

Special Meeting
13th April, 1911.

A Special Meeting of the Wexford County Council was held in the County Council Chamber, Courthouse Wexford on 13th April, 1911.

Present: - Mr. E. Store, (Chairman), Presiding.
Other Members: - Messrs. T. Apple, M. Browne, John Bolger, M. Codd, J. Codd, J. A. Doyle, M. A. Ennis, Park Fortune, John S. Hearn, Michael Hickey, Alexander Kinsella, John J. Kehoe, P. Breane, Patrick O'Neill, G. H. Peacocke, James J. Stafford & J. Cummins.

Mr. Peacocke subsequently occupied the chair.

The Secretary, the County Surveyor, and Mr. R. W. Elgee Solicitor to the Council, were also in attendance.

Poundage and Irrecoverable Rates

The following recommendation of the Finance Committee was confirmed on the motion of Mr. Stafford, seconded by Mr. Kehoe: -

"That amounts for poundage to Rate Collectors in respect of the collection for the half-year ended 31st March, 1911, as certified by our Secretary be paid.

That the lists of Irrecoverable Rates as presented by our Secretary be agreed to and that the Local Government Board be requested to sanction payment of the amount."

Striking the Rate for 1911-12.

On the motion of Mr. Kehoe, seconded by Mr. O'Neill the following resolution was adopted: -

"That we hereby strike the Rate for General and Separate Charges for the financial year 1911-12 as agreed to at the meeting of the County Council on the 8th February, 1911, and allow and make the same as assessed in the Rate Books, said Rates being in conformity with the valuation in force for the time being. That the allowance for said Rates, as entered at the foot of said Rate Books signed by the Chairman and two Members present at this meeting, be adopted, attested by the Seal of the Council and countersigned by the

Secretary.

That the warrants of the Rate Collectors to collect said Rates be signed and sealed in the same manner as the Rate Books.

That the demand on the Urban Councils of Enniscorthy, New Ross and Wexford, be duly signed and sealed, the amounts demanded from above Urban Districts after allowing for credit items in Form 51 being:-

	County	Union	Separate
Enniscorthy	£ 472-9-7	£ 525-9-8	
New Ross	475-3-8	745-18-5	£ 93-16-1
Wexford	988-11-11	904-11-2	

Appointment of Official Checkers, Rate Collectors' Accounts.

On the motion of Mr. Kehoe.

Seconded by Mr. Creane. The following resolution was adopted:-

"That we hereby appoint Messrs. D. McDonald, R. Gighan, M. J. Finn and D. W. Kehoe, as the official checkers of the accounts of the Rate Collectors for the Rural Districts of Enniscorthy, Gorey, New Ross and Wexford respectively, for the Rate for 1911-12 at a Salary to be calculated at 5/- per 100 Ratings in each District."

Ballyhack Harbour.

Mr. Cummins proposed the following, of which he had given previous notice:

"That the County Council accept the offer of the Waterford Harbour Board to transfer to the County Council the boat harbours at Ballyhack, as per letter from the Secretary Waterford Harbour Board under date 3rd February, 1911."

In connection with this matter the following letter under date 3rd February, 1911, from the Secretary to the Waterford Harbour Board was read:-

"With reference to your letter of the 5th ultimo, the Commissioners desire me to say that, as previously explained, the provision of shelter for fishermen's boats is not a matter for which they have any funds available, as it does not fall within the scope of their duties; but in order to get over the difficulty in which your Council are placed,

they will be prepared to transfer to your Council, free of any charge except the cost of the legal instrument of conveyance the Slip which forms the dock or boat harbour at Ballyhack, thus enabling your Council to incur expenditure in connection with the place.

If this proposal is approved by your Council, I will on hearing from you have a draft deed of Conveyance prepared and forwarded to you."

Mr. R.W. Elge, Solicitor to the County Council, wrote as follows, under date 25th February, 1911:-

"Referring to your letter of the 13th inst., with the enclosure from Mr. Allingham, the Secretary of the Waterford Harbour Commissioners, in which he offers, on behalf of the Commissioners, to hand over to the Council the Boat Slip at Ballyhack, I write to say that I have carefully looked into the matter and I cannot find that the Council have any power to accept this offer and take up the Slip.

It seems to me to be clear that this Slip comes under the category of a Pier, Harbour or Marine Work, and the only Piers, Harbours or Marine Works the Council can take and keep in repair are such as have been constructed by the Congested District Board or the Board of Works, (See Sec 18 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898), and Ballyhack so far as I know is not one of them, nor is it Scheduled.

It might be possible to take over the Slip under a Provisional Order if the Local Government Board would make one, (Under Sec 20 of the Local Government Act), but that would cost money and the Board probably would not do so unless the entire Pier or whatever it is called was to be taken."

The Secretary to the Waterford Harbour Board wrote as follows to Mr. Elge under date 5th April 1911:-

"Mr. J. Cummins of Ballyhack has sent me a copy of your letter to Mr. Trizelle of 25th February.

The Boat Slip at Ballyhack which forms the little dock there is a very ancient structure, probably coeval with Ballyhack Castle, and was in existence long before the Congested District Board or the Board of Works or my Board were established. When the river steamer commenced to ply some 50 or 60 years ago, my Board carried out some necessary repairs to the Slip so as to adapt

it for the accommodation of the Steamer, and afterwards from time to time we repaired the Slip and did a little dredging on the outer or river face of it where the Steamer berthed. All this however was for the Steamer only, and we never did any dredging along the inner face which forms the dock or boat harbour. In 1881-2 we built a new pier at Ballyhack, and my object in now writing is to point out to you that this new pier is situated some distance away from, and is entirely distinct from the old Slip, so that the difficulty you apprehend with the Local Government Board in regard to a Provisional Order would probably not arise.

My Board's revenue is altogether derived from Port dues paid by Shipping, and we have not power to collect anything from Fishing boats or to expend anything for their accommodation. At the various outlying places in the river and harbour where small vessels occasionally load or discharge cargo we endeavour to provide facilities reasonably commensurate with the amount of traffic, and as a matter of profit and loss the outlay on these places considerably exceeds the sums we receive from the few vessels that resort to them. Ballyhack Pier for instance cost us £2000 exclusive of contributions received from Lord Templemore and the Waterford Steam Ship Company, and we never got £10 a year out of the place since it was built which is the annual sum we pay a man for looking after the lamps there.

My Board's offer to transfer the old Slip to your Council was made because we gather from Mr. Fitzgerald's letter that your Council was desirous to improve the accommodation for fishing boats, and the new pier which we built is in no way involved in that question. I write thus fully hoping that you will see that we are merely anxious to facilitate your Council.

Under date April 7th Mr. R. W. Elgee wrote that he could see nothing in this letter of Mr. Alhingham's to alter the opinion he had given in his letter of 25th February.

Mr. Ennis proposed, Mr. Kacocks seconded:— "That Mr. Elgee be instructed to ascertain the approximate cost of obtaining a Provisional Order for the transfer of the 'Old Boat Ship' at Ballyhack Harbour from the Waterford Harbour Commissioners, to the Waterford County Council. That Mr. Elgee also ascertain from the Waterford Harbour Commissioners if the proposal to obtain this boat ship covers the permission to carry out the work mentioned in the letter of the Department under date

17th Nov. 1910. That Mr. Elgee report to May Meeting of County Council." Passed.

Rate Collector John Walsh.

The following motion by Mr. Kinsella of which he had given previous notice was proposed by him:-

"That the resolution of the County Council of the 4th January 1911, calling on Collector John Walsh to resign as from 31st March 1911, be rescinded."

By permission of the meeting Mr. Kinsella added the following to his resolution:- Provided Mr. Walsh is satisfied to resign voluntarily, in which event the Council will favorably consider granting him Superannuation" Passed.

Mr. John Bolger seconded. Passed.

Mr. Kinsella gave notice of motion that he would move at Annual Meeting of Co. Council to be held in June that Mr. Walsh be given superannuation of £25 per annum, as from 31st March 1911."

Windmill at Vinegar Hill.

Proposed by Mr. Ennis, seconded by the Chairman, and adopted:-

"That the Seal of the County Council be affixed to the deed investing the Windmill at Vinegar Hill, Enniscorthy in the County Council."

Audits of Accounts of Public Bodies

The Local Government Board forwarded Reports of their Auditor in connection with his Audit of the Accounts for the financial period ended 30th September 1910 of the following public bodies:-

Enniscorthy District Asylum; Gorey Union and Rural District Council; New Ross Union and Rural District Council; Enniscorthy Union and Rural District Council; Wexford Union and Rural District Council, and Co. Wexford Committee of Agriculture and Technical Instruction.

Marked "Read"

Sealed Orders of Local Government Board

The Local Government Board forwarded Sealed Orders as

follows:

Water Supply and Sewerage at Taghmon, to be leased off Wexford Rural District; and supply of water at Chapel, to be leased off the Rural District of Enniscorthy.

Marked "Read"

Deductions from Government Grants

Under date 28th February, the Local Government Board wrote (letter No. 9293-1911 - Miscellaneous) that there would not be any deduction in respect of the liability of the Council for arrears in purchase annuities under the Land Purchase Acts made from the Estate Duty Grant for March, 1911.

In connection with the payment of grants for Sanitary Salaries and Medical and Educational purposes the Local Government Board wrote:-

"I am to state that owing to the insufficiency of the amount paid under Sec. 58 of the Local Government (Ireland) Act 1898, to the Local Taxation (Ireland) account in the current financial year to meet the sums payable thereout in the same period under the Section, as amended by the Local Government (Ireland) Act 1907, His Excellency, the Lord Lieutenant as previously pointed out, deemed it necessary, in pursuance of the provisions of Sub-Section (5) of Sec 58 to direct a proportionate abatement of the sums payable having regard to the said insufficiency.

The Local Government Board learn that the balance in the account is insufficient to pay the residue of all the sums ascertained to be so payable from the account in the present financial year, and the amounts included in the accompanying order represents the proportion of the salaries above-mentioned, after the necessary abatements have been made."

