

Monuments - Headstones

If you want a first-class Headstone or Monument, send to

Chislett's Marble Works

We carry the LARGEST STOCK and BEST FINISHED WORK in the City.

Entire Satisfaction Guaranteed

Our Carving and Lettering pleases everyone. We are now booking orders for

Spring Delivery.

DESIGNS and PHOTOS of our own work sent everywhere FREE

Write to

Chislett's Marble Works

108 Water Street, ST. JOHN'S

P. O. Box 86

Newfoundland Government Postal Telegraphs and Cable Service

Covers the whole of Newfoundland with Telegraph and Telephone Service.

Has Wireless connection with Shipping, via Cape Race, Fogo and Labrador, via Battle Harbor.

Gives quick service to Canada and the United States, and all benefits of reduced low rates fortnight messages. Direct service to Great Britain at rates as low as 6 cents a word.

Messages go to Newfoundland Revenue and the business is handled by officials sworn to secrecy.

DAVID STOTT,
Superintendent

G. W. LeMESSURIER,
Deputy Min. Posts & Telegraph

April 19, 23



ROTHWELL & BOWRING LIMITED

DISTRIBUTORS.

C. CHESLEY BUTT, HARBOR GRACE, BROKER.

SOLD BY W. H. GREENLAND, COLEY'S POINT.

Nfld. Government Railway

VACATIONISTS!

Take the Sea Trip!

Via "PROSPERO", "PORTIA",
or "GLENCOE".

"A Fortnight Afloat".

Ask our Railway Agent about the Exceptionally Low Round Trip Fare, including berth and meals. Every consideration given to the Round Tripper.

NEWFOUNDLAND GOVERNMENT RAILWAY

Use

Kirkman's Borax

Soap

and

Your Hands

Will be Grateful.

GEORGE NEAL Limited

Sole Agents.

House of Assembly Proceedings.

OFFICIAL SYNOPSIS

(Continued.)

From 150 to 200 men are employed in connection with work at the dock and around it. Wages paid out in 1924 amounted to \$176,000.00. The cost of material purchased and used in connection with repair work on the dock in 1924 amounted to \$115,000.00. The indirect revenue to the country from the purchasing power of the \$176,000.00 paid in wages and the duty collected on the \$115,000.00 worth of material used in connection with the dock repairs, say at 25 p.c., is equivalent of \$72,750.00 per annum. In addition to this we have, according to the General Manager of the Railway, Mr. Russell, a net profit on the operation of the dock in 1924, of \$41,200.00 making a total, direct and indirect revenue of \$113,950.00 per annum. From the figures quoted, I do not think we would be justified in closing the dock permanently. We must also bear in mind, that with a modernized dock equipped with a proper machine shops and with improved facilities for doing work, and moreover, situated as we are geographically, there is every reason to suppose that with the improvements suggested, much better results would be obtained.

Now, let us consider the several propositions outlined in the two reports which have been tabled for the information of this House.

The Crandell Engineering Co. make four propositions. 1 and 2 are similar for re-conditioning the Dock as it is, at a price of \$357,000.00. Proposition No. 3 is to re-condition and widen dock with retaining concrete walls, including concrete gate, abutments and new steel gate, at an estimated cost of \$624,000.00. Please note that the Crandell Co. recommends that if funds are available, that Proposition No. 3 has the most to recommend it. Proposition No. 4 is for a new dock, at a cost of three or four million dollars, which I think is not likely to be entertained, and it is unnecessary for me to refer to it any further. The Crandell Engineering Co. offer engineering supervision at 4 p.c. of the cost, or they are ready to undertake the construction on a cost plus 15 p.c. basis.

Now let us consider the propositions put forward by Colonel Mitchell, the consulting engineer for Wm. I. Bishop, Ltd. Proposition No. 1 deals with repairs to existing dock as outlined in Colonel Mitchell's report, which does not widen or deepen the dock. This is to be done at a cost of \$500,000.00. Proposition No. 2 is practically the same as the Crandell Engineering Co's No. 3 proposition, except that considerable work is included in Proposition No. 2 by Bishop, which Crandell makes no mention of, and of which I am supplying details.

