

Going It Blind?

To the Electors of *The* City of Stratford.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :

Are you going to go it blind? The Board of Trade submits a Water Supply By-law, worse if possible, than that you overwhelmingly defeated about four years ago.

The Company claims to have expended since then a few thousand dollars. \$4,350 of this has gone into an intake pipe and filtration dam that have proved worthless as means of improving the water.

Some of this expense has gone into cheap extensions that need to be replaced or duplicated, and more into temporary work.

The additions of a permanent nature are far outweighed by the deteriorations that four years' use of such a plant produces.

The price asked then was too high. The price asked now is higher. The works are older. The fifty year franchise has four years less to run.

The pumps I then said were a wasteful kind. The promoters of these by-laws denied this. Mr. Chipman, an engineer of the highest standing and widest experience, has since then in his report to the City Council said:—"A modern high duty engine would cut the fuel account in half." The astounding confession of Mr. Jones, the hired advocate of the Board of Trade ought to silence them. He says in his report to them:

"The pumps and boilers are in fair condition. Owing to the low duty of the engines, the quantity of coal consumed is *more than double the amount that should be required* if a high duty engine were installed and the distribution system improved in the manner outlined below.

"The cost of installation of a high duty 3 million imperial gallon engine, I estimate to be \$22,000. *The saving in coal should be sufficient to provide interest and sinking fund to pay for this in fifteen years.*

"Two boilers providing for a pressure of not less than 90 lbs. would be required, but as boilers No. 1 and 2 have already been in service for *nineteen years, their renewal in any event, would be required shortly.*"

This is part of a report that tries to put the best face on the matter for the Water Supply Company, and yet its author is forced to make this confession, although he has the impudence to value the pumping plant and boilers at \$16,000, less reductions, and in the next sentence, *advise replacing them* by boilers and pump at a cost of \$22,000.00. There seems to be no reason for placing \$16,000 on such goods and making percentage reduction