



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

<https://archive.org/details/b2136557x>

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON THE

Supply of Water to the Metropolis;

TOGETHER WITH

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

SUNDRY PAPERS LAID BEFORE THEM.

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
29 June 1821.*

WITNESSES :

<i>William Chadwell Mylne, Esq.</i>	- - - - -	pp. 3. 17. 179. 186.
<i>Mr. John Paul Rowe</i>	- - - - -	pp. 8. 138.
<i>Thomas Simpson, Esq.</i>	- - - - -	pp. 10. 66. 181.
<i>Mr. James Gascoigne Lynde</i>	- - - - -	pp. 13. 178. 181. 186.
<i>Mr. Richard Till</i>	- - - - -	p. 15.
<i>Mr. James Dupin</i>	- - - - -	p. 23.
<i>Mr. William Tierney Clark</i>	- - - - -	p. 25.
<i>Mr. Matthias Koops Knight</i>	- - - - -	pp. 31. 97. 158. 161. 169. 173. 187.
<i>William Anderson, Esq.</i>	- - - - -	p. 34.
<i>William Matthew Coe, Esq.</i>	- - - - -	p. 44. 95. 147. 152. 169. 173.
<i>Mr. John Southam</i>	- - - - -	p. 51.
<i>Mr. John Dowley</i>	- - - - -	ibid.
<i>Mr. George Saunders</i>	- - - - -	p. 52.
<i>Mr. Joseph Steevens</i>	- - - - -	pp. 54. 69.
<i>Mr. Thomas Nelson Pickering</i>	- - - - -	pp. 61. 157. 172.
<i>Mr. Matthew Chitty Marshall</i>	- - - - -	p. 63.
<i>Mr. Joseph Nelthorpe</i>	- - - - -	p. 69.
<i>Mr. William Rudge</i>	- - - - -	ibid.
<i>Mr. James Weale</i>	- - - - -	pp. 70. 83. 129.
<i>Mr. Charles Smith</i>	- - - - -	p. 93.
<i>Mr. William John Newton</i>	- - - - -	p. 94.
<i>Daniel Robert Barker, Esq.</i>	- - - - -	p. 103.
<i>Jonas Hall Pope, Esq.</i>	- - - - -	p. 105.
<i>Mr. James Day</i>	- - - - -	p. 107.
<i>Mr. Seth Smith</i>	- - - - -	p. 110.
<i>Mr. Richard Dennison</i>	- - - - -	ibid.
<i>Mr. John Thorowgood</i>	- - - - -	p. 112.
<i>Dr. Robert Masters Kerrison</i>	- - - - -	p. 115.
<i>Mr. William Harris</i>	- - - - -	p. 118.
<i>Mr. William Ansted</i>	- - - - -	ibid.
<i>Mr. William Knowles</i>	- - - - -	p. 119.
<i>Mr. Shirley David Beare</i>	- - - - -	p. 120.
<i>Mr. Joseph Simpkin</i>	- - - - -	p. 122.
<i>Mr. John Richardson</i>	- - - - -	p. 126.
<i>Mr. Michael Smith</i>	- - - - -	p. 128.
<i>Mr. John Bullock</i>	- - - - -	p. 129.
<i>Mr. John Thomas Hope</i>	- - - - -	p. 130.
<i>Mr. James Birch Sharpe</i>	- - - - -	pp. 133. 137.
<i>Mr. William Treacher</i>	- - - - -	p. 139.
<i>Mr. Robert Wright</i>	- - - - -	p. 143.
<i>Mr. James Davis</i>	- - - - -	p. 146.
<i>Mr. William Hart</i>	- - - - -	p. 147.
<i>Mr. John Gibson</i>	- - - - -	p. 148.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Veneris, 16^o die Februarij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

William Chadwell Mylne, Esq. Called in; and Examined.

HOW long have you been engineer to the New River company?—About ten years.

*William C. Mylne,
Esq.*

You were not engineer previous to the year 1810?—No; I acted under my father; my father was then engineer.

(16 February.)

Are you the principal engineer?—Yes, I am.

Have you any record, or any average statement of the quantity of water supplied by the New River company previous to the year 1810?—Supposing that I might be asked for that, I collected what documents were in my possession, and I have made a statement of it, or nearly so.

This confines it to a time previously to the year 1810?—Yes.

And relates solely to the supply of water?—Yes, to the west end of the town; I cannot distinguish correctly as to the parishes, but this relates to the whole of Mary-le-bone, part of Soho, and part of St. George's Hanover-square.

It does not therefore comprehend the whole of the supply at that time?—The whole of the supply to Mary-le-bone, part to Soho, and part to St. George's Hanover-square.

