousing facilities in Bradford, but were soon rivalled by the equally large and up-to-date warehouses erected by the Lancashire and Yorkshire and Midland Railways.

Traffic still refused to justify expectations, and the Bradford Canal was one of those singled out for special treatment under the Canal Tolls and Charges Order Confirmation Act of 1894, when a minimum toll of five shillings was authorized. The Appendix of the Report of the Royal Commission on Inland Waterways, 1905, reveals that from 1888 traffic increased from 80,674 tons to 98,271 tons annually, but it was not enough. In 1888 there was a net trading surplus of £837, a loss of £263 in 1898, and a small surplus of £334 again in 1905. In these years by far the greatest revenue came from renting storage space in the terminal premises, bringing in £2,042 out of a total of £3,094 in 1905. The greatest single expense was pumping, amounting to £1,481.

In 1902 the Aire and Calder proposed that the canal should be enlarged to take Aire and Calder boats and so avoid transshipment at Leeds, but the Leeds and Liverpool did not favour enlarging the 12 miles of their own canal to Shipley to make through transit possible.

During the first war the waterways were controlled by the Government, but after the armistice the decline really set in. In 1919, 1920 and 1921 deficits of near £3,000 a year were incurred, not including interest on £82,500 which the joint companies had invested in the undertaking. Less than 150 boats a year used the canal during the five years preceding 1922, and the cost of pumping was estimated at £8.10. 0 per boat against a toll of ten shillings. The Aire and Calder itself was carrying goods by road from its Leeds wharf to Bradford, finding it cheaper to do so. In 1921 the companies deposited a Bill to abandon the canal which was opposed by Bradford Corporation, the Chamber of Commerce and West Riding County Council as a matter of public policy. The Bradford Dyers Association, Ltd. the canal's largest customer, did not oppose, being willing to make other arrangements for transport. The Commons Committee rejected the Bill, the preamble being not proved, but added a rider that their decision should not prejudice a future application if more complete evidence could be produced.

A second Bill was drawn up in 1922 and the opposition agreed to withdraw. Various clauses were incorporated to protect the interests of the Corporation and Leather's Chemical Company, and The B.D.A. Ltd. were given the option of purchasing the first half mile from Shipley to their Midland Dyeworks, failing which the land would pass to Shipley U.D.C. The Bill successfully passed the Committee stage unopposed, and became law on June 29th 1922. The canal finally closed on July 25th that year.

So died the Bradford Canal for the second and last time, after 143 years of eventful life. Various schemes were mooted for the use of its land, such as a goods loop for the Midland Railway, a new sewer and a diversion channel for Bradford Beck floodwater. None of them was acted upon and much of the site still remains.

(To be continued).

THE OAKHAM CANALBy M. Talbot-Smith

(continued from p. 29)

For the next hundred yards the canal is wet and in good condition, but it is then filled in almost completely, and only the merest depression in the ground marks its course for some hundred yards. It has then been dammed to provide a small duckpond. Shortly after this a large double basin is reached, but the purpose of this is very difficult to understand. From the way in which the tree-lined banks follow the shape of the structure on both sides it would appear that the whole thing formed a definite section of the original canal. Nothing of the sort is marked in the original survey map at this point, and it is a mystery in the absence of further information. From this point, until the Barrow-Teigh road is reached the canal is well shaped, but it is marshy and nearly overgrown with bushes. The tow-path is impassable, and an earth bank with no signs of a bridge carries the road. Beyond the road there is a deep marshy section, and there are many rotting tree trunks in the bed of the canal. The banks are much eroded. This state of affairs continues until the point is reached corresponding to a bench mark on the 2½" O.S. map at O.S. 882146. From there the canal is very swampy, and is hedged off on both sides until 50 yards before the railway is reached. From the railway the bed is marshy, but the banks are well shaped until a small copse is found about 100 yards north of the Ashwell-Greetham road. Some of the trees of the copse grow in the canal itself. There is no trace of any bridge to carry this road over the canal - the road appears, like so many others, to have been built after the canal fell into disuse and an earth bank was constructed to carry the road across the canal bed.

