CONDITIONS OF MIXTURE AND PROPORTIONS.

The proportions adopted for this series were one of eement, two of sand, and four of stones, by weight, the proportion of water being based on the weight of sand and cement.

The cement and the sand were first theroughly mixed dry, then the water added gradually. The stones were then thrown on this mortar, spread out, and the whole vigourously and very theroughly mixed. The fresh concrete was then placed into the moulds and rammed in $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 inch layers.

RAMMING.

The rammer was a block of hard wood 2 feet long by 2×2 inches, with a lathe turned handle. It was not very easy with this to ram uniformly, even throughout one block, and this is one of the main sources of discrepancies in this series of experiments.

It was thought that a reduction of the breaking loads to a standard weight of the blocks would be only fair, and would slightly improve the results.

GROUPING OF TESTS.

The tests were made at one week, four weeks, and two months, and the results grouped accordingly, that is to say, the one week tests, with different per cent. of water, compare between themselves, four weeks and two months likewise. Parallels between the results, at different ages, cannot be drawn on account of some specimens having been prepared under widely different conditions. For instance, the results at two months are exceedingly low as compared with those obtained at one and four weeks. This is due to the fact that these two months specimens were the first prepared of all, and this before the cemented trough in which they were to be immersed was completed. Consequently they were kept 8 to 10 days longer than the others in the dry air of the laboratory, which seems to have had a disastrous effect on them. But in spite of these slight drawbacks, the annexed table shows that up to 24 per cent., the percentage of water has not a very great effect on the strength. This is an important point, for below 20 per cent. the mortar obtained is rather dry and very difficult to handle.

But beyond this limit of 24 per cent. a greater proportion of water seems to weaken the concrete considerably.

This limit is very sharply defined in the adjoining table, where an additional 2 per cent. of water, from 24 to 26 per cent., weakens the concrete by almost one-half for the one-week tests. It is, however, interesting to notice that strength is almost completely recovered with time, the four-week tests showing the weakening limit to be between 26 and 28 per cent., and the two months' between 28 and 30 per cent. So that if immediate strength be not required of the concrete structure, 28 per cent. of water will not affect the ultimate resistance if allowed to stand two months.

In the parallel sand and coment tests the weak line is not so sharply defined, but yet it is sufficiently so to show that the same statement applies. The tests in this case show a marked weakening between 14 and 16 per cent. of water for the one week, which strength is ultimately recovered, as is shown by the four weeks' and two months' tests.

The low limit of 14 per cent., as compared with 24 for the concrete, is probably due to the fact that the stones of the concrete, on account of their porosity, absorb a part of the water.

The table shows that the greatest density is obtained with 16 and 18 per cent. The weights of the cubes beyond this decrease up to 24 and 26 per cent., where they are again nearly equal in density to the 16 and 18 per cent. of water. Therefore this 24 and 26 per cent. seems to be the point where the best practical results are obtained, because 16 and 18 per cent. make up too dry a concrete to allow of easy handling.

Another point incidentally comes up. Attention has been drawn to the poor results obtained by the same tests and reason of long exposure to dry air given. This shows up a very important point, namely, the