The object of this Committee's inquiry comprehends the whole metropolis: you were then entitled to supply the whole of the metropolis: the Committee wish to know what was the amount of your whole supply?—From an estimate taken in 1811, the quantity of water furnished by the New River company, to the whole of London was 214,000 hogsheads a day.

In that estimate, what part of the town was comprehended?—The whole of the town; that was the quantity of water delivered by the New River into the reservoirs at the New River head.

Now specify the parts of the town under the other head?—The only distinction I can make of the quantity supplied, is by the quantity raised by the steam engines to supply the west end of the town.

When were those steam engines erected?—I go back as far as 1767: I believe the first might have been thirty years before that; in the first instance it was a wind-mill, it was then converted into a horse engine, and after that into a steam engine.

When was it converted into a steam engine?—I do not know; it was before Mr. Smeaton's time. In 1767 there were four mains passing to the west end of the town; one called the Soho Main, another the Grosvenor Main, the third the Oxford Main, and the fourth the Portland-road Main. The Soho main was allowed 21 hours a week, the Grosvenor main 24 hours, the Oxford-road main 15, and the Portland-road main 6 hours, making 66 hours per week of a 7 inches main, with a head of 34 feet pressure upon it. In 1768 the number of hours were increased to 117 per week.

From 66 hours they were increased to 117?—Yes.

In relative proportions?—I can give the proportions; in 1773 it amounted to 150 hours; in 1780, 229 hours and a half; in 1787, 301. About the year 1787 Messrs. Bolton and Watt had a patent for an improved steam engine, and they agreed with the New River company to put one up, being allowed a profit on the coals; they employed a person to take down in a book the time of working the engine, and from that book I have the time of its working very nearly up to 1810: there are three years not made out.

William C. Mylne,
Esq.

(16 February.)

Do you consider that the first steam engine?—No; but it was the first upon which an account was kept, which was done by Bolton and Watt's man as a check against the company. In the first two years, 1787 and 1788, the quantity of water is 4,900,000 hogsheads; those two years are rather more than the following year, from this circumstance; a water wheel was erected in 1789, which threw up about as much water as supplied Islington, but in the first two years Islington was supplied from the steam engine, and after this period I consider the whole of this water to go to the west end: this is the exact number of hogsheads raised; each motion of the engine is registered, and each motion produces a given quantity of water; in the first year it amounted to 4,940,243 hogsheads.

Including Islington?—Yes; the supply of Mary-le-bone has increased gradually, up to 1810, to 10,000,000; in 1789, 1,780,019 hogsheads were supplied to Mary-le-bone; that I conceive is the whole of the water that went to the west.

In the two years after the erection of Mr. Bolton's steam engine the whole amount of water supplied amounted to 4,940,243 hogsheads?—That is the first year only, 1787; in 1788, 4,041,952.

That embraced the whole of London?—The whole from the upper reservoir.

Proceed with your statement from 1788?—In 1789, 1,678,019; the whole of that water went westward, I should conceive, not including Islington.

And so you go on regularly till what time?—Till 1810; in 1810, it was 10,035,664 hogsheads, of 54 gallons, in a year.

That included what part of the town?—It supplied the whole of Mary-le-bone, part of Soho, part of St. George's Hanover-square, that being the higher ground adjoining Oxford-street; every house to the north of Oxford-street being supplied by it, and a portion to the south on the high ground.

Do you consider that this supply of 10,035,664 hogsheads was the full extent to which your powers could be carried, or could you have furnished more?—Not without robbing other parts of the town.

Could you have afforded more if a demand had been made of you?—A portion more certainly might be supplied in flood times, but not a regular supply, I should conceive.

Your fund of water was exhausted by that then?—The whole that was delivered at the New River head was distributed in the town; if more had been taken from the river a greater portion might have come down, but not to any great extent.

It was pretty nearly the whole extent you could supply at that time?—I should imagine so.

Have you any detail of that supply, namely, into months, or weeks, or days?—Yes, I could give it; I have it not by me; I have got a book of the description to show the mode in which the account was kept.

Will that answer the question?—It gives it weekly.

In the year 1810, what was it, weekly?—This is only up to 1790.

Have you any detail or any memorandum of the number of houses that were supplied in this district?—The secretary of the company has; I have not.

Is the secretary here?—Yes.

You say in 1787 the total supply was 4,940,243, including Islington, and in 1789, 1,678,019; was that difference made by the supply of Islington?—All the higher ground: it was what they called the higher service, and that makes the difference; it is rather more than half; it appears so in the book.