After about 100 yards, the tow-path becomes passable, and a rather wet and muddy footpath lies where the actual tow-path once was. The elbow bend at O.S. 883127 is well formed, the tow-path being high and dry, and the bed of the canal being marshy. Immediately round the bend there is a marked widening of the canal. This is shown on the 2½" O.S. map, and there is no apparent reason for it. A small ditch cut into the bed carries water. From there onwards the canal is mostly dry. Hawthorns grow on the banks, but the latter are well shaped and in good condition. About 400 yards from the bend, at O.S. 877124, there is an earth bank across the canal carrying a fence. The canal then becomes very swampy and overgrown, with bushes actually growing in the bed.

Knowing that the original survey map marked the feed reservoir as lying between Ashwell and Langham, signs of this were looked for on the west side of the canal at this stage. Traces of boggiess in the fields adjacent to the canal were discerned, but little else. Signs of a feeder stream into the canal were searched for, but without

success. A stream was found but this flows away from the canal and appears to have passed under it via a culvert. At O.S. 872118 a brick dam lies across the canal. For about 100 yards beyond the dam the canal is filled in and cultivated in a kind of allotment. It then becomes wet and deep with reedy sides. A small stream drains away from the canal, and it is necessary to step right over this, there being no evidence of there ever having been a bridge.

The Oakham-Ashwell road crosses the canal near the Cottessmore Hunt Kennels some 500 yards further on. Although there is now no actual bridge here, there evidently was at one time, since it is marked on the 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ " O.S. map as "Turnover Bridge", and from here onwards the tow-path is on the left-hand side, instead of the right as previously. The water in the canal beyond the road is deep and not stagnant. A very high (15 ft) bank is on the right side, and on the left the tow-path is in very good condition, possibly maintained so by an angling society which fishes this section of the canal. About 500 yards from "Turnover Bridge" the canal is crossed by the Burley-Langham road by means of an earth bank with a modern concrete culvert to equalize the water levels on both sides. The 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ " O.S. map marks this as "Gate House Bridge", but no signs of the original masonry can be seen. From this point until O.S. 863105, where there is a modern concrete dam with an overflow weir, the canal is wider than hitherto and filled with deep, clear water.

From the dam the canal is filled in and barely discernible for about 200 yards. In places there is a faint depression in the ground, but the absence of field furrows is the only other indication. A half filled-in well, about 60 yards from the dam, indicates the existence of the clay base of the canal. There is then an overgrown and swampy section for about 250 yards, where it is impossible to discern the footpath. However the canal is clearly lined with trees. It is followed by a dry section raised some twenty feet above the fields on the left hand side, and marked only as a 2 - 3 foot depression in the ground. There is a hedge on the right side and, at one point, on the left as well. There are indications of a winding hole with a semi-circular bulge on the right hand side about 60 yards from the short stretch of hedge referred to above.

From here the canal becomes lost in private gardens and is largely filled in. The only traces of it are a hedge and bank on the right hand side. This hedge runs along one side of the Oakham School Playing Fields. Although the actual line of the canal cannot be traced beyond this point it may be noted that the line of the hedge aims for a point about 100 yards east of Oakham Church spire.

A careful examination of the region round Cutt's Close in Oakham, where the canal basin was, failed to show any signs of where the canal entered the basin. The northern side of the road which cuts across the line of the canal immediately before it enters the basin is built up with large houses apparently put up after the canal fell into disuse, and this accounts for the absence of indications.

(Tables of Locks and approx. Lock positions will be included in the next issue).

THE PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

By E. A. Wilson

The remarks that follow arise from the astonishing fact that only two competitors entered for the Society's photographic competition. Taking into account the fact that membership is about two hundred this is incredible.