Estimated cost of Bishop's No. 2 Proposition, \$1,086,000.00. Bishop offers engineering supervision at 4 p.c. of the cost or agrees to do the work on a cost plus basis of 10 p.c. inclusive. Referring again to Bishop's Proposition No. 1, which deals with the renewal of the Dock as originally built, and allowing steel sheet piling for the South Side and West end of Dock and cut offs at entrance, including—
1. Coff dam.
2. Renewal of entrance.
3. Renewal of decayed timber.
4. Grouting under floor to make the Dock water tight.
5. Concrete Toe Wall edge of floor.
6. Clay Puddle.
7. Steel sheet piling (costing about \$72,000.00).
8. Repairing Caisson or gate.
Estimated cost of
above \$285,400.00
Contingencies 20,000.00
Engineering 4% 11,445.00
Contractors fixed fee 28,500.00
\$345,345.00
As against Crandell's estimate of 357,000.00
Balance in favour of Bishop 11,655.00
plus addition suggested in report.
9. Roadway concrete base, granite paving.
10. Travelling Crane, 20 tons,

on the north side of the Dock, with a 70' radius.

11. Bollards and Power Capstans and Mooring Rings.

12. Lowering Pumps new suction and discharge pipes.

Estimated cost \$112,500.00

Contingencies 6,655.00
Engineering 4,500.00

Contractors fixed fee 11,000.00
Unwatering 20,000.00

154,625.00

\$500,000.00

Total estimate outlined in report.

Proposition No. 2 covers the widening, lengthening, and deepening of the dock in concrete, with masonry entrance and renewal of the upper portion in timber. The Dock will then accommodate vessels 600 feet long by 70 feet beam and entering on 30 feet draught over the sill. This estimate also provides for everything in Proposition No. 1 with the addition of Quay wall 700 feet long eastward from the Long Bridge to end of the present shed. It also includes timber jetty 550 feet long on the south side of entrance, with rock heartening replacing shorelegs and elevating same and removing from the north side to the south side, moving, replacing and lowering present pumping station, and a new caisson or gate.

Estimated cost of
above \$896,000.00
Contingencies 60,000.00
Engineering 32,000.00
Contractors fixed fee 70,000.00
Unwatering 28,000.00

\$1,086,000.00

Looking ahead, I think it is the general opinion of the Government that it is in the best interests of the country that whatever we do now, should be done with a view to its being an asset to the country, and re-conditioning of the Dock as it was, is not looked upon as being a good business proposition.

The type of ships being built now is altogether different from the ships which were built when the present Dock was constructed, and it is necessary that the Dock should be widened and deepened. If scheme No. 2 is carried out, we shall have a Dock which will suit our purpose as good as proposition No. 4 which was estimated to cost between three and four million dollars, and a Dock that will cost very little in repair, as it is only the top portion will be wood. To tighten the Dock it is absolutely necessary that a new concrete bottom should be put in, as it cannot be widened out from the old concrete bottom formation obtained, it seems probable that there was a certain amount of skimming done on this Dock when constructed. The type of

dock built at the time the Government Dock was built called for a concrete bottom with a thickness of about 6 feet of concrete at the entrances tapering off to 2 1/2 feet at the inside end. From investigation made, it seems that there is a uniform depth of about 2 feet of concrete in the bottom of the Dock and necessity for the deepening of the Dock is urgent, because the old Dock is not down to proper foundations. It was thought or assumed at the time that they were down to till. It is true that they succeeded in getting down to till at one or two places but not uniform. It is necessary to get down to solid foundations, and by that, I mean a foundation that is impervious to water. From experiments made by borings at the Dock, it was found that considerable water pressure was acting on this thin concrete floor on the bottom of the dock. This I shall refer to later on in my remarks, but by deepening the Dock as outlined in proposition No. 2 from experiments made, there is no doubt but the proper foundation will be reached.

I shall give you now, a comparison in cost of the two propositions which I think should be considered.

Comparison of Propositions.
Crandell Engineering Company, Proposition No. 3.

No renewal of piling allowed for and re-filling at gate abutments, only figured on widening dock to 70 feet, cost \$624,000.00

Plus 15% contractors fees 93,600.00

Plus unwatering 28,000.00

Dock 28,000.00

\$745,600.00

with reduced leakage only and does not guarantee you a tight dock.

Wm. I. Bishop, Ltd., Proposition No. 2.
The dock to be enlarged and deepened, size 600 feet x 70 feet, x 30 feet cost \$896,000.00

Contingencies and unwatering 80,000.00

\$976,000.00

Deduct for Crane, Pumping Station, Capstans, Bollards, Quay Wall, Timber Jetty, Rock Heartening, Shorelegs, Paved Granite Roadway. \$390,000.00

586,000.00

Plus 10% Contractors' fees 58,600.00

644,600.00

leaving a difference of \$89,000.00 in favour of Bishop, Limited.

No explanation that one can give this House can make clear to you the great difference in the Crandell Engineering Company's Proposition No. 3 as compared with William I. Bishop Company's No. 2 Proposition as a comparison of the plans submitted by both parties will show. I suggest you compare Cran-

dell's plan No. 324 with Bishop's plan No. 4, which are both drawn to the same scale, and after studying same, I am sure that every member of the House will be unanimous as to which Proposition they will select.