You state that the supply amounted to 117 hours and 150 hours, and so on; what number of services had you in the week; when was it put on; and how long did it continue each time?—This statement refers merely to charging the main from the reservoir at the head; it was then distributed by the turncocks; the account of which I have not.

How often did you charge the main?—Every day the Soho main was charged for 21 hours in 1767; on Monday, seven; Tuesday, nothing; Wednesday, seven; Friday, seven; making twenty-one.

That is three times a week?—Yes: the Grosvenor worked every day; Monday, three; Tuesday, five; Wednesday, three; and so on.

Have you any document of the same sort for 1810?—No, I have not.

It was supplied in the same way?—Yes.

Did the mains continue full after that?—They did not at that period.

Do you consider them as full always now?—Yes.

You are positive your mains are always full now?—Yes; those mains were shut off every night.

What

*William C. Mayne,
Esq.*

(16 February.)

What was the total quantity supplied in 1811?—214,000 hogsheads a day.

That was the total supply of the New River per day?—Yes.

Have you got any returns of the supply beyond the year 1810?—No, no account was kept; Bolton and Watt's patent was out, and no account was kept.

But you have an account of the supply since, have not you?—None whatever.

Have you no daily return?—No.

How do you calculate your rates then upon the supply?—The regulation of the rates is entirely managed by the board; they generally judge from the size of the house, and the general consumption of the house or manufactory.

Do you mean to say that the company are ignorant of the quantity of water supplied from their works?—They know nothing more than what the river produces.

What time do your engines work at this moment?—The engines work only for the high supply now; the water from the level of the New River will pass to all other parts of the district now supplied by the New River company.

And the mains are always kept charged?—Yes.

That makes sixty-eight millions to the other parts of London?—It will be so.

You make sixty-eight millions to the other parts of London, exclusive of Mary-le-bone and the higher ground, and ten millions to the higher ground?—Yes.

Have you no means, by the mode of working your water, of ascertaining or guessing or giving information as to the quantity of water you now supply to the public?—No.

Do you consider that it is considerably beyond what it was in 1811?—No; I should not consider it now quite so much.

Has there been no such account kept of the supply since 1810 as was kept previous?—No; we have an account of the coals burnt by the engine, which would lead us to it.

Your engine only raises a certain portion of your water?—Yes, for the supply of cisterns above the level of the river.

What quantity of coal do you consume annually?—Rather under 400 chaldrons.

What quantity of water per chaldron is the estimate that that coal consumed raises?—That is a question I cannot answer; the engine works with different pressures.

How many horse power?—Sixty-three it is called; there are three; but a chaldron of coals, when raising water ten feet high, will raise only half that quantity if you are supplying houses twenty feet high. The way in which the water is regulated is, that the cock in the street is opened, then it has been ascertained, in a given pressure, how many hours will supply every house; when that is ascertained, it is shut by the turncock, and he is not allowed to go beyond it. If any abuse arises in a particular street, the tenants complain, and it is immediately looked to, and remedied if possible.

You can give no information as to the quantity of water that is raised by the expenditure of those 400 chaldrons of coals?—I could, but I have it not here; I believe I have the hours the engine has worked for the last two or three years.

Do you know the quantity it raises per hour?—It will vary a little, but it may be averaged sufficiently near.

You have no memorandum upon that?—No, I have not.

Do you know whether there has been a greater quantity of coal consumed since the year 1810, than before?—There was a great deal consumed the first three or four years, at the time of the competition; the return of the coals every year will show it: the theatres are supplied to the top, and many brewhouses are supplied to the top; that must be done by steam.

Can you give the Committee any information as to the quantity of water supplied daily to each house within your district?—I merely from curiosity took the quantity of hogsheads delivered per day, and divided it by the number of tenants on the books; it amounted to about four hogsheads per tenant: there may be more houses than there are tenants, because people farm them; sometimes a person will farm a whole street, and it appears in one name in the book: it amounted, by the books, to four hogsheads per tenant.

Have you any means of ascertaining the quantity of houses so farmed?—Surely the secretary has that.

You say from mere curiosity you took the number of hogsheads furnished per day; did you take the number of hogsheads furnished from the whole of your works per day?—Yes; 214,000 hogsheads.

You are speaking of 1811?—Yes.

William C. Mylne,
Esq.

(16 February.)

The question refers to the present time?—The river has the same declivity, and will yield the same quantity; the fall is three inches in a mile.

Do you expend the whole of your means at the present time?—No, not in the supply of the town.

Can you give us any idea of what is reserved?—I have not got it here, but I have calculated it within the last month, taking it in general numbers; I forget what it amounted to.