There must be a reason for this unexpected result and the Council have almost certainly hit upon the correct one when they suggest that the majority of members owning cameras use them purely for record purposes and, as far as photography is concerned, are in the "snapshotting" class. No doubt many a member who would have entered felt that his snaps had little photographic merit, and recorded such a small, local facet as to be of little interest to others historically; certainly not to warrant having a whole plate enlargement made, mounting it, and paying 1/- entry fee.

This is a great pity, and as photography is a longstanding hobby of mine I felt I would like to contribute some remarks about the importance of the "photographic record".

A play on sound radio is often more satisfying than one on the TV, because one uses the imagination to conjure up the scenes and situations suggested by the spoken word. How often we are disappointed when we see a film version of a well loved book!

The written word is subject to just as many different interpretations as the spoken word, and while no harm is done when it is concerned with fiction, the results can be disastrous when concerned with recording of facts - surely the main aim of our Society. There may even be a double error because we all tend to see our own pet subject through "rose-coloured spectacles", and the more enthusiastic we are the greater the element of distortion when we commit ourselves to print. The only way to avoid this is constantly to apply a harsh discipline which allows no deviation from facts.

Now this is where photography comes into its own. Although I do not go so far as to state that "photography cannot lie", a straightforward photograph is far more likely to be an accurate record of fact than a written account. It is first-hand information - not second or third hand - as much of our written work is bound to be. Further we do not select what is shown, as when writing, and some feature not noticed by us may be of interest to someone else.

As with writing one improves with practice, and I would put in a plea for members to realize the importance of the photographic record and take up photography seriously. How galling it is to take an unsatisfactory picture of some item of historical interest which subsequently disappears!

Sometimes a poor picture is the result of circumstances beyond our control, for instance on our only visit the weather may be bad; or it may be impossible to find a good viewpoint; or get permission to go close enough; but often it is due to the inexperience of the "snap-shooter"; or to an inadequate camera.

Better cameras allow pictures to be taken in poor light; or of trains moving at high speed; or to get closer to the object; allow the distance to be judged with greater accuracy; etc. Do I hear some saying "It's all right for you, but I can't afford it"? - well, there are ways and means, and I bought a good camera and photo-electric meter with the earnings obtained by writing articles in our County Magazine, and am half-way towards the cost of a precision enlarger to replace my home-made enlarger constructed from old car parts begged from a local garage.

Experience, of course, is the result of practice. An artist can miss out a telegraph pole from his picture simply by not painting it in, but the photographer has a more difficult problem. However, instead of "snapping" the scene immediately it is well worth the effort of searching around for a better viewpoint to improve the composition of the picture. If you haven't a natural flair for composition much can be learnt by studying the weekly articles in the Amateur Photographer which analyse pictures from this angle.

Care in focussing on near objects is essential for sharp results, and an avoidance of "camera shake". If the snap is slightly blurred enlarging is out of the question.

Many "snapshotters" take scenes which are too distant so that the resulting picture needs viewing through a lens. Remember sunshine adds to the "sparkle" of your picture, and when there are many clouds about it is well worth waiting until the sun breaks through before taking your picture.

And now a word about pictures for publication. Inevitably some of the quality of your picture is lost when a half-tone block is made from it for printing purposes. To retain as much detail as possible editors insist on prints being of vigorous quality on glossy paper and of a larger size than the reproduction, say half-plate or whole-plate size. The copyright remains in your hands unless an agreement is made to the contrary.

Finally, pictures entered for competitions: if the purpose of the competition is purely photographic it must be artistically good and well mounted, and technically as near perfection as possible. For record purposes, as I have already pointed out, the object is two-fold; primarily the picture must be of outstanding historical interest, but of two pictures equal in this respect that which is better photographically should win the prize.

As far as our Society is concerned members come from all parts of the country, and are interested in various topics such as railways, canals, tramways, tunnels, engines, rolling stock, etc. An exhibition of this nature would be of considerable interest to all, even if unmounted and of only postcard size, and whether you win a prize or not ought to be a secondary matter. It would be interesting to hear whether members would contribute to such an exhibition (on loan only) if there were no competitive element involved.