In reference to the payment of the Capital Grant for the Enniscorthy Asylum, the Under Secretary, Dublin Castle, forwarded under date 20th February an order for payment of £1070-16-1, being the amount certified by the District Auditor to have been payable in respect of the cost of maintenance of pauper lunatics for the 3 months ended 31st March 1899 in the County Wexford District Asylum.

Under date 10th March the Under Secretary Dublin Castle wrote forwarding an Order for payment of £881. 17. 7. Capitation Grant for year ended 31st March 1910.

Under date 14th March 1911 the following letter (No 4739) was received from the Under Secretary, Dublin Castle, in reply to a resolution of the Finance Committee of the County Council:

"I am directed by the Lord Lieutenant to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst., and to state that payment of the sum of £1070-16-1 in respect of the cost of maintenance of pauper lunatics for the quarter ended 31st March 1899, in the Wexford District Asylum, was made from the income of the Local Taxation Account under Section 58 of the Local Government Act 1898, in the current financial year. Had it not become necessary so to meet the claims of the several Asylums for the period in question the income of the Account would have sufficed to discharge the remaining statutory liabilities of the Account to the extent of 94.32 per cent of the latter."

The following recommendation of the Finance Committee was confirmed on the motion of Mr Ennis, seconded by Mr. Browne :-

"That our Secretary call the attention of Mr P. J. O'Neill Chairman of the Dublin Co. Council, and a member of the Parliamentary Local Taxation Committee to the deductions which have been made in this County in connection with the Local Taxation Account"

"That Mr. O'Neill be requested to use his best efforts to have an adjustment of this Account so far as Ireland is concerned made, and the fund placed on an equitable financial basis with as little delay as possible"

Waterford Bridge Loan.

Under date 21st February, the following letter (No. 8542-11 Wexford County) was read from the Local Government Board:-

"The Local Government Board for Ireland have had before them your letter of the 14th inst. forwarding a copy of a resolution passed by the joint Committee of the Waterford Bridge as regards the present financial position of the undertaking and inquiring whether the Board see any objection to allowing the County Council of Wexford to make payment out of the Ordinary funds of the Council to the joint Committee pending the receipt of the first instalment of the loan of £11,000

Sanctioned to the Council in the matter.

In reference thereto, I am to state that provided there is a sufficient balance to the credit of the County fund to enable this money to be temporarily advanced from it without prejudicing the ordinary payments which have to be made, the Board see no objection to the course proposed.

The loan from the National Bank should be lodged to the Council's Capital Account, and an Order recouping the revenue account should be made at the earliest opportunity.

The Board, at the same time, desire to state that it is most desirable that these transactions should be completed before the end of the current financial year."

Under date 16th March 1911, the following letter (no 13299) was read from the Local Government Board:-

"I am directed by the Local Government Board for Ireland to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. relative to the loan sanctioned by the County Council of Wexford for the purpose of defraying their proportion of the cost of erecting a bridge over the Suir at Waterford, &c., and in reference thereto, I am to state that the Board authorize the raising by the Council of a further sum of £3,000 in this case".

Proposed by Mr. Peacocke, seconded by Mr. James Codd, and passed:

"In pursuance of the consent of the Local Government Board for Ireland dated 23rd January 1911 to the raising by the Council of a loan for the purpose of defraying the share of the Council of the costs of erection of the new bridge over the Suir at Waterford. It is hereby resolved that the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to a Deed of Mortgage to secure the sum of Three thousand pounds advanced by the National Bank Ltd. to the Council, being portion of the sum of Eleven thousand pounds to be raised by the Council for the said purpose".

"Proposed by Mr. Peacocke, seconded by Mr. James Codd and passed: "In pursuance of the consent of the Local Government Board for Ireland dated 23rd day of January 1911 to the raising by the Council of a loan for the purpose of defraying the share of the Council of the costs of erection of the new bridge over the Suir at Waterford. It is hereby resolved that the Common Seal of the Council be affixed to a Deed of Mortgage to secure the sum of

Three thousand pounds advanced by the National Bank Ltd to the Council, being a second instalment of a sum of Eleven thousand pounds to be raised by the Council for said purpose as per the Consent of the Local Government Board dated the 16th day of March 1911."

Weeds & Seeds (Ireland) Act, 1909.

Under date 31st March 1911, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, wrote suggesting to the Council the desirability of consenting to an Order made by the Department under part 1. of the Act, and pointing out that such Order was in force in sixteen Counties last year, and the hearty co-operation of agriculturists in these Counties enabled the Order to be administered without causing any friction.

Proposed by Mr. John Bolger, seconded by Mr. Browne:
"That this Council hereby consent to an Order being made by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland declaring that throughout the County of Wexford, all plants of the following species, viz:- Thistle, Ragwort and Dock, are noxious weeds for the purposes of the Weeds and Agricultural Seeds (Ireland) Act 1909."

A Poll was taken with the following result:-

For the resolution:- Messrs. Browne, Kinsella, Stafford, John Bolger, Ennis, Kehoe, Creane - 7.

Against: The Chairman, Messrs Peacocke, Mark Codd, Asple, Doyle, Fortune, Cummins, Hickey, James Codd - 9.

The Chairman declared the resolution lost.

Sheep-dipping - Autumn period.

Under date 25th March 1911 the following letter (1363 V.B.) was read from the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland:-

"With reference to your letter of 23rd inst, embodying a resolution on the subject of the Autumn dipping period which was adopted at the previous day's meeting of the County Wexford Committee of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, I have to state that the Department regret the view taken by the Committee in this matter. Action such as they have suggested would not only be inimical to the interests of the County in connection with the sale

of sheep for exportation but would also be contrary to the statutory requirements.

Under the terms of Section 2 of the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894, it is compulsory on every Local Authority to execute and enforce the Sheep Dipping Order as regard both the dipping periods therein prescribed."

The Secretary attention to the following Resolutions protesting against the Autumn Dipping. - From the County Committee of Agriculture and Technical Instruction:-

"That we ask the County Council to put for the coming year into force the resolution adopted at the special meeting of the Council of 4th August 1909, refusing to put the Autumn Sheep-Dipping Order into operation in the County Wexford."

From the Ballyduff Farmers Society:-

"We, the members of the Ballyduff Farmers Society, protest most emphatically against the Autumn Dipping of sheep in our district, principally for the following reasons:- (1) Sheep properly attended to in the Summer do not require Autumn Dipping; (2) weak and well-bred lambs dipped in Autumn, cold and wet weather ensuing, are prone to die; (3) ewes dipped in autumn - the lups do not take with them for a time."

The following resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Kinsella, seconded by Mr. John Bolger:-

"That we decline to administer the present Autumn Sheep Dipping Order because as Sheep Owners in the County Wexford raise large numbers of early lambs the Autumn dipping period is a most serious time in which to dip ewes with lambs. Consequently in the interests of Sheep Owners of County Wexford we cannot see our way to administer the Autumn Dipping Order."

Sheep dipping Inspectors.

Proposed by Mr. Peacocke, seconded by Mr. Kehoe and adopted:-

"That Messrs J.J. Egan, Boley, Ballycullane; Ranal Mac Donald, Tinnahask, Oylegate; Aidan Leary, Raheraskash, Oulart; Wm Stafford, Ballyboher, Tombagford, be appointed Sheep Dipping Inspectors under the Sheep Dipping (Ireland) Order, 1911, for the Summer dipping period at a remuneration of £14 each."

Chairman County Council

Proposed by Mr. Peacocke, seconded by Mr. Kinsella, the following resolution was adopted:-

"That in view of his invaluable services to this Council we request our Chairman - Mr. Hore - to reconsider his intention of resigning his position as one of our Members, and that this resolution be conveyed to Mr. Hore for this Council on 24th inst., by Messrs. Kehoe, Peacocke, Stafford, Ennis, John Bolger and James Codd."

Trunk Road Scheme

The following report was read:-

"At the Conference between the Road Board and the delegates of the Irish County Councils on Tuesday 7th March 1911, at the Shelburne Hotel, Dublin, the Wexford County Council was represented by:-

Messrs: E.H. Peacocke, (Vice Chairman), James J. Stafford, John Bolger and Mr. Gaffney County Surveyor. Mr. Ennis was also present.

The proceedings of the Conference were conducted in private, but the address of the Chairman of the Road Board, who presided at the Conference, was supplied to the Press.

The Wexford delegates had a special interview with Sir George Gibb, Chairman of the Road Board, on the afternoon of 10th March.

Sir George Gibb explained that as suggested by the Irish County Councils General Council the Road Board were prepared to include in their Scheme for Wexford County the road from Newtownbarry to Enniscorthy.

The delegates pointed out that the Route mapped out by the Road Board, viz: from Gorey to Waterford, via Camolin, Ferns, Enniscorthy, Blunroche, Palace, Rathgrove and New Ross would be of practically no benefit to the Ratepayers of the County Wexford, though admittedly it was a suitable Route for motorists who wished to tour the South of Ireland. The inclusion of the road from Newtownbarry to Enniscorthy was a concession because the traffic over this route was probably the heaviest in the County.

But no Scheme would be satisfactory to the County Council or be accepted by them which did not include the road from Enniscorthy to Wexford, and, on to Rosslare Harbour as part of the first

arrangement with the Road Board.

The Chairman said this road would be agreed to by his Board.

He knew the development which had taken place through the establishment of the Fishguard and Rosslare service.

He pointed out that what the Road Board intended to do as regards Trunk Roads was so far as their funds permitted to give an equal contribution with the County Councils, viz: to put down pound for pound.

The Board would be prepared to place at the disposal of the Wexford County Council a sum of £2,000 to form the nucleus of the fund to be devoted as a contribution to a total of £4,000 on the proper strengthening and construction of those roads. The details of the expenditure to be settled hereafter.

The County Council would be obliged to purchase Steam Rolling plant and spend an equal amount to what the Road Board provided.