What do you do with it, let it off?—Let it off; at this period of the year there is a great deal more water from the river skirting hills in different parts; in the summer we have none to spare.

What do you consider as the difference between the wastage quantity when you used the wooden pipes, and now you use iron ones?—The waste was immense, but I cannot form any opinion; there is an immense waste in the town at present.

Owing to what?—The company not having enforced ball-cocks; they have had no deficiency of water, and they have been rather lax.

Do you consider that there was more regulation and more prevention of waste in 1811 than there is now?—Far greater.

Why was it so?—The necessity of preserving the water for the tenants. Marylebone was never satisfied in my remembrance.

The demand was greater then?—The demand was greater; it was with difficulty that water could be saved.

As engineer, can you show any reasonable ground for an increase of rate beyond the rate of 1810, within your district, arising from any other grounds than those of the expenditure on the competition between the companies?—In 1810 the New River company could not serve above the ground-floor, in any part of the town, and did not profess to do it; their works were all in wood: there may have been instances in the lower ground where the water has gone up higher, but they did not profess to give above the ground-floor. The mains were generally shut off in the night to prevent the waste of water.

That means, the mains were not full at night?—They were not full; the cock at the upper end of them was shut. At present the works are wholly in iron, and now they will engage to serve the top of any house in their district. The mains are always kept charged, and the supply of the tenant is as regular as the day comes.

What do you mean by the expression, shut off in the night?—Not full.

The supply now is perfectly regular to all the houses?—Perfectly regular.

And the mains regularly charged during the night?—Yes.

Which used not to be the case previous to the year 1816?—Certainly.

Then you mean to distinguish that there being iron pipes now, instead of wooden pipes, as one of the grounds for an additional rate?—Yes; all the benefit arising from the iron works.

But the iron did not serve, independent of the high service, one iota better than the wooden pipes?—More regularly. In 1810 there were nine pipes passing down Goswell-street, side by side; water would escape from one, and it would be a month before it was found out; now it is one pipe, and I do not receive in the average ten complaints in a year of deficiency.

You do not receive ten complaints in a year of a defect of supply?—No; the turncocks may have received complaints, which did not come to my ears.

Could you give the information to the Committee as to the difference of expense between an iron pipe, of any given length, and a wooden pipe of the same description, laid down with a proportionate diameter?—I can on a future day: there are many situations where one iron pipe is cheaper than nine wooden ones in the same street.

Were all your wooden pipes taken up in one year, or was it a long process?—In about four years; the greater part was done in two years.

Could you furnish the Committee with any information as to the extent of district, and what number of houses have been supplied since the arrangement in the year 1817, for dividing the metropolis into districts?—I cannot give it directly; 52,000 tenants were supplied since the year 1817, and they cannot have varied much.

That is your present number, is it?—Yes.

Could you inform the Committee whether there is any plan or written document specifying the line of demarcation between the separate establishments, the line to which you are confined, and the line which is taken up by the other companies?—There is a plan on which I have inserted the whole of the companies works, which extends to the districts they now supply.

Has that plan been regulated by a comparison with the other companies; is it a mutual agreement?—There is nothing with the plan that at all refers to an agreement.

How was it settled?—The withdrawing of the supply was settled by a communication between the different companies.

In that communication the line was specified, was not it?—The line was specified. Specified by mutual agreement?—Yes.

Was that specification in writing?—No.

Was not there an exchange made of iron pipes, by which your proportion in the iron pipes was ascertained so as to mark the district?—The district was completely marked by the present supply of the water; all pipes that remained in the New River district were purchased by them.

Were you privy to that contract?—I valued the pipes.

In the arrangement of the district, was there any legally binding contract or agreement?—Nothing whatever.

Is there no plan of the district which you supply with water?—I have a plan; it is a large plan, and very cumbersome.

What quantity of water is supplied by the New River; you cannot furnish the Committee with any distinct information upon that head beyond the year 1811, more than that you believe it is less than it was at that period?—It is rather less now than it was at that period.

You stated that in Goswell-street there were nine wooden pipes running parallel where one iron main is now, and you say in that case the iron pipe would be cheaper than the wooden one?—I should conceive it is.

But upon the average you think the iron is about double?—Not upon the average; but in pipes of the same dimensions the iron is nearly double the wood.

Supposing that the pipes were of equal diameter, what would be the expense of repairing the wooden pipes, as well as the iron?—It is a very difficult question; it could be got at only by the average of the company's expenses to maintain them.

Have your iron pipes required much repair?—Very little indeed.

Have they sunk at all in any cases?—Only by crossing large sewers; not in common ground.