* * * * *

TRAIN SERVICES ON THE EAST LONDON RAILWAY AND INNER CIRCLE, 1884, 1885.

By H. V. Borley

At the beginning of 1884 the services on the East London Railway were:-

L.B. & S.C. trains Liverpool Street and New Cross L.B. & S.C.
L.B. & S.C. trains Liverpool Street and Peckham Rye.
S.E. trains Liverpool Street and Croydon, Addiscombe Road.

On weekdays some of the New Cross trains ran to and from New Croydon. On 3 March 1884 the S.E. trains were diverted to St. Marys, Whitechapel.

The Inner Circle extended from Aldgate to Mansion House and was worked by both the Metropolitan and Metropolitan District Railways, the service most of the day (including Sundays) being 6 trains per hour in the ratio of 5 District trains consecutively to 7 Metropolitan trains.

When the remaining portion of the Inner Circle and the extension to Whitechapel were nearing completion the question of train service was considered by the Metropolitan and Metropolitan District Railways and at a meeting held on 30 July 1884 the Metropolitan proposed that the Inner Circle service be increased to 3 trains per hour. To this the District agreed but apparently regretted having done so, as from 1 September 1884 that Company increased their local service presumably with the idea of proving that it was impracticable to work eight Inner Circle trains in the hour. This action caused much confusion and delay, but it was hoped that the position would be eased when Mansion House ceased to be a terminus for all trains.

On and from 1 October 1884 the S.E. trains were withdrawn from the East London Railway and the New Cross (L.B. & S.C.) Liverpool Street Service considerably reduced. On the same date Metropolitan trains commenced to run to and from New Cross S.E. Rly and District trains to and from Whitechapel (Mile End) and New Cross E.L. Station. This station, sometimes referred to as the Low Level was close to the L.B. & S.C. station. For the first few days the Metropolitan and District trains did not convey passengers over the newly constructed portion of the railway but did convey passengers between St. Marys and the respective stations at New Cross. As regards the Inner Circle it had been agreed

that the trains on the Inner Rail (Mansion House, Aldgate, S. Kensington, Mansion House) should be provided by the District, and the trains on the Outer Rail by the Metropolitan and this service should be worked by eleven trains on each rail, averaging every $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes. On Sundays the Metropolitan was to work the whole service on both Rails.

It proved quite impossible to work these services and serious delays took place chiefly on the District Railway. However, the new lines and stations were opened to the public on and from Monday 6 October 1884. The District objected strongly to The Tower of London Station, which had been constructed by the Metropolitan and opened 25 September 1882, and pressed for it to be closed. Under protest the Metropolitan closed this station on and from 13 October 1884. In September 1884 the trains using the Tower of London station were the Metropolitan Hammersmith trains which terminated there. It is not clear what trains actually called at The Tower during the first half of October, certainly the Metropolitan trains on the Outer Rail called and probably the District trains on the Inner Rail also. The City Press reporting the public opening on 6 October of the new lines states that the first train left Mansion House at 5.35, called at Cannon Street, Eastcheap, Mark Lane, The Tower, and thence onwards from Aldgate. Starting from Mansion House this must have been a District train and as stated above the District worked the service on the Inner Rail. The District trains to and from Whitechapel and New Cross did not call at The Tower and the District would not operate fares to that station.

The delays were made worse by the District Company running their Inner Rail trains over their own line from Kensington High Street (the Cromwell Curve) to South Kensington thereby crossing the Outer Rail twice, at High Street and at South Kensington. The District tried to get the Metropolitan to agree a reduction in the number of trains on the Circle but without success, and the matter went to arbitration. The award being in favour of the Metropolitan the District reduced their local services and agreed to run their Inner Rail trains on the Metropolitan lines between Kensington High Street and South Kensington. The revised services operated on and from 10 November 1884 from which day the Metropolitan provided some of the trains on the Inner Rail.