There was no use undertaking a scheme of this kind unless Steam Rolling plant was procured, and so far as the Road Board could see, if Contractors could not be found who would take great lengths of road, (and which seemed unlikely), the work would have to be carried out by Direct Labour. It would not be possible under the Contract system as known in Ireland to properly construct and maintain the Trunk Roads.

In the course of a very friendly discussion it was pointed out to Sir George Gibb that unless it could be proved to the District Councils that the proposals agreed to by the Road Board did not involve any extra taxation the scheme would not be agreed to.

The County Council having carefully considered the figures were in a position to inform the District Councils that if they were called on to pay only one-fourth of the cost of the scheme there would not be any increase in the Rates, but the deputation considered that if the Ratepayers were obliged to pay half the cost there would be a certain amount of increased taxation.

The cost of the roads of the County had gone up £3,000, or one 2^d in the £ on the Rural Districts within the last three years, and in view of this it would be most difficult to induce the District Councils to entertain the idea of a further increase on works which are regarded by them as mainly for the benefit of motorists. And it was well for everyone connected with a scheme of this kind to remember that practically the last word rested

with the District Councils, who were, in the present condition of the law, the body that accepted the Tenders for the upkeep of all roads including Main Roads.

The deputation in conclusion pointed out that although the County Council had passed a resolution asking for the adoption of three routes and that only two had been agreed to, nevertheless they considered that the County Council would be satisfied with the inclusion only of the two routes for the present, and on condition that in any further arrangements the route now left out, viz: - from Wexford to New Ross - would receive favourable consideration. But as regards the financial portion of the Scheme the representatives of the County Council pointed out that they believed there was no chance of inducing the County Council or the District Councils to agree to the proposal of the Road Board. And unless the Road Board could see its way to increase their proposed contribution from one-half to three-fourths the Scheme should be "hung up" for the present.

The Members of the deputation thanked Sir George Gibb for his courteous reception."

In reference to the administration of Grant for Ireland the following Resolutions were received from the Irish County Councils' General Council:-

"That the Executive Committee of the Irish County Councils' General Council emphatically protest against the proposal of the Road Board to allocate for purpose of road improvement in Ireland a sum of only £150,000 out of the total amount of £1,600,000 estimated to be available for road improvement in the United Kingdom for the period ending 31st March 1912, as both inadequate and inequitable. That we base our protest on the following grounds. (1) The expressed intention of the framers of the Act to develop by improved transit facilities the resources of poorer and more thinly populated; and the admitted greater urgent need of Ireland in this respect in comparison with other parts of the Kingdom. (2) The intention of the Act to assist agricultural and kindred industries, and the fact that Ireland possesses one-fifth of the acreage under crops and between one-third and one-fourth of the population engaged in agriculture and fisheries in the United Kingdom. (3) That

Ireland possesses about one-fourth of the total mileage of rural roads in the United Kingdom, and that the burden for road maintenance cast on the Irish Ratepayers per £ of the annual rateable value is three times as great as that borne by the Ratepayers of Great Britain.

On these grounds we claim that Ireland's proportion of the available funds should not be less than one fifth of the whole."

"That this Special meeting of the Irish County Councils' General Council protests against the Scheme for the administration of the grant for the improvement of Irish roads under the Development fund and Road Improvement Act, as outlined by the Chairman of the Road Board, Sir George Gibb at the recent conference in Dublin. That we do so on the following grounds - (1) The inadequacy of the sum proposed to be allocated to Ireland. On this point we hold for the reasons already set forth in the resolutions of our Executive Committee, the fair share of Ireland should not be less than one fifth of the entire fund, and we believe the allocation made by the Board to be in violation of the expressed intention of the framers of the Act of Parliament; (2) the stereotyping of the amount of the grant to Ireland for a period of ten years in view of the fact that the income of the Board is not fixed, but it is likely to be of a rapidly expanding character; (3) the fact that the already heavy burden borne by Irish Ratepayers for road maintenance (almost three times as great as that borne by the Ratepayers of Great Britain) renders it impracticable to add to the rates for this purpose. On this point we hold that the existing expenditure on roads in Ireland should be accepted as the contribution from the ratepayers; (4) that whilst we agree with the principle that the main roads of Ireland should be dealt with on a national instead of a local basis, we hold that the administration of Ireland's proportion of the grant should be in the control of an Irish body having local knowledge of the needs of the Country.

We, therefore, recommend Irish County Councils to postpone co-operation in the proposed Scheme of the Road Board until Ireland's fair proportion of the grant has been determined. Until such fair proportion has been ascertained no satisfactory

"national scheme can be put forward by the representatives of Irish ratepayers"

Proposed by Mr. Kehoe, seconded by Mr. Keane and adopted:-

"That the Report be received and adopted."

Mr. W. Rees Jeffreys, Secretary to the Road Board wrote under date 24th February 1911, acknowledging the Resolutions of the County Council at their meeting of the 22nd and stating they would receive attention.

Carnsore Pier.

Under date 7th April the following letter No 4047-11 from the Board of Works was read:-

"I am directed by the Commissioners of Public Works to state that they have received a report that on the east side of Carnsore Pier portion of the concrete facing measuring about 18 yards by 2 yards is stripped off; also that at the landing place at the north end the top stone is loose and two others are broken and loose. In your letter of the 21st June last it was stated that a sum of £45 was placed at the disposal of the County Surveyor for the execution of repairs at this pier."

Will you kindly say if repairs were then carried out, and I am to ask that the attention of the Wexford County Council may be called to the present condition of the pier."

The Secretary stated he had furnished a copy of the letter to the County Surveyor.

The following letter under date 11th April from the County Surveyor was read:-

"With regard to the Board of Works letter, re Carnsore Pier, I will go and see the place as soon as possible."

The damage to the concrete facing seems to be quite new. as to the landing place at the north end, etc., we are waiting for finer weather to carry out the repairs.

The £45 passed last June is not all spent and in addition a further sum of £50 was passed for this Pier in December last."

"Referred to County Surveyor."

Post offices and Bank Holidays.

Under date 13th March the following letter No 15403-11 was

read from the Secretary, General Post Office, London:-

"With reference to your letter of the 5th January, I am directed by the Postmaster General to state that the Bridgetown and Foulksmills Post Offices have not yet been closed before 8 P.M. on Bank Holidays, but it is proposed to close them at noon on future Bank Holidays in order to afford the Sub Postmasters and their Assistants some relief on those occasions.

The business transacted after noon on Bank Holidays is small, and telegrams will be delivered from Tombaggard and Wellington Bridge respectively.

In these circumstances the Postmaster General thinks you will agree that little or no inconvenience will result from the arrangement."

At the meeting of the County Council on the 4th January the following resolution on this matter was adopted:-

"That we protest against the action of the Postmaster General in closing on Bank Holidays the Post Offices of Bridgetown and Foulksmills against the wishes of the District Council concerned, and before the County Council had an opportunity of expressing their opinion on the subject.

This County Council considers these offices should be open on Bank Holidays during the same hours as on Saturdays; otherwise serious inconvenience will be caused to the people of the districts."

Proposed by Mr. Hickey, seconded by Mr. Cummins:-

"That the County Council call the attention of the Postmaster General to the resolution adopted by the Council on 4th January 1911, and that he be informed that nothing has occurred in the meantime to alter the views of the Council protesting against the closing of these offices."

Passed.

Second Irish Road Congress.

Communications were received from Messrs: R. H. Dorman and A. Leogh. Nolan, Hon Secs. Irish Road Congress, asking the County Council to appoint two delegates to the Conference, which is to be held in Dublin on the 19th 20th & 21st inst.

and giving programme, &c.

On the motion of Mr. Eunis, seconded by Mr. Stafford, -
Messrs. M. A. Eunis and John Bolger were appointed as delegates
to Road Congress."

Poisons and Pharmacy Act 1908.

Applications for renewals of licences were received
from: -

John W. Greene, George Street, Enniscorthy; J. H. Roberts,
Main Street, Newtownbary; Jas. W. Redmond, 51 Main Street,
Gorey; Isaac Wallis, Arthurstown; B. L. Keating, Ballycanew
Co-operative Society; Mrs. Mary Hennessy, South Street, New Ross;
Mrs. Johanna Hagan, Enniscorthy.

"On the motion of the Chairman, the renewals of licences
under the Poisons and Pharmacy Act were granted."

Fertylarrig Bridge.

The following letter, written to Mr. R. Colhoun, Contractor
for the erection of Fertylarrig Bridge, by the County Surveyor,
was submitted to the meeting: -

"My Council are very dissatisfied with the progress on the
new bridge at Fertylarrig, and they consider that there is no
cause for any further delay in proceeding with its erection.

There seems to be a lack of foresight and organisation in
connection with this work. The making of the parapet blocks
has had to be stopped for want of proper labour; the casting
of some of the piles has been delayed for want of sufficient
diaphragms; the steel of the lower bracings, instead of being
on the ground bent to shape and assembled ready for con-
necting after the piles were finished has I learnt to-day, not yet
arrived.

These bars are not of exceptional size and there should have
been no difficulty in getting them here in time. I have, as yet,
received no certificate of the tests of these bars.

More preparation could also have been made for the driving
of the piles. A lot of this can be done without interfering with
either the approaches or the opening span.

I observe also that the Insurance Policy for the workmen has
not been lodged here yet.

Proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Mr. Stafford, and passed:-
 "That the attention of Mr. Robert Roulhoun be called to the fact that his contract for the erection of Ferrycross Bridge expires on 15th April, and that he is liable to a penalty of £10 per week, as liquidated damages for each week's delay, beyond the time specified."

Proposed Road Depot

Under date 24th March 1911, the following letter was read from Messrs. M. J. O'Connor & Co., Solicitors, Wexford:-

"We are acting in this matter for Mr. John Sheill, Contractor of the road from the seacoast leading from Flaherty's Gap, and from Flaherty's Gap to the sea-coast road leading to Blackwater.

We have already written in the matter and pointed out that there is no depot for depositing of stones which he has to put out upon the road.

