The Canadian Engineer

WEEKLY

ESTABLISHED 1893

Vol. XIV .- No. 10.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 4th, 1907.

The Canadian Engineer

ESTABLISHED 1893

Issued Weekly in the Interests of the

CIVIL, MECHANICAL STRUCTURAL, ELECTRICAL, MARINE AND MINING ENGINEER, THE SURVEYOR, THE MANUFACTURER AND THE CONTRACTOR.

Subscription: Canada and Great Britain, \$2.00 per year; United States, \$2.50; Foreign, 10s., payable in advance

Advertising rates on application.

MEAD OFFICE: 62 Church Street, and Court Street, Toronto.
TELEPHONE MAIN 7404.
Montreal Office: B 32 Board of Trade Building. T. C. Allum, Business and Editorial Representative. Phone M 2797.
Winnipeg Office: 330 Smith Street. Amalgamated Fress of Canada, Limited Phone 5758.

Vancouver Office: Representative: A. Oswald Barratt. 619 Hastings Street. British Representative: A. Webster, 184 Chancery Lane, London, E.C.

Address all communications to the Company and not to individuals. Everything affecting the editorial department should be directed to the Editor.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS:

Changes of advertisement copy should reach the Head Office by 10 a.m Monday preceding the date of publication, except the first issue of the month for which changes of copy should be received at least two weeks prior to publication date

Printed at the office of The Monetary Times Printing Co., Limited, Toronto, Canada.

TORONTO, CANADA, OCTOBER 4th, 1907.

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE.

Editorial:—	P. Contract
Ouebec Bridge	341
"Lusitania's" Ocean Voyage	342
Editorial Notes	342
Book Reviews	343
Construction News Section	344
Market Conditions	347
New Incorporations	348
Cartie Tonks for the Royal Muskoka Hotel	349
Guelph and Goderich Railway	350
Mushroom System of Reinforced Concrete	351
Engineering News from Great Britain	353
Tracts of Concrete	355
Telephones in the "Lusitania"	357
G . C D as a Fixed Charge	358
Branged Railway Station and Hotel, Ottawa	360
Mineral Resources of New Zealand	362
Dier et Montreal	
n C Welch	36;
M. deingl Engineers	36
Machine Shops	36
C. 1 1 and Circulars	36
T 1 Anchor Ice	36
The Costom of Roof Glazing	A NOW
Panama Canal	37

THE OUEBEC BRIDGE.

Thus far the Commission that is investigating the Quebec bridge disaster, has not been able to arrive at any conclusion as to what the actual cause of the collapse was, while the verdict of the Coroner's Jury is, "We have not been able to adduce the cause of the collapse of the bridge, but believe it our duty to declare that, according to proof adduced at the inquest, all necessary precautions were taken to ensure the safety of the struc-

The evidence given up to the time of writing is to the effect that the design, shop work, and erection work on the site were given the best possible care, and nothing was left undone that would make the structure a worthy monument to the skill of the engineers. In the words of Mr. Holgate, Chairman of the Commission:-"As far as we have been able to learn, there had been the greatest care taken all along the line to ensure the safety and permanency of the Quebec bridge structure. engineers on the continent prepared the plans and specifications, and a wonderful care and accuracy in carrying them out was shown. We found absolutely no trace of dishonesty or graft in connection with the construction of This seems to be the case of the best the bridge. engineering brains on the continent and the very best accepted engineering methods being on trial."

At the time of the collapse it was said that the bridge It has been shown, went down without any warning. however, that the bridge showed signs of weakness, which were apparently neglected by the engineers in charge. Even the workmen gave more attention to these than did the men who were responsible for the safety of the structure. Many of the workmen have stated that the bridge showed signs of distress three weeks before the collapse. Of course, with the structure a tangled mass of steel at the bottom of the river, there is no evidence of this further than what has been stated by the men. If from the design this can be shown to be the case then those who had charge of the erection should be severely censured for the loss of life incurred, if not for

the collapse itself. The opinion of eminent engineers is that the bridge would have carried its load when completed, and that in this respect the design was all right, but the stresses on the finished structure, and those during erection are totally different, and it is these latter that were not properly provided for. At the time of the disaster the portion of the bridge hanging over the river (nearly 750 feet), practically constituted a long heavy lever. finished bridge would have presented an arch, and on the lever and the arch the strains would be of an entirely different character. It is quite possible, too, that the bridge had a slight lateral motion, as there was a strong wind blowing at the time of the accident. The weight of the overhanging span, being thrown on one side, made an additional weight, straining the members beyond their factor of safety on the side to which the weight was In this case the bridge would appear to collapse vertically, but such would not actually have been the case. The side receiving the weight would have gone down almost straight, while the other side would have fallen inwards somewhat.