The services worked reasonably well but the District still wished to increase their local services and eventually persuaded the Metropolitan to agree a reduction in the number of Circle trains to 6 per hour. This service was to have started on 1 April but actually came into operation on 7 April 1885.

One of the suggestions put forward to relieve congestion was for the G.W. Middle Circle trains to complete the Circle instead of terminating at Mansion House, but the Great Western would not agree.

The journey time around the Inner Circle in October 1884 was 81 to 84 minutes; the service being worked by eleven trains on each rail, averaging every $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes. From 7 April 1885 there were 6 trains per hour, the journey time being 70 minutes, the District providing 5 trains and the Metropolitan two trains on the Inner Rail. On the Outer Rail the Metropolitan provided 7 trains.

A writer in the City Press suggested that Mark Lane and The Tower stations be combined by extending the platforms with entrances at each end, the combined station to be named Mark Lane & Minories.

The East London Station at New Cross had been closed since the night of 31 October 1876. It was reopened for the District trains but closed again on and from 1 September 1886.

St. Marys station and the connecting line from the East London Railway was built by the East London Railway and transferred to the Metropolitan and Metropolitan District jointly from 1 October 1884.

The East London Joint Committee was formed 1 October 1884, the Great Eastern joining 1 April 1885. The services on the E.L. line were:-

Metropolitan	October 1884	Weekdays 4 trains per hour Sundays 2 or 3 trains per hour
	10 November 1884	Weekdays and Sundays 2 trains per hour
District	October 1884	Weekdays 4 trains per hour Sundays 2 trains per hour
	1 November 1884	Weekdays and Sundays 2 trains per hour
L.B. & S.C.	October 1884	Approximately 1 train per hour week-days and Sundays: Liverpool Street and New Cross Liverpool Street and Peckham Rye
		since increased from 1 November 1884 from Whytechapel, and from 10 November 1884 from Liverpool Street, G.E.R.

* * * * *

CORRESPONDENCE

UNDERNEATH THE ARCHES

Sir, - In his article in the Journal for September 1957 Mr. Course said: "It would be interesting to hear of other examples" of dwellings below railway arches. J. Lloyd, in his South Wales Iron Works 1760-1840, gives a lengthy extract from the account of the Blaenafon Iron Works by Archdeacon Cox (Historical Tour in Monmouthshire, 1801) in which the following occurs:

"The want of habitation for the increasing number of families has occasioned an ingenious contrivance: a bridge being thrown across a deep dingle for the support of a rail road leading into a mine, the arches, which are ten in number, have been walled up, and formed into dwellings."

R. TAYLOR.

Sir, - In his most interesting article in the May Journal about the railway junction at Wansford between the Stamford & Essendine and London & North Western Railways, Mr. Clinker mentions the stone sleeper blocks that were put down as stepping stones there, and points out that the Blisworth-Peterborough line was laid with these stone sleepers when first opened in 1845. When the London & Birmingham Railway converted their lines to wooden sleepers they must have had a large quantity of stone on their hands and it would be interesting to know what became of the majority of these sleeper blocks. Some were certainly used elsewhere as stepping stones, and by Ringstead & Addington station a miniature causeway has been laid down with them to enable passengers to reach the two Addington villages across the River Nene. The connecting path crosses the Nene on a foot-bridge at Upper Ringstead Lock and is carried across the low-lying ground adjoining the river on a long line of these giant-size stepping-stones. They are, incidentally, most uncomfortable to walk on and one wonders how the villagers got along in the dark in floodtime!

J. M. PALMER.

YARRANTON'S IRON WORKS

Sir, - Miss M. Wight, whose name is mentioned in the article on Yarranton (May Journal), is often in consultation with me on local matters. I showed her the article and she was good enough to let me have some comments. These are as follows:

p.43. The Cartway. There seems no reason for this long way round to the furnace, behind the cottage. Why not follow the modern drive past the lodges, having crossed the main road at the bridge? The small bridge may be later, part of the laying out of the estate, c.1700.

p.45. The flood did not carry away the road bridge: only its parapet.

p.44. The iron works were only in use "several years". Nearly 50 years later the estate was laid out and the house built; by this time the furnace would be overgrown and partly buried. Over it was built the dam, a much larger dam than Yarranton's original. But a little slag has always been visible below the dam and traces of charcoal on the opposite side, above the site of the furnace.