For years the Contractor have been always putting stones against the fence of the lands belonging to Mr. Donohue and Mr. Sinnott of Ballinacash. Lately, owing to a dispute, Mr. Donohue has objected, and as Mr. Hassett knows, Mr. Donohue actually threw the materials belonging to ~~the~~ client upon the public road to the danger of the public as was proved in Court at our last Session's last month.

The matter was left to the Arbitration of Mr. Talbot D.L., and Mr. Moses Fortune J.P. and the result is shown in Mr. Fortune's letter of which we send you a copy. What our client want is, that you will kindly bring the matter before the County Council at the next meeting, so that a Depot may be arranged on Mr. Donohue's land, and so that Mr. Donohue may not be taken unawares about this matter, we have sent copy of this letter formally and officially to Mr. J. W. Scallon his Solicitor. We are also sending copy to Mr. Park Fortune of Green, County Councillor of the district. We do not know what his report will be, but we do believe from what we know of the case that he will also be of opinion that the Depot will be necessary.

We understand that £1. is allowed for depot, but surely some fund could be provided for the balance of £8. or £9. which it will cost for materials to make the depot in order to enable the Contractor to carry out the work according to the Specification.

In the event of the County Council not finding it possible to make the depot, of course then Mr. Donohue can have no objection to the gravel being put against his fence as heretofore, otherwise the Contract cannot be carried out by our client."

The following is a report made by Mr. J. H. Talbot, and Mr. W. Fortune before whom the case was heard at petty sessions:-

"We have inspected the gravel deposits which caused dispute, and found the roadside covered with material for almost fifty perches. This material belonged to four or five parties who hold different Contracts and is of the best quality. With reference to Mr. Donohue's objection to having the material heap so close to his gate, we considered upon inspection that it was a little too close, but Mr. Donohue's action in spreading the material across the road was hasty, as there was other means by which he might have attained his object, or point."

"The road indeed is narrow, and when material is stored upon it is not up to the requirements. We recommend the County Council to consider the advisability of having a suitable depot provided as close to the sea as possible. We also found the gap in its proper place, and ordered the Contractor to let it remain so."

"No order made, as the County Council find that the custom of depositing gravel at this road has prevailed for a number of years, and is a general custom all over the County."

Gravel Pit at Ballycarney

With reference to the proposed purchase of Gravel Pit at Tomgarrow, Ballycarney, the following letter from Mr. John A. Sennott & Co. Solicitors for vendor, to Mr. Elgee, Solicitor for the County Council, was laid before the meeting:-

"Referring to previous correspondence, we have seen Mr. Karanagh to-day and he instructs us that he merely undertook to give what title he had himself to the County Council to the two acres of his holding for the purpose of his gravel pit, and that any consent of the Land Commission, or the owners, required by the County Council should be procured at their expense, and he insists that he so arranged with the Committee of the County Council with whom he had to do in this matter. We told him that all we could do was to write his instructions to you as Solicitor

for the County Council, as we had not seen either the document or a copy signed by him at the time of making the arrangements to let the County Council have part of his holding. If the County Council will now proceed to procure the consents they require all will be well, but Mr. Kavanagh is positive that he will not go to any expense in procuring such.

The following resolution of the Finance Committee was confirmed: -

On the Motion of Mr. James Codd,

Seconded by Mr. Stafford: -

"That the letter of Messrs. John A. Sinnott & Co., be referred to Mr. Elgee to report to next meeting of the County Council.

By-Laws - Locomotives.

Mr. R. W. Elgee submitted the draft by-laws for use of locomotives on highways, and as to opening and closing of bridges across the Slaney, and for New Ross Bridge.

On the motion of Mr. Kehoe, seconded by Mr. Stafford, the draft by-laws as submitted by Mr. Elgee was passed.

Courstown Harbour.

A letter was received from the Harbour Department, Board of Trade, pointing out with reference to previous correspondence as to casualties to fishing boats "Candoi" and "Violet", that the boats on entering the Harbour came into contact with the north Pier and had their sides ripped open by bolt heads projecting from the wood-work of the pier.

The Courstown Harbour Committee to whom this letter was referred, forwarded the following minute: - The bolts now in wooden fender on the north Pier have become prised through rust, and are working out of the wood. We are of opinion that they should be renewed.

In connection with this matter the following further recommendation was received from the Courstown Harbour Committee: -

"We recommend that a red light be procured to be exhibited at the Pier Head when it might be dangerous for boats to attempt to enter the Harbour, as owing to the

want of a proper signal more than one accident has occurred recently."

In connection with the April meeting of the Cusstown Harbour Committee, the following is an extract from the minutes of their meeting:

The Harbour Master laid before the Committee the amount of arrears of dues outstanding £ 22.13.10 of which they consider nearly £ 9. irrecoverable as the boats are worn out and past repair, and have not been used for some considerable time, they impressed on the Harbour Master the necessity of using every means to collect outstanding dues.

List of boats worn out and amounts owing on them:-

"Wave"	Edward Nolan	£ 2.19.0	Boat broken up.
"Margaret"	Patrick Kinsella	3.12.6.	Boat worn out; not used for two or three years.
"Mayflower"	Nichl. Kenny	1.12.6.	Severely, not used for four years.
"Lady"	Park Bolger.	5. 0.	Payment disputed.
		£ 8. 9. 0	

Under date 4th March the following resolution was read from Gorey Rural District Council:-

"That we press the claims of Cusstown Harbour on the Development Grant Commissioners as being worthy of immediate consideration."

Cusstown is an important fishing centre, but the condition of the bar there is destroying the industry. An extension of the pier is absolutely necessary in the interests of the general trade of the district, and of the town of Gorey in particular."

The Cusstown Harbour Committee recommend that the Harbour Master procure 12 oar poles at a cost not exceeding £ 2.

The following recommendations of the Finance Committee were adopted on the motion of Mr. Stafford, seconded by Mr. Kehoe:-

"That in view of the report of the Cusstown Harbour Committee and Mr. Elgee, Solicitor to the Council, the sum of £ 8.9.0. referred to in minute of Cusstown Harbour Committee of the 4th April be struck off as irrecoverable."

"The recommendation of the Finance Committee, agreeing to the erection of red light at the Pier Head at Cusstown was confirmed".

Erection of Weighbridge at The Harrow

under date 31st March the following letter was read from Mr. Alfred Haughton, Rockspring, Ferns:-

"A number of farmers in this neighbourhood have joined together to buy a weighbridge. The proposed site is in The Harrow as you will see by the enclosed plan.

I would ask you if you would kindly lay this before the County Council at their next meeting for their consent.

There will be a pen to hold cattle at either or both ends and the whole thing will be against Mr. Redmond's wall running parallel and won't project more than 10 feet from the wall.

You will see by the plan that there is really none of the street taken up and won't interfere with the traffic in any way.

The weighbridge as you will see, is 7 feet at one end and 12 feet at the other, inside the water table.

Mr. Redmond is quite willing, in fact offered this site, for the erection of the weighbridge.

I have notified Mr. Gaffney also Mr. Howlin about this matter; Mr. Howlin has seen the place and all has been explained to him.

Thanking you in anticipation"

On the motion of Mr. Stafford, seconded by Mr. Kehoe, the following resolution was adopted:-

"That the necessary permission be given Mr. Haughton for the erection of a weighbridge at the Harrow."

Road Contractors Security

The following letter was read from Mr. Robert Rackard, Kiltanne, Enniscorthy:-

"Referring to Road Contractor Simon O'Brien, for whom I am one of his sureties, I now beg he relieved from same as I am now about becoming a Candidate for the District Council, I name as my substitute my brother

John Rackard of Killanne. Hoping you will grant my request".

On the motion of Mr. Kehoe,

Seconded by Mr. Stafford the following resolution was adopted:-

"That Mr. Robert Rackard be relieved of his suretyship for road contract of Simon O'Brien, Milltown, Killanne, No 28, Enniscorthy, as soon as new bond has been entered into".

Rate Collection

The Secretary reported that all the collectors had closed in good time except Collector John Walsh, who had £552.16.9 outstanding on March 31st, since then Mr. Walsh had closed his collection.

The following resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Stafford, Seconded by Mr. Kehoe:-

"That we request the Local Government Board to extend the period for the close of the collection of Rate Collector John Walsh to the 12th April, as Mr. Walsh was laid up for a considerable period during the collection."

With reference to the state of the Rate Collection submitted to the County Council on 8th February, the Secretary called attention to letters which appeared in the Press from Messrs. Redmond and Lacy.

The former wrote: "at that meeting it was stated I had lodged only a sum of £62. though as a matter of fact I had lodged up to date £339.17.6., I don't quite understand the system of book keeping that is responsible for sending broadcast such a misleading statement."

Mr. Lacy wrote - "There was not a word about what I collected and lodged up to the meeting of the 8th. was that to mislead the public, and make them believe I was a defaulter."

The Secretary stated that when he saw those letters he wrote to Messrs. Redmond and Lacy that the state of the Rate Collection up to the day before the meeting of the Council on the 8th, was laid before the meeting, and this was proved by the resolution of the Council informing the Local Government Board that since the receipt of their letter of 24th January a substantial improvement had been made in the Rate

Collection.

The Collectors were asked to admit that in view of the facts their letters were unjustifiable, or write to the papers contradicting the falsehoods in their letters.

The following resolution was adopted: on the motion of Mr. Stappford, seconded by Mr. Creane:-

"That the Council direct the attention of Collectors Redmond and Lacey, to the fact that the statements made by them in the newspapers that no return of poor rate up to date was laid before the meeting of 8th February is incorrect, and that therefore the deductions made by them to cover an attack upon the Council and the Secretary, are entirely without warrant or justification.

That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Collectors Redmond and Lacey."

Death of a Surety.

Mr. Redmond, Rate Collector, Ballincash, Ferns, wrote that one of his sureties - Andrew Kehoe of Ballinamora, had died on 2nd March.

The following resolution was adopted:

"That Mr. Redmond be requested to submit the name of surety vice Mr. Andrew Kehoe deceased. That if the Finance Committee approve of name submitted, Mr. Redmond be directed to enter into a new bond."

