

After a careful study of the tenders received on the board's design and on alternative designs submitted, amounting in all to thirty-five different propositions, your board has eliminated, as not acceptable, all but the following:

1st. Design No. V of the board, with short shore arms and floating erection of the suspended span on high staging, tenders on which were submitted by all four firms.

2nd. Design 'A' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, being different in outline from the board's design and having the top chords built of nickel steel plates throughout.

3rd. Design 'B' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, similar in all respects to design 'A,' except that the top chords of the anchor arm are built of carbon steel.

4th. Design 'C' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, similar in all respects to 'B,' with the exception of the top chords, which are designed with eyebars, instead of plates:

Classified for cost only they are as follows:

1. British Empire Bridge Co., board's design 'V'	\$11,025,566
2. Pennsylvania Steel Co., board's design 'V'	11,686,751
3. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., design 'B'	11,957,500
4. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., design 'A'	12,153,500
5. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., design 'C'	12,216,400
6. Maschinenfabrik Augs-Nurn, board's design 'V'	13,230,050
7. St. Lawrence Bridge Co., board's design 'V'	14,867,170

The cost as per specifications may be increased by 2 per cent and includes an amount of \$118,500 to be paid to Messrs. M. P. & J. T. Davis for increased quantities of masonry in the anchor and short piers. The Pennsylvania Steel Company and the British Empire Bridge Company, according to their tenders, use a somewhat larger number of splices in the bottom chord than shown on the board's plan. Your board may later recommend that their figures be slightly increased, in order to reduce the number of splices.

Your board does not consider that it is within their province to report on the financial status and ability of the different contractors.

They beg, however, to submit the following notes:

British Empire Bridge Company, Limited.—This is a company incorporated in Canada at a capital of \$5,000,000. It was formed by the Cleveland Bridge and Engineering Co., Limited, of Darlington, England, and by the Patent Shaft and Axletree Company, of Wednesbury, England.

Our Chairman reported that he had visited the works of these companies. That the Cleveland Bridge and Engineering Company, at the time of his visit, was a modern bridge shop of about 12,000 to 16,000 tons annual capacity.

That the Patent Shaft and Axletree Company was one of the largest firms in England, and that their bridge department was composed of two large main buildings. He could not judge of their equipment, as no bridge work was being done at the time of his visit.

The representative of the British Empire

Mr. GRAHAM.

Bridge Company submitted photographs showing some of the bridges built by the parent companies, including a 500 feet arch over the Zambesi River at Victoria Falls, Africa.

He also stated that the Patent Shaft and Axletree Company had a capital of £1,500,000, with a reserve of £400,000 together with other reserves; that their stock was issued at £1 par value and was now selling at £3.

This company has no assets known to us except an accepted cheque for \$500,000, which we assume to be in the hands of the Minister, and your board does not know if the parent companies would become parties to the contract.

The British Empire Bridge Company state that they would establish works in this country, where all parts of the bridge, except the raw material, would be manufactured.

Pennsylvania Steel Company.—This firm is considered one of the strongest in the United States and has apparently very large assets.

Your board has no doubt about their ability to build the bridge and fulfill all the conditions of the contract.

It is not quite clear how much, if any, of the shop work would be done in Canada. Transportation of large members from their present shops would be very risky.

Maschinenfabrik Augsburg-Nurnberg A.G.—Your board does not know anything definite about this firm. It proposes to manufacture the bridge partly in Germany and partly in Canada, in connection with the Canada Foundry Company, Limited, of Toronto, in which case the same observation about transportation would apply to a much larger extent. They also state that they may decide later on to build everything in Canada.

St. Lawrence Bridge Company, Limited.—From information given by their representative, this is a company incorporated in Canada with a capital of \$500,000, to be increased as need may be.

The Dominion Bridge Company and the Canadian Bridge Company each own one half the number of the shares, but neither parent company will become a party to the contract.

This company has no assets known to us except an accepted cheque for \$500,000, which we assume to be in the hands of the Minister. The parent companies are very strong and very well known companies and there is no doubt about the ability of the men at their head to carry the contract to a successful issue.

Specifications.

The Maschinenfabrik Augsburg-Nurnberg A.G. does not ask any modifications of the specifications. They only state that no nickel steel material will be longer than 53 feet, which is acceptable to the board.

The Pennsylvania Steel Company and British Empire Bridge Company discussed the specifications with the board. A complete understanding, signed in each case by the representative of the company and the members of the board, has been arrived at.

The St. Lawrence Bridge Company has asked for several modifications to the specifications. In the case of their tender on the board's plans an agreement can probably be arrived at on the basis proposed, except on the question of eyebars. They propose to make further experiments on the manu-