An examination of Bishop's drawing No. 2 shows some of the cavities existing in under the altars at sides of Dock. Drawing No. 1 shows where the four bore holes were put down and also shows where the leaks are in the Dock. At Bore holes No. 1 and 2 considerable water was found by Colonel Mitchell under the floor, and at Bore No. 2 the water pressure amounted to 800 lbs. per square foot, or nearly half a ton, whilst the weight of concrete only amounted to 400 lbs. pressure per sq. foot. To make the floor of the Dock safe this water must be shut off. This can only be done by carrying out the suggestions as outlined in Colonel Mitchell's report.

Plan No. 1 also shows a very serious condition inside the head gates. I refer to the bulges on both sides of the Dock immediately inside of gate. It also shows the position of the proposed Jetty and its relation to the old hulk "Desola."

Plan No. 3 shows proposed widening and improvements such as position of steel sheet piling all around Dock; proposed new wharf and training wall; proposed new pumping house, and track for 20 ton travelling crane.

If the House should decide on repairing the present Dock, without deepening or widening it, it will mean employment for about 100 men, probably for six or seven months. Most of the men employed will be carpenters, as it will be practically all timber work. With proposition No. 2 it will mean the employment of 400 or 500 men for eight months. In addition to the work on the Dock and the new Jetty, it is proposed to build a transit shed for freight not included either party. To provide labor and keep the money in the country it has been decided to build a shed of re-inforced concrete instead of importing structural steel, and it has been found that a considerable saving can be effected by a building of re-inforced concrete instead of structural steel, notwithstanding the fact that a very low price has been quoted on structural steel. Construction of this shed will

give employment to about fifty men for four months.

For the information of this House, I might say the Government instructed the General Manager of the Railway to have Mr. W. F. Joyce, Chief Engineer of the Newfoundland Government Railway, compare the prices as submitted by the Crandell Engineering Company and by Bishop Co., Ltd. As the Crandell Engineering Company's proposition appeared cheaper, he was instructed to estimate the cost of the extra work outlined in project No. 2 of W. I. Bishop, Ltd., and let us know if the extra amount that Bishop Company was asking for was justified. From the brief synopsis which I gave you earlier in my remarks, you will see there is a difference of \$87,800 in favour of the Bishop proposition.

For the information of the House, I quote you extracts from Mr. W. Joyce's report dated March 19th. There is a slight difference between Mr. Joyce's figures and h ones that I have already quoted, as there is an amount of \$28,000.00 for unwatering in Crandell's estimate, which Crandell does not include and other items. Now, to sum-

(Continued on page 3.)

marked-down goods

MEN'S SUITS clearing at \$10.00 per suit.

Also PANTS and OVERALLS at our usual Low prices. New stock just in.

MEN'S NAVY SWEATERS, extra good value at \$3.50.

BOYS' SWEATERS, from \$1.00 to \$2.00.

LADIES' SWEATERS, to clear at COST PRICE.

COTTON BLANKETS, large size, \$2.75 per pair.

MEN'S FLEECE-LINED UNDERWEAR at \$1.00 per garment.

Full line of FLANNELETTES white and coloured, always on hand.

GUS PARSONS

Bareneed Road, Coley's Point.

NOTICE

To Owners and Masters of British Ships

The attention of Owners and Masters of British Ships is called to the 7th Section of the "Merchant Shipping Act, 1894."

75.—(1) A Ship belonging to a British Subject shall hoist the proper national colors—

- (a) on a signal made to her by one of His Majesty's ships, including any vessel under the command of an officer of His Majesty's navy or full pay, and
- (b) on entering or leaving any foreign port and
- (c) if of fifty tons gross tonnage or upwards, on entering or leaving any British Port.

(2) If default is made on board any ship in complying with this section the master of the ship shall for each offence be liable to a fine not exceeding one hundred pounds.

At time of war it is necessary for every British Ship to hoist the colours and heave to if signalled by a British Warship; if a vessel hoists no colours and runs away, it is liable to be fired upon.

H. W. LeMESSURIER,
Registrar of Shipping

THRIFTY HOUSE WIVES

Realize the best result with

CAKES,
PUDDINGS,
BISCUITS,

and never fail with the BEST BREAD when they use

VERBENA FLOUR

W. A. Munn, Wholesale Agent.

FARMING IMPLEMENTS

Rakes, Forks, Plows, Cultivators.

Everything for the Garden and Farm.

A Full Line of Terry's New Seeds.

MAIL ORDERS

specially attended to with promptness and despatch.

Bowring Brothers, Limited,
St. John's, Nfld.