Analyst's Report

The following report was read for the meeting:-

City Laboratory,

17 Castle St.,

Dublin

6th March, 1911.

The Report of Sir Charles Cameron B.Sc., M.D., Public Analyst for the County Wexford on articles submitted to him for analysis during the quarter ended 31st December 1910.

797 Articles were received from the Food Inspectors, R.I.C. as follows:-

Article	Number
Milk	42
Whiskey	16
Butter	8
Buttermilk	4
Port wine	1
Gin	1
Total 72	

One Certificate was sent to Sergeant Bonaghy, Wexford, for specimen of milk deprived of at least 20 per cent of its fats, and one certificate for specimen of Buttermilk adulterated with at least 41 per cent of added water exclusive of 25 per cent allowed for churning purposes.

There were three specimens of butter analysed by directions from the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, Upper Horton Street, Dublin, which were taken up in County Wexford, and were pure.

One specimen of Water analysed for the Secretary, Wexford County Council, had the following composition. One imperial gallon contained in grains.

Total solid matter	29.400
Including	
Albuminoid ammonia	0.075
Saline ammonia	0.000
Nitric Acid	Trace
Chlorine	2.080

A Polluted water

For the Guardians of Gorey Union fifteen drugs were analysed. Two were incorrect.

For the Guardians of Enniscorthy Union twelve drugs were analysed. One was incorrect.

For Shillelagh Union, which is partly situated in the County Wexford, six drugs were analysed. Two were incorrect.

Two specimens of water analysed for Shillelagh Rural District Council which is partly situated in the County Wexford, had the following compositions:

One imperial gallon contained in

grains:

no 1

no 2

Total Solid

matter — 10.500

30.100

Including

Albuminoid Amm.

onia 0.005

0.0035

Saline Ammonia 0.001

0.001

Nitric Acid 1.500

3.890

Chlorine 1.680

3.280

Good Waters

Total Analyses. III.

adulterated and defective articles 7.

(Sd) - C. A. Cameron

Confirmation of Minutes of Committees.

On the motion of Mr. Stafford,

Seconded by Mr. Asple the following minutes of the Finance Committee were confirmed:—

"That the County Council be recommended to accept a sum of £40 as the annual rent for St. Bridget's Inebriates Home as from 1st January 1911, and for year 1911 only, being a reduction of £10 on the amount agreed on, and which concession is granted owing to the fact that the average number of patients in the Institution for the past year was only 11.8.

For the future the Finance Committee cannot hold out any hope that any reduction on the fixed rent will be agreed to by the County Council."

"That we ask the Local Government Board to extend the time for payment of £95-11-3 to Messrs. Kelly & Co., Timber merchants, New Ross, which was not furnished to the County Council in time, owing to the death of the manager of the firm, and subsequently in consequence of the death of the caretaker of the Bridge"

"That permission be given to Mr. Gaffney, County Surveyor, to prosecute the following Road Contractors, should be con-

sides it necessary:

Hugh Kenny, no 162, Gorey; Joseph Murphy, no 222 Gorey; David Power, no 159 & 182 New Ross; and Charles Breen, Mangan, Killanne; Charles Breen, Bolabawn, Davidstown; Michael Breen Mangan, Killanne, for neglect of Special Works."

"That Mr. Gaffney consult with Mr. Elgie, Solicitor, as to damage at Ferrycrossing Bridge by the Steam Barge of the Ennisceathy Steam Boat Co. That Mr. Elgie be instructed to recover from the Steam Boat Co. the amount spent by Mr. Gaffney in having the repairs carried out."

The various minutes of the Finance Committee in respect of the Rate Collection just closed were also agreed to, as were those approving of purchase of coal bags by the Countess Harbour Committee.

Recommendations of Finance Committee relative to payment of poundage to Rate Collectors, and of irrecoverable rates were also confirmed.

Dublin Development Association
Mr. W. J. Branagan, Secretary to Dublin Development Association wrote asking the County Council to appoint six delegates to the all Ireland Industrial Conference, to be held in the City Hall, Dublin on June 14th & 15th.

"Referred to County Council Meeting in May."

Coals for County Courthouse

The following tenders for coals for use of the County Courthouse were received:— J. N. Barlow @ 24/- per ton; Murphy, Bros. & Co. 24/- per ton; Patrick Byrne 23/- per ton.

On the motion of Mr. Stafford, Seconded by Mr. Kehoe, the tender of Mr. Byrne was accepted.

Coneduff Pier.

The following memorial extensively signed was read:—

"We, the undersigned beg to draw your attention to

a defect in the structure of the old part of Poulduff Pier. Said defect consists in the slip, which is wrongly constructed. The steps facing the sea are a grave danger to property and life. Mr. Webster intended in his last estimate for repairs to include said slip. During the last South East Storm which prevailed around our Coast it was a miracle of Providence that some of our Boats were not lost. It is also the means of keeping one of our Boats from a Quay Berth.

As the cost is not very large we beg you to consider the opinion of Mr. Stafford Raffney who saw the defects a few days ago."

Under date of 7th February the following letter was read from Mr. Kinsella, County Councilor:-

"In reference to the Memorial from the Fishermen of Poulduff which has been forwarded to the County Council for consideration at their meeting to-morrow in connection with some improvements to the Pier and landing-place at Cahore as particularly mentioned in the Memorial.

I believe that such improvements are absolutely necessary for the due safety of the men and boats engaged in the Fishing Industry there, and furthermore, I understand that the work does not involve any considerable outlay.

In my opinion the Memorial of the Fishermen should be granted and the work carried out with as little delay as possible.

I regret very much that owing to a very important engagement I shall be unable to attend the meeting of the Council to-morrow, and I shall be much obliged if you will place this letter before the meeting so that the Council may have an expression of my views on the subject."

"Referred to proposal Committee"

Kilmore Harbour.

In connection with the dredging of Kilmore Harbour the following letter No 844-11 F.B., was read from the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, Ireland:-

"adverting to your letter of the 25th ultimo,

I have to state, for the information of the Wexford County Council, that up to the present time the Department have been unable to secure plant which would be likely to deal effectually with the material which awaits removal from Kilmore Harbour.

The state of the Department's funds precludes the possibility of their purchasing a specially constructed dredger for work on the harbour in question and of providing for its annual upkeep, but certain representations in regard to the desirability of providing the Department with a second dredger have been made to the Development Commissioners, and if these are favourably entertained the case of Kilmore Harbour will take its place with those which will engage the consideration of the Department."

Marked "Read."

Capstans for Curraclloe Fishermen

Under date 13th February, the Department of Agriculture & Technical Instruction wrote (Letter No 1314 - F.B.) forwarding copy of the following letter which they had sent Messrs W. H. Morris & Co. Solicitors, Wexford; in reference to the necessity for the provision of two capstans for the use of the Curraclloe fishermen:-

"Adverting to your letter of the 30th ultimo in which you refer to the correspondence between Sir Thomas Esmonde and the Department on the subject of the necessity for the erection of a Capstan at Curraclloe, and point out the necessity for the erection of a similar engine at Ballyniskar, I have to state that in view of the fact that the County Council appear to have no statutory authority to contribute to the cost involved, the Department are prepared to provide - within a limit of £20 in each case - two-thirds of the necessary expenditure; and would themselves erect the engines, subject to the existence of permission to do so from the owner of the site or person or body having control thereof.

The Department will later on, decide on the relative advantages of winches or capstans."

Marked "Read"

Report of County Surveyor
On the Condition of the New Bridge

December 30th 1910.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,

I beg to make the following report
to you on the above:

The Bridge, I believe, was constructed about 1863, and is therefore 47 years old. It is impossible to say for how much longer it will be economically useful, but at the outside I think it will be about 50 years. It may quite probably be less, as of course the structure will deteriorate the more the older it grows. In accordance with your instructions I made a careful examination of every member of the Bridge and I attach a detailed account of the result to this report.

Before going further I should say definitely that this report excludes the opening span and the two adjoining ones, which at the present moment are being repaired.

Considering the Bridge as a whole its condition cannot be called satisfactory. To put the case concisely before you I think it will be necessary immediately to repair or replace 16 Piles, 17 Crossheads, 34 Beams, 6 Stringers 2 Diagonals and 53 Saddles, and the cost of these repairs I estimate at £2,600.

In another couple of years more repairs will be required, consisting of the repairing or replacing of 34 Piles, 11 Crossheads, 40 Beams, 14 Stringers, 11 Diagonals and 15 Saddles and the cost of this I put at £2,450. This includes 18 broken castings and 2 tie bars which are a bit wasted. The castings are bolted to the top of the Crossheads and the ends of the beams rest in them; they also serve as anchorages for the tie bars. Some are tied up with chains and the remainder held up with wrought iron bars.

In five or six years from now I think it will be necessary to carry out further work. This will consist of the repairing or replacing of 44 Piles, 64 Beams, 7 Stringers and 4 Diagonals which will cost £3,700. Some of Piles Stringers and Diagonals may last a bit longer, but all the Beams, I think should certainly be repaired.

Looking a little further ahead I expect that in ten or twelve years from now, further repairs will be required. as well as can be decided at present these will comprise the repair or replacing of 11 Piles, 11 Beams, 1 Stringer and 2 Diagonals, and the probable cost will be £830. It must be remembered, of course, that the Bridge is getting older all this time and materials which are now sound may not be sound then.

After this period it is impossible to say with any degree of accuracy what the annual cost of repairs will be; but sooner or later the Piles will have to be repaired and this will be a difficult and expensive matter, as a very large amount of work will have to be done under water.

I think I might venture to say, however, that if these repairs be carried out, the Bridge will be in good order and condition and will remain so for perhaps fifteen or twenty years with minor repair.

Finally I would add that I have made the most careful examination possible of every member of this structure, but there, probably may be defects I have failed to discover.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient Servant
Stafford Gaffney
County Surveyor

County Surveyor's Office,

Wexford, 30th December, 1910.