I. COHEN.

(The following reply has been received from the authors. - Ed.)

Through the courtesy of the Editor we have been allowed to read Mr. Cohen's letter and are grateful for the opportunity of replying.

p.43. The Cartway. We preserve an open mind on this point. Our reasons, however, (and we surmise, Yarranton's) for the long route is that it preserves a fairly level way for loaded carts, avoiding the awkward descent to, and ascent from, the brook. The "modern drive past the lodges" is surely part of the estate-making of 1700 and would therefore not have been available at the time the furnace was in use. The bridge is very much in style with the other masonry works and we

believe it to have been an 'Old Bridge' in 1700, since the estate bridge a mile or so upstream near Astley is to this day called 'New Bridge' as if to distinguish it.

p.45. Glasshampton Bridge. It is true that the flood only carried away the parapet in 1924. Subsequently, however, the Worcestershire County Council demolished the remaining portion and entirely rebuilt the bridge.

Incidentally, we have had the pleasure of a considerable exchange of correspondence with Miss Wight, both at the time of our visits to Dick Brook in 1957 and again recently. In her last letter Miss Wight tells us that the stream across which the successive dams were built is called "Nutnells".

J. M. PALMER
M. I. BERRILL

* * * * *

BOOK REVIEW

The Leominster - Stourport Canal, by I. Cohen, M. I. Mech. E. 21 pp., photographs, map and bibliography. Reprinted from the Transactions of the Woolhope Club, Vol. XXXV, 1955-7. (Obtainable from the Woolhope Club, 267 Upper Ledbury Road, Hereford, price 2/6 post free).

Like other great failures, the Leominster Canal has its own peculiar fascination. In its case this is probably to a large extent due to the almost complete lack of original records or indeed of any printed material about the canal at all. Reference to many contemporary sources is often misleading. Joseph Priestley, for example, writes as though the basin at Stourport was completed whereas an examination of the ground will show that it was almost certainly never started.

In this paper, therefore, Mr. Cohen has done us a great service in collecting together such information as can be gleaned from contemporary newspapers, pamphlets and acts as well as from the later railway minute books. With this material the author has built up a valuable account of the canal that goes a long way to explaining away the mystery that had surrounded it. Much, however, remains unknown and will probably continue to do so until the minute books and other records of the company can be found.

Besides the historical account and a section on the visible remains, the paper contains photographs of the Rea Aqueduct and Putnal Tunnel together with a useful sketch map showing the line of canal as actually constructed and the positions of the isolated digging near Kingsland and Stockton. One thing that is not mentioned is the partially constructed tramroad, traces of which can be seen on the banks of the Severn at Aveley Kings and ammile or so inland on the intended line of canal at Dunley. It is not known whether this line has any connexion with the canal, but it seems just feasible in view of the several schemes that were put forward by the company to link its

isolated canal with Stourport by tramroad. An investigation into this and the other tramroads in the Pensax area would be rewarding and would form the basis of a further valuable paper.