New Bridge, Wexford
Detailed Report on Structure
Numbered from the Railway Side

First Span -

1 st beam South	Poor
1 st and 2 nd beams North	Bad

First Pier -

2 top stringers	Bad
4 th Pile South	Bad
1 Diagonal	Bad
Saddles	Bad

Second Span -

2nd beam North	Bad
3rd beam North	very Bad
4th beam North	very Bad
3rd beam South	Bad
2nd beam South	Poor

Second Pier -

Top stringer	very Bad
3rd pile North	Bad
Crosshead South end	Bad
Saddles	Bad

Third Span -

1st & 2nd beams South	Bad
3rd Beams North & South	Poor
2nd beam North	Bad in Centre

Third Pier -

1st 2nd & 3rd Piles North	Bad
4th pile North	Poor (old portion)
2nd pile South	Bad
Crosshead, South	Bad
Top stringers (2)	Bad
Diagonal (right)	Bad
Saddles	Bad

Fourth Span -

1st beam North	very Bad
2nd & 3rd beams North	Bad
1st beam South	Not very good
3rd beam South	Bad at end

Fourth Pier -

3rd and 4th piles North	Not very good (scuffed)
1st & 3rd piles South	Poor.
Crosshead, South end	Bad
Diagonal (1)	Bad
Saddles	Bad

Fifth Span -

2nd beam South	Bad
1st & 2nd beams North	Bad at ends
1st beam South	Poor generally. bad at one end
3rd beam North	Poor on top.

4th beam South not very good
3rd beam South very bad

Fifth Pier -

1st & 4th Piles South Poor
1st pile, north Poor
Crosshead Bad at both ends
Top stringers (2) Bad
Diagonals (2) Bad
Saddles Bad

Sixth Span -

1st beam north very bad
3rd beam north Bad
4th beam north Bad to top
1st beam South Bad on bottom
2nd beam South Bad

Sixth Pier -

1st Pile South very Bad
2nd Pile north Bad low down
Crosshead Bad at both ends
Stringers (1) Diagonal (1) Bad
Saddles Bad

Seventh Span -

1st beam north Bad
2nd and 4th beams north very Bad
3rd beam north north Rather Bad
1st & 2nd beams South very Bad
3rd beam South Rather Poor

Seventh Pier -

1st & 2nd Piles north Bad
3rd Pile north Poor
4th Pile South Poor
Crosshead very Bad
Stringers (1) Bad
Saddles Bad

There are three broken Castings on this Pier

Eighth Span -

1st & 2nd beams South very Bad
4th beam South Bad
1st beam north Rather Bad

Eighth Pier -

1st Pile North	very Bad
1st Pile South	Bad
2nd Pile South	Fair
Grosshead	Bad
Stringer (1)	Bad
Diagonal (1)	Poor
Saddles	Bad

Ninth Span -

2nd beam North	Rather Bad
3rd beam North	Bad
1st beam North	very Bad
1st beam South	Bad

Ninth Pier -

1st & 3rd Piles South	Bad
1st & 2nd Piles North	Poor
Grossheads & Saddles	Bad

Tenth Span -

2nd beam South	very Bad
1st beam South	Bad
1st beam North	Bad
2nd & 3rd beam North	Poor
4th beam North & South	Fair

Tenth Pier -

1st Pile North & South	Bad
2nd Pile South	Rather Bad
3rd & 4th & 5th pile South	not very good
Grosshead saddle pieces	Bad
Stringer	Rather Bad

Eleventh Span -

1st beam South	Rather Bad
2nd beam North	very Bad
3rd beam North	Fair

Eleventh Pier -

1st & 3rd Piles North	Bad
2nd & 4th piles North	Fair
1st Pile South	old portion bad
3rd & 4th piles South	going
Stringers (2) Saddles	Bad

Diagonals (1)	Poor
Twelfth Span -	
1 st beam north	Very Bad
2 nd & 3 rd beams north	Bad
4 th beam north	Weak at Bearing
Twelfth Pier -	
1 st 2 nd & 4 th Piles north	Bad
1 st & 2 nd Piles south	Soft; Rather Bad
Crossheads and Saddles	Bad
Stringers (1) and Diagonal (1)	Bad
Thirteenth Span -	
1 st beam north	Rather Bad
2 nd beam north	Very Bad
2 nd beam south	Bad
3 rd beam south	Top Bad
4 th beam south	Fair
Thirteenth Pier -	
2 nd & 3 rd piles south	Very Bad
1 st pile south	old portion poor; new Bad
4 th pile north	Fair
Crosshead north and 4 saddles	Bad
Fourteenth Span -	
1 st beams north & south	Very Bad
2 nd beam north	Rather Bad
2 nd beams north & south	Getting soft and Bad
Fourteenth Pier -	
1 st pile south	Bad
2 nd 3 rd & 4 th piles north	Soft
3 rd pile south	Soft
Crosshead, south end	very Bad
Stringers (1) & Diagonal (1)	Bad
Saddles	Bad
Fifteenth Span -	
1 st beam north	Bad, tie Rod wasted
2 nd beams north & south	Gone a bit on top
3 rd beam north	Going abit at Bottom
4 th beam south	Going abit at Bottom
Fifteenth Pier -	
1 st pile north	Bad above

2nd pile north	Poor
crosshead + saddles	Bad
diagonal (1)	very Bad
From Pier no 16 to Pier no. 19	The Bridges at present being repaired.
Sixteenth and Seventeenth Span -	
Beams continuous, 1st north	
and south	Being replaced
2nd south	Poor
4th north	Bad
2nd & 3rd north	very Bad
Sixteenth Pier -	
Piles 1st and 4th north	Bad
Piles 1st 2nd & 3rd south	Bad
Crosshead	Bad
Saddles	Bad
Nineteenth + Twentieth Span -	
Beams continuous, 2nd north	very Bad
Nineteenth Pier -	
Crosshead	very Bad
Saddles	Bad
Twentieth Pier -	
1st pile north	Bad
3rd pile south	soft, new portion
Crosshead + Saddles	Bad
diagonal (1)	very Bad
Twenty-First Span -	
3rd Beam south	very Bad
2nd beam south	Bad
4th beam south	not very good
Twenty-First Pier -	
2nd Pile north	a Bit soft
1st Pile south	Bad at top
Crosshead + Saddles	Bad
Stings (1)	very Bad
Twenty-Second Span -	
First second & third beams south	Rather Poor
1st Beam north	Gone on top
2nd & 3 beams north	very Bad

Twenty-Second Pier -	
1 st and second Piles South	very Bad
Crossheads & saddles	Bad
2 nd pile North	Going on top
Diagonal (1) Stringer (1)	Bad
Twenty-Third Span -	
1 st beam North	Rather Poor
2 nd beam South	Fair; the rod wasted
Twenty-Third Pier -	
1 st & 2 nd piles North	Bad
1 st pile South	Bad
3 rd & 4 th Piles North	not very good
Crosshead & Saddles	Bad
Diagonal (1) Stringer (1)	Bad
Twenty-Fourth Span -	
1 st & 2 nd Beams South	Bad
1 st & 2 nd Beams North	Poor on top
2 nd Beam South	Bad on top
3 rd & 4 th beams North	Bad
Twenty-Fourth Pier -	
1 st pile South	Poor
Crosshead & Saddles	Bad
Diagonal (1)	Bad
Stringer (1)	Very Bad
Twenty-Fifth Span -	
1 st beam South	Bad
2 nd beam South	very Bad
2 nd & 3 rd beams North	Going
Twenty-Fifth Pier -	
1 st & 3 rd piles North	Bad
3 rd pile South	Bad at Bottom
1 st pile South	Bad at Bottom and going a bit at top.
Crosshead	Bad
Saddles	Bad
Stringer (1)	Poor
Stringer (1)	Bad
Twenty-Sixth Span	
1 st beam North	Top Bad

1st & 3rd Beam South	Bad
3rd beam north	casting Broken
Twenty - Sixth Pier -	
1st 2nd & 3rd Piles north	getting soft and worn
2nd & 3rd piles south	Bad
4th pile south	new portion going
crosshead & saddles	Bad
Diagonal (1)	Bad
Twenty - Seventh Span	
1st Beam South	very Bad
2nd & 4th beams South	Poor; going a bit
1st beam north	Bad
Twenty - Eighth Pier -	
1st & 3rd piles South	Portion Bad & going
Crosshead & Saddles	very Bad
Stringers (1)	Bad
Twenty - Eighth Span -	
1st Beam north	Poor on Top
2nd Beam north	very Bad, Rotten
3rd beam north	Fair
2nd and 4th beams South	Bad
3rd beam South	Rather Bad
Twenty - Eighth Pier	
1st & 4th Piles South	getting a bit soft
4th pile north	a bit soft
1st & 3rd piles north	Bad
Crosshead & saddles	very Bad
Diagonals (1)	Bad on top
Stringers (1)	Rotten.
Twenty - Ninth Span -	
1st & 2nd Beams South	Very Bad
3rd Beam South	going on top
1st & 2nd beams north	Poor
all beams are sagging, due to broken casting.	
Twenty - Ninth Pier -	
1st Piles north & South	very Bad
Crossheads & saddle Pieces	Very Bad
Stringers (2)	Bad.

Thirtieth Span -

1st + 2nd Beams South

Bad

4th Beam South

Fair

1st Beam North

awful Bad

2nd Beam North

Bad on top

4th Beam North

Fair; Broken casting

Thirtieth Pier -

3rd + 4th Piles North

Going a Bit Soft

2nd Pile South

Soft

2nd Pile North

Very Bad

1st Pile South

Bad, one side

Crosshead and saddles

very Bad

Diagonals (2) Stringers (1)

Bad

Thirty-First Span -

1st beams North & South

very Bad

2nd beam South

Bad on top

2nd beam North

Bad at Bottom

Thirty-First Pier -

1st pile North

Very Bad

4th pile North

new portion young

1st pile South

Bad

2nd pile South

Top Bad

Crosshead, saddles & stringers (2)

very Bad

Thirty-Second Span -

1st + 3rd beams North

Very Bad

2nd beam North

Going

1st beam South

Poor

3rd beam South

Fair; Going bad at bottom.

4th beam South

Bad

2nd beam South

Jie Rod wasted

Thirty-Second Pier -

1st pile South

Outside Poor

2nd pile South

Old part Bad

Crosshead & saddles

Bad

Thirty-Third Span -

1st beam South

Bad

2nd beam South

Fair; going a little

1st beam North

very Bad

2nd beam North

Bad over casting; latter broken

3 rd Beam north	Rather Bad
Thirty - Third Pier -	
1 st and 2 nd piles south	Bad
1 st Pile north	Rather poor
Crosshead and saddles -	Bad
Thirty - Fourth Span -	
3 rd and 4 th beams south	Castings broken
3 rd Beam south	going at bottom
1 st Beam north	going on top
2 nd Beam north	very Bad
Thirty - Fourth Pier -	
1 st Pile north	very Bad
3 rd and 4 th Piles north	Rather Bad
1 st Pile south	Fair
Crosshead + saddles	very Bad
Stringers (2)	Poor
Thirty - Fifth Span -	
1 st + 4 th beams south	Very Bad
2 nd Beam south	Bad
2 nd + 4 th Beams north	Poor
1 st Beam north	Bad.
	Stafford Gaffney
30 th December, 1910.	

Wexford Bridge.

Reports from George L. Webb & Co, Submarine
and General Contractors, West Grove, Wood Green, Essex.

15th March 1911

Sir,

I beg to make the following report
to you of my survey of Wexford Timber Road Bridge,
which you were good enough to trust in our hands to
survey:

On the 20th February, 1911, I went to Wexford as
arranged, and accompanied you to the site of this Bridge,
over which we walked and found, after inspection, that
it had dropped in several places.

The next morning, 21st idem, and the three following days we examined and surveyed the Bridge by Boat, commencing at West side, and underneath we examined every Bay, with the exception of the opening span and the two small Bays on each side of same, these being already under repair.

We give you on a separate sheet details of timber and iron work required for each Bay. We find very little with the timber work below ordinary tides, the bottom wailings are sound, and all the piles could be scarfed at or above these wailings.

We consider if these repairs are carried out and the Bridge tarred and painted it will then be in good and proper repair, and I consider if the same amount of repairs are necessary and are carried out in ten or twelve years time you will have a good Bridge for at least 30 years.

We have also allowed for new bolts for fixing all new timbers, and also for tarring, as low down as possible in the water, the whole of the timbers from end to end of the Bridge, also to clean and paint with two coats of oil colour the whole of the Parapet fencing, and make good the roadway and footpath with ballast and shingle wherever it has been disturbed getting in new timbers &c.

We have allowed £200 in our estimate for unforeseen things, such as the provision of a few more stringers and caps which may be found necessary when opening up the roadway, which will then open up the tops of these timbers which is impossible to get at underneath, also there may be several cast-iron flooring plates cracked and broken, and by allowing £200 as a provisional sum, it can be added or deducted from the estimate.

We estimate the whole of this work to cost £4,540-16-4.- Four Thousand Five Hundred and Forty Pounds, sixteen Shillings, and Four Pence - and the material estimated to be used is good, sound, creosoted pitch pine. Both timber and bolts to be the same size as those now in the existing old Bridge.

I have gone very carefully into this survey and estimate and to the best of my knowledge I believe it to be a true and faithful statement. I enclose your estimate to this amount; we should be only too pleased to enter into a contract to

carry out the repairs for you on the lines we have based in our estimate.

We are, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,
W. G. Webb.

Report of Survey of "Wexford Timber Bridge"
Starting from "west side of Bridge."

13th March 1911.

Bay	No	Struts	Caps	Corbels	Top Railings	Beams	Piles	Broken Castings
"	1	3			1		1	
"	2	4			1		1	
"	3			2	1		3	
"	4	1				1		
"	5	2	1	2	1			
"	6	2			1	1	1	
"	7	4	1	2	1		2	3
"	8	3			1		1	1
"	9	3	1	2			1	
"	10	4			1		3	
"	11	3		2			1	
"	12	1			1	1	1	
"	13	3		2			3	
"	14	2			1		2	
"	15	1	1	2		1		
"	16	1	1	2				
"	22	1	1	2	1			
"	23	2	1	2			3	
"	24	2					3	
"	25				1	1		
"	26	3	1	2	1		1	
"	27	1		2				
"	28	2	1	2				2
"	29	5	1	2			1	
"	30	4	1	2	2		2	6
"	31	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
"	32	4	1	2	2		2	
"	33	4		2			1	1
"	34	5	1	2	1		2	1
"	35	3	1	2	2		1	2
"	36	4						
Total		49	15	40	22	6	38	17

13th March, 1911

Sir,

We have much pleasure in enclosing you our estimate to carry out the repairs to Wexford Bridge. We agree to find all timber and ironwork of the best quality according to our report and survey, and the amount of work which is reported to be done in each Bay.

We propose to carry out the work as under:

To block half the roadway and footpath, and fence off same in about 150 feet lengths. Cut all caps in two in the centre, where they have to be renewed and put in the new caps in two also, scarfed in the centre, renew stringers where specified, then relay cast iron decking and kerbing and make the road good. Then carry on the same till we reach the centre, work back and finish off the other half of the bridge in the same way. We will complete the East side of the Bridge first, as this side is in a worse condition than the other side.

We shall also find all the tools, plant, cranes, temporary staging, timber, watchmen, lights &c., necessary to carry out the whole work in a proper workmanship manner. We will keep all the traffic on the roadway going, and finish the whole of the Contract to the satisfaction of your appointed engineers and Clerk of Works for a lump sum of Four Thousand Five hundred and Forty Pounds, Sixteen Shillings and Four Pence (£4,540.16.4) If necessary, we could make a start at once, and we estimate it will take about five months to complete the Contract.

All old material is to become our property.

We are, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

W. G. Webb & Co.

13th March 1911.

Sir,

Reference to the examination of the Piles under Water at Wexford Bridge. I beg to state that we went to Wexford on Saturday 4th March, 1911, and made arrangements to commence diving on Monday, 6th March. We continued until we had

surveyed the whole 36 Bays and Piles; we completed our survey on Friday 10th March, 1911.

I have great pleasure in saying that as far as our bows could ascertain each Pile is perfectly sound and well down into the bed of the river.

We are, dear Sir,

yours faithfully,

W. & L. Webb & Co.

Dear Sir,

I find when I got back to Waterford to-day that there was more cubic measurement in the timber required to repair your Waterford Bridge than I told you. But if the 15 Caps and the whole of the Corbels were put in oak instead of pitch-pine, which is about 1,100 cubic feet at 2/- per cubic foot more, would be £110 and if the 38 Piles were Scarfed with oak instead of pitch pine, which is about 1000 cubic feet at 2/- per cubic foot extra it would be £100, making, if those Caps, Piles and Corbels were down in oak it would add to the timber about £210. We consider for the little difference it makes in the price it would be best to have oak. Of course the Walings and Braces would do in pitch pine, as being in such long lengths oak would be too expensive.

With regard to the Graded Scheme I am doing all I can to let you have it by the end of the week. Also I have sent away for the prices of Tar Macadam land.

I am, Sir,

yours faithfully

For W. & L. Webb & Co

G. Webb

(Copy)

Dear Sir,

We have as promised gone to a lot of trouble to get this Scheme out for you this week to replace your temporary Bridge with steel and concrete at top as follows:

All main stringers to be of the best steel rolled joists in 40 ft lengths, with the exception of 4 small bays by opening span; there will be 16 48 ft. and 240 40 ft.

x 12 in. x 5 in. fixed in the same shoes and bolted to the Truss bar brackets with 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ in. bolts by means of a saddle plate 9 in. x 9 in. x $\frac{3}{4}$ in., either rivetted or bolted on to the underside of the joists, the ends in each of the brackets to be filled in and packed tight with hard wood; then this takes the place of the 14 in. x 14 in. top stinger; then on the top across the 12 in. x 5 in. longitudinal joists are placed 1 ft 6 in. centre $4\frac{3}{4}$ x $1\frac{3}{4}$ steel rolled joists forming concrete bars and bolted down on the top; $\frac{1}{2}$ in. bolts to every main joist reversible, 1 on one side and 1 on the other and so on right through the bridge; then underneath these are used ordinary timber sheeting and 7 in. of 5 to 1 concrete spread all over the bridge; after this is properly set the shuttering to be removed. you could then add on top 2 in. to 3 in. thick of good Tar Macadam, which would then make a splendid bridge, and take over a rolling load on four wheels, 12 tons, or you could use the ordinary round metalling that is there now on the old bridge on the top of the concrete, as you will see the Tar Macadam is very expensive.

The following is copy of a letter to hand:

From John Rheinhardt and Son, Limited, Marks Lane, Gt. Brunswick St., Dublin.

"In reply to yours of 21st inst. we could supply the Tar Macadam you require at Wexford at the rate of 15/- per ton, free on rail, Wexford Station."

Without using the Tar Macadam and only put back the ordinary road metalling and rolling same in, we could do the whole of this work for the lump sum of £4518-6-8.

All this includes as well, to scarf the number of piles; also to renew Walings and Braces we have already specified in our estimate. It also includes to put on 36 new oak 38 in. x 14 in. x 14 in. baps scarfed in the middle; also the whole of the Corbells on top, Tar the whole of the bridge as specified, paint and refix the iron parapet.

Trusting now this information will be satisfactory and enable you to get things passed at your meeting either in one way or the other but we strongly recommend the latter scheme which we think and quite believe would have a good substantial bridge for the next 50 or 60 years with very little

upkeep.

Signed G. L. Webb & Co.

Wexford Timber Bridge.

Report of James Price, Ainst. C. E.

4th April 1911.

To the County Council of Wexford.

Gentlemen,

As directed I beg to report that on March 23rd & 24th I examined Wexford Timber Bridge at high and low water.

Mr. Stafford Raffney supplied me with copies of his own report and notes and Messrs Webb's Tender for repairs of the more defective parts of the bridge. From my own observations and from the information supplied I am satisfied that at least one third of the woodwork above half tide level is decayed and defective. When the work is opened up for repairs I fear that half the timber will require renewal.