J. M. P.

* * * * *

RECENT LITERATURE

William J. Skillern

- BARRIE, D.S.M. The Dundalk, Newry & Greenore Railway, and the Holyhead - Greenore steamship service. 1957. (Oakwood Press, 12/6).
- BRITISH RAILWAYS: Research Department. Stocks of periodicals held at the libraries at London Road, Derby, and 222 Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1. 1958. (B.R. Research Dept. Library, London Road, Derby, gratis). Duplicated typescript.
- BRITISH RAILWAYS pre-grouping atlas and gazetteer. [1958]. (Ian Allan, 21/-).
- CENTRAL TRANSPORT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE. Proposed withdrawal of train services from the Lewes - East Grinstead branch railway: report, presented to Parliament February 1958. (Cmd. 360). (H.M. Stationery Office, 2/-).
- DAVIES, W.J.K. Pike Bros., Fayle & Co. Ltd., (Furzebrook): [a narrow-gauge industrial railway system in Dorset. 1958]. (Narrow-Gauge Railway Society, 18 Eden Crescent, Leeds 4, 2/6). Duplicated typescript.
- DAY, John R. and B.G. WILSON. Unusual railways 1957. (Miller, 21/-).
- [GOTHERIDGE, I.] The Corringham Light Railway. [1958]. (Branch Line Society, 11 Armley Grange Avenue, Leeds 12. 9d). Duplicated Typescript. (Also in "Branch Line News", December, 1957).
- NOCK, O.S. The Great Northern Railway. 1958. (Ian Allan, 30/-).
- PROUTY, Roger The Transformation of the Board of Trade, 1870-1885. 1957. (Heinemann, 15/-).
- RAILCAR progress around the British Isles. [1958]. (Self-Changing Gears, Ltd., Lythalls Lane, Coventry, gratis).
- ROLT, L.T.C. Thomas Telford. 1958. (Longmans, 25/-).
- SINGER, Charles A History of technology. Vol. 4, The Industrial Revolution, c.1750 to c.1850; [includes a chapter on canals by Charles Hadfield]. 1958. Oxford University Press, £8. 8. 0).
- & Others. (eds.)
- SMITH, Harold. The Channel Tunnel: [a bibliography of English books, pamphlets, reports and periodical articles, 1858-1958; with introduction by S. L. Solon]. 1958. (Library Association, 2/6). Duplicated Typescript.

- STEPHENSON LOCOMOTIVE SOCIETY. Photographic souvenir and historical notes in connexion with the last train on the Abergavenny - Merthyr line, 5 January 1958. (S.L.S., Midland Area, 16 Hutton Road, Handsworth, Birmingham 20, 1/-).
- TOMLINSON, V.I. Salford activities connected with the Bridgewater Canal. 1957. (Lancashire & Cheshire Antiquarian Society, 88 Grange Avenue, Oldham, 4/6). (Also in "Trans. Lancs. & Chesh. Antiq. Soc." Vol. 56, 1956. 1957).

ARTICLES

- Two hundred years of railway legislation, by C. R. Clinker. (In "Modern Transport", May 24, 1958).
- Two centuries at Middleton: vicissitudes of Brandling's line. (In "Modern Transport", May 24, 1958).

* * * * *

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

Railway Times, 10.4.1858. Competition between railways and canals: From a paper read at a meeting of the Institution of Civil Engineers:- "Canals were still extensively useful as a means of conveyance, and that they might be rendered more so by combination with railways. The returns of the Grand Junction Canal, which had to contend with the formidable opposition of the London and North-Western, gave an annual increase from 1840 to 1856, of 262,949 tons per annum, or 28½ per cent;" the increase had been "gradual and progressive." "This result was in some degree due to a considerable reduction in the tolls, and also to the development of the resources of the country due to railways; so that canals were now actually profiting by that which in the first instance threatened to annihilate them." The River Lea Navigation, competing with the Eastern Counties Railway, had increased its traffic by 25 per cent. in tonnage, or about 50 per cent. in receipts. As an example of a canal working in conjunction with a railway, the Trent & Mersey system, worked by the North Staffordshire, it was said that the tonnage during the ten years 1846-1856 had increased by about 40 per cent.

* * * * *

UNIVERSITY COURSE

A member of this Society, Mr. E. A. Course, of the University of Southampton, gave six weekly lectures at the Railway Enthusiasts Club at Farnborough during April and May on the Railways of Southern England. Some of the points included were in connexion with the promotion, authorization and construction of railways; influence of economic conditions; engineering techniques; influence of the pre-grouping of companies on the growth of railway network; and railways and road and water transport.

NEWS FROM THE SOCIETYHON. SECRETARY'S NOTESNew Members

BAKER, J.	196, Coombe Lane, West Wimbledon, London, S.W.20.
BARKER, Dr. T.C.	31, Mount Pleasant, Cockfosters, Barnet, Herts.
LATTIMORE, Sgt. A.L.	R.A.E.C., No. 3 Higher Education Centre, Hohnes, B.F.P.O. 30.
MILLER, Miss A.M.L.	40, Kildare Terrace, London, W.2.
MOOREHOUSE, J.T.	79, Albert Road, Levenshulme, Manchester 19.
THARBY, W.G.	26, Rickman Hill, Coulsdon, Surrey.
USHER, T.F.	5, Woodheys Drive, Sale, Cheshire.
WEAVER, C.P.	"Old English", Tamworth Road, Corley, Coventry, Warwickshire.

Change of Address

BARBEY, M.F.	114, Newland Park, Hull, Yorkshire.
HOLT, G.O.	"Cofton", Kings Newton, Melbourne, Derbyshire.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Modern Transport for 24 May 1958, from C. F. Klapper, containing editorial mention of the Society, an article entitled "Two Hundred Years of Railway Legislation" by C. R. Clinker, and an illustrated article on Brandling's Railway.

Guide to an Exhibition on Transport and Communications at the Northampton Art Gallery and Museum 1958, (Northampton Archives Committee), and Road and Rail, catalogue of old prints, drawings, books, etc., at Frank T. Sablin's Spring Exhibition 1958, both from H. W. Parris.

HISTORICAL NOTES

Supplies of historical notes in connexion with outings are available for those members who were unable to take part. They will be sent on request to the Programme Secretary, Miss K. M. Stephens, 20, Colwyn Avenue, Derby. A foolscap, stamped addressed envelope should be enclosed with the request.

THE JOURNAL

Material for publication in the Journal should be received by the Editor not later than the first of the month preceding publication. A good deal of material is needed to make a full and varied issue for September, and members are asked to help by sending something as soon as possible.

New members may like to note that back numbers are still available at 2/- each post free. These numbers are as follows:-

1956 March, July, September; 1957 March, May, July, September, November; 1958 January, March, May.

REPORTS ON EVENTS

7 June 1958. Bicentenary Celebration of Act of authorization (first railway Act of Parliament, received Royal assent 9 June 1758) for Brandling's Railroad (Middleton Colliery to Leeds).

With the invaluable assistance of the Leeds City Librarian and staff, an exhibition of historical documents and relics had been prepared in the Leeds City Art Gallery, where it remained open to the public for two weeks. The exhibition was officially opened in the presence of some 65 members of the Railway Correspondence & Travel Society and our own Society by Mr. E. E. Cowell, Traffic Manager (West Riding), British Railways, N.E. Region. A vote of thanks to Mr. Cowell and the organizers of the exhibition was proposed by the President, Mr. C. R. Clinker.

In the afternoon, short walks over the closed portions of the Middleton Colliery railway were made, followed by a tour of the remaining portion of the present line, arranged by the R.C.T.S. in conjunction with the National Coal Board. A special train of open wagons, hauled by the Hudswell Clarke 0-6-Ct locomotive "Blenkinsop", accompanied by a new Fowler diesel locomotive, carried about 225 people from Moor Depot in the Hunslet district of Leeds, to the present Middleton Colliery. A further walk took members to the original cable-worked incline to the Venture Pit. A welcome surprise was the provision of a substantial free tea by the National Coal Board, kindly served in the colliery canteen.

With our Commemoration Dinner following the A.G.M. and this joint visit to the line by the two Societies, the bicentenary of Brandling's Railroad had been well and truly celebrated. The staging of a successful public exhibition is also proof of happy cooperation with local bodies.

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

12 July, The Newmarket Railway. It is hoped to organize a tour of this railway, including a visit to the old station at Newmarket, conducted by Mr. M. D. Greville. Members interested should contact the London Group Secretary, Mr. P. Roos, 19b, Uxbridge Road, London, W.12.