Below half tide level the timber is obviously sound.

The iron tie rods are so heavily rusted at parts as to interfere materially with their strength.

The combined effect of these defects approximately reduces the strength of the structure to half of what it was originally.

The cause of this state of things is the misuse of Tar on the timber and iron work - periodically the bridge has been tarred to hide defects and no attempt seems to have been made to scale the iron and clean the old tar from the timber.

The iron work should have been scaled and painted every five years and the timber painted with hot creosote occasionally.

Obviously the bridge cannot be allowed to remain in its present state; I note repairs of the moving portion have been commenced. Messrs Webb's Tender provides for the renewal of something less than one third of the timber work for the sum of £4,540; to this should be added say, £160 for new iron tie bars; when the bridge is opened up further defects will doubtless be found which will run the cost of repairs up to nearly £6,500. In ten years time it is probable that the remainder of the timber work will require renewal at the same expense - making the

total cost of reconstructing the bridge by patchwork £ 13,000.

I cannot advise this method of treating the question; it is both expensive and inconvenient to the public using the bridge.

I have considered carefully three methods of complete reconstruction of the Bridge above water level, viz. in Treasured Pitch Pine Australian Hardwood (Karri) and Ferro Concrete. The cost of each would be as follows:-

Treasured Pitch Pine - Cost to reconstruct with new wood throughout, using part of the present iron work, estimated at £ 9,300.

	£	s.	d.
Annual Cost - Interest @ 4 per cent	372	0	0
Repairs	465	0	0
Painting	60	0	0
Total	897	0	0
Karri - Cost as above £	11,200	0	0

Annual Cost - Interest @ 4 per cent — £	448	0	0
Repairs	162	0	0
Painting	60	0	0
Total	670	0	0

The amounts put down for repairs would not be necessary during the first years after reconstruction, but the money should be put aside to cover heavier expenditure at a later date - they do not include repairs of the road surface which depend on the amount of traffic.

These two methods of reconstruction would bring the bridge back to its original strength and allow loads of 2 ton per axle to cross the bridge with safety.

It is expedient however to consider the future; what was strong enough for 60 years ago may be quite out of date in a few years, when the trade of the North East of Wexford may be developed by heavy commercial motors, and the navigation of the River Slaney becomes important. I therefore suggest the consideration of a Ferro Concrete Bridge to take the heavy weights that may be necessary.

For a Ferro Concrete bridge the existing timber piles might be surrounded by Sika Concrete to half tide level; above these Ferro concrete work might be constructed, with complete Ferro Concrete

deck and beams.

I estimate the cost of such a bridge as follows:

Fixed spans	£ 17,200
Movable spans - steel truss bridge, 2 spans of 50 ft. on caste piers 30 ft. with suitable fendering - hand moving gear	£ 4,500
Total	£ 21,700

The important point about a Ferro concrete bridge is that it is practically everlasting; there is no wood to decay, and no unprotected iron to rust.

The annual cost to the County, would be as follows:

Interest 4 percent on £ 21,700	-	£ 868. 0. 0
Paint - movable part, etc.		50. 0. 0
Total	£	918. 0. 0

The annual expense is thus only £121. over the Geosted Pitch Pine Bridge, or £248 over the Harri bridge, and for the price stated the Ferro Concrete bridge might be made strong enough to take steam rollers up to 15 tons weight.

I have noted the site of the old bridge nearer the town as a possible site for a new Ferro Concrete bridge. The distance to be crossed is about 300 ft. less; as against this the depths of water are greater, and the whole structure below water should be Ferro Concrete; the land abutments would require widening and refacing. A new site with no existing traffic to be provided for is an advantage - certain public roads would have to be reconstructed.

Taking into all these points into consideration, I doubt if any money would be saved by changing the site.

Owing to the position of the Dublin & South Eastern Railway girders, more frequent openings of the bridge would be required, so that it might be necessary to provide a gas engine with a regular attendant for opening, which would add to the maintenance charges about £80 a year.

Vested interests should also be considered - the Harbour authorities might object to the change of the site which would deprive the Port of the valuable sheltered anchorage.

I have considered the suggestions in the letter of Messrs.

George B. Webb & Co., of March -

These are to repair certain timber work in the piers, and construct in these piers a complete deck of concrete on rolled steel joists of a strength to take moving loads of 12 tons on four wheels, for £7,518. As no drawings are supplied I cannot test the figures.

Girders formed of the present tie rods and steel joists would be defective in design, as they would not have sufficient depth in proportion to span to give the rigidity required for a concrete deck.

The work so proposed would be incomplete unless the piers were converted into permanent concrete piers, and the opening portion converted into a steel swing bridge to take loads up to 12 tons on four wheels - with these corrections, and the cost of the bridge in this form would be about £15,000.

There would also be considerably more expense in painting exposed iron than in the Ferro Concrete bridge - so that the annual cost would be little less than for Ferro Concrete, the design being imperfect as regards rigidity. I cannot recommend a bridge of this nature.

Some suggestions are made as to using oak. This timber at the best is not more durable than seasoned Pitch Pine, and costs twice as much per cubic foot; and if not carefully selected, may have an extremely short life.

Generally, I am strongly adverse to patching the present bridge. Even when the amount of defective timber is known, patching costs 50 per cent more than reconstruction, but in this case, until the bridge is opened up it is impossible to say exactly how far defects extend. For instance I would not be surprised to hear that every bolt in the bridge was reduced by rusting to half its original strength.

Again, if the bridge is to be reconstructed, it is important to consider the question of the requirements of the future; if the trade of the County is likely to be improved the bridge should be of a nature to take heavy traffic, and not such as to become obsolete in a few years.

Whatever form of reconstruction is decided on, some immediate strengthening of the present bridge is required.

As to the moving part, the works now in hands should

be completed, with respect to fixed spans the strengthening need not be expensive, say £400 in all. The chief danger is from the breaking under traffic of one of the main beams, as the cast iron road castings are not continuous transversely, this would allow a portion of the roadway to fall into the river.

To remedy this defect, I would suggest transverse beams of Pitch Pine, 25 ft. by 12 ins. by 12 ins., laid across the tie rods, one or two to each span, as shown on sketch (A), herewith, and each defective beam should be supported by wooden blocks and wedges from these transverse beams.

This would distribute the load from the decayed beams to those adjoining that were sound. The tie rods should also be examined, and extra rods, as shown in sketch (B), put in where the sectional area of the tie rod is found to be materially reduced. With this strengthening, I consider the bridge safe for traffic of one ton per pair of wheels.

In conclusion, I wish to thank your County Surveyor, Mr. Gaffney, for the full information he supplied to me, and for his assistance in the examination of the bridge.

I am, Gentlemen,

your obedient servant,

Jas. Price.

April 14th 1911.

Report of County Surveyor to Wexford County Council

Mr Chairman and Gentlemen,

With further reference to the new bridge, and Mr. Price's report thereon, which I received on the 5th inst., I have to say that I agree generally with that report.

In my report to you last January I estimated the cost of repairs in the next 12 years at almost £10,000 and the future life at 40 years.

Messrs. Webb & Co for the same period gave the cost of repairs at a little over £9,000 with a further life of 30 years. In an additional report they suggested a scheme costing about £7,500 with a life of 50 to 60 years. This, however, if the design were satisfactory, would be unnecessarily strong.

and the future maintenance would be difficult and expensive.

Mr. Price in his report gives three estimates of the cost of reconstructing the bridge above water level, viz.:

1. - In Creosoted pitch pine, £ 9,300.

2. - In Kauri pine, £ 11,200.

3. - In Ferro Concrete, £ 21,700.

This first estimate is between Messrs. Webb's and mine for the same class of work.

This second estimate is also for the same class of work, but with better timber.

These estimates, you will note, have been arrived at in three entirely different ways, and I may say that substantially they are in agreement.

I would point out, however, that in my report I said that there would probably be defects which I had failed to discover. Similarly Messrs. Webb include a sum in their estimate for repairs which are at present not discoverable, and now Mr. Price reports that until the bridge is opened up it is impossible to say how far defects extend.

As regards Mr. Price's third estimate I am not prepared to differ with it, but it seems high. From information I have received I think a new ferro-concrete bridge could be erected on the present site for £ 18,500, and on the old site opposite the Courthouse for about £ 13,500.

These estimates of course, are contingent on the results of soundings and borings at the two sites, and I have assumed an opening span of the type of the existing one. A swing span like the one at New Ross, such as Mr. Price favours, has many advantages, but would cost between £2000 and £3000 more.

As regards the question of site for a new bridge it would be useless to provide one on the present site unless the railway were reconstructed also, or adapted to take the same load, and further it would be useless to build a new bridge without making it strong enough to take any load that possibly may come onto it.

As to the Courthouse site, the frequent opening of the bridge will, in a way, be a benefit, as it will tend to ensure the machinery being kept in working order.

with regard to Messrs. Webb's second scheme I quite agree with Mr. Pries remarks, and point out in addition that the difficulty of the railway bridge still remains.

Mr. Pries suggestions and recommendations for the immediate repair of the present bridge are very good and most valuable, but I think he underestimates the cost which I expect would be about £750.

Finally I would add that the Road Board have power to contribute to the cost strengthening or reconstruction of weak bridges which seriously limit the use for commercial transport of roads of first class importance.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant

Stafford Gaffney
County Surveyor.

County Surveyor's Office
Wexford,

7th April, 1911.

Proposed by Mr. Peacocke, seconded by Mr. O'Neill,
and passed:—

"That the Finance Committee be appointed a Committee to consider the question of the repair or reconstruction of the bridge of Wexford, or erection of a new bridge on either of the sites referred to in the Engineers' reports, the Committee to have power to approach the Board of Trade, the Harbour Commissioners, Railway Company, and any others interested, so that the Committee may be in a position to lay a definite report before the Council as soon as possible"

"It was decided that the Committee meet at 10 A.M. on 24th April."

B. H. Peacocke.