In the understanding which exists between the companies to serve particular districts, is there any thing legally to hinder you from infringing on the districts you have deserted?—I understand not; but I believe there are persons here who can answer the question better than myself. I have generally understood that the company are not bound in any way from going into Mary-le-bone.

What is your opinion of the advantage of iron pipes, taking into consideration their original cost, and the expense of repairing them?—There is no comparison in the supply derived through wood and iron; one is extremely uncertain, and the other is as certain as the day comes.

Were the wooden pipes competent to stand the pressure necessary for high service?—No, they gave way immediately on the engine being applied to them.

Do you know the comparison of the strength of the two materials, as to the high service?—No; in a main, however good the timber might be when laid down, it passes through such various soils, that in two miles, you may find a hundred places in it, where it will be decayed in two years, while the rest is entirely sound.

In the case of low service, is iron preferable to wood?—Far preferable.

And you think that it would be more desirable for a new company to put down iron for low service?—It depends entirely upon the inhabitants, what supply would satisfy them; they might have wooden pipes to supply a portion, if they would consent to take it irregularly.

Have there been any experiments made at any time respecting iron pipes, that ascertain the extent of their durability?—None have worn out yet; they have been down 30 or 35 years. I have seen parts of pipes that have been 80 years under ground, perfectly good.

They corrode in some places, but not in others; that depends upon the soil in which they are put?—Yes.

Have you seen any instance of decay in the iron pipes?—Nothing worth mentioning.

Have you ever known any expense incurred in repairing iron pipes?—There is a small expense: there is a contraction and expansion takes place with every change of the season, and when they were screwed together, they became one rod, and pulled themselves asunder every winter; now passing into each other, it is not perceivable.

They are not screwed together now?—No; the contraction on nine feet is so small, it does not affect the joint.

*William C. Mylne,
Esq.*

(16 February.)

There is considerable expense to keep wooden pipes in repair?—Yes.

At this time, have the companies any choice as to the sort of pipes they will have, or are they not compelled, by Mr. Taylor's Act, to use iron pipes, and iron pipes only?—I believe it is so understood.

Are they not compellable?—No; I do not believe they are; I do not believe it is so; by the act of parliament all new companies must lay down iron pipes.

What is your opinion respecting the advantage the public derive from the present supply of water, in comparison with the former one?—It is very great; the supply is more certain; there is a supply in cases of fire; and fifteen years ago, the mains to Mary-le-bone were always shut off of a night, and if a fire happened, they had to send to the New River head for water: a watchman was kept to look out.

Have you formed any notion of the number of houses that used to be burned down before this ample supply, and the number of houses since burned down?—No.

Have you any notion in your own mind of the increased supply of water over the supply in 1810, as it now exists?—In the district supplied by the New River, it certainly is increased, but the ground is limited, and the same quantity of water is delivered to a smaller number of tenants; the ground which has been quitted by the other companies, I believe, to consume about double.

Have you any minute or memorandum to inform us what was the number of houses supplied in 1811 by the New River company?—No.

You state the number of houses to be now about 52,000?—I believe it was between 70 and 80,000 in 1810, but you can ascertain that from the secretary.

Do you know whether the sewers are now kept in a much better state, from a larger supply of water being given to this end of the town, than they used to be?—That is certainly the case; as a commissioner of the district I can answer to that fact.

You are a commissioner of sewers?—I am.

At the time that the separation was made of districts, in the year 1817, when you withdrew from certain districts, did the companies who took up those districts any of them purchase your mains and pipes?—Each company purchased the pipes that were left, both wood and iron, and every thing else in the districts abandoned.

Mr. John Paul Rowe, Called in; and Examined.

*Mr.
John Paul Rowe.*

HOW long have you been secretary to the New River company?—Since the year 1811; Midsummer 1811.

Were you employed before the year 1811 by the New River company?—Yes, I was.

What situation were you in?—I was then a collector.

Were you conversant with their books and records?—Only so far as related to my own district as a collector.

Can you give the Committee any information with regard to the quantity of water furnished by the New River since you have been secretary in the year 1811, either by the year, month, week, or day?—No, I cannot.

Can you furnish the Committee with any information of the quantity of water that is raised for high service by the consumption of 400 chaldrons of coals in a year?—No, I cannot.

Can you inform the Committee as to the number of persons to whom water is furnished?—I can.

What number?—I have it not in my recollection, but I can furnish such an account; do you mean inhabitants or houses, I have received instructions to prepare an account of the number of houses supplied, which is nearly concluded.

Can you give the Committee any information with regard to the relative difference of expense between laying down a wooden pipe and an iron pipe?—No, I do not think I can.

Can you inform the Committee what extent of district, and what number of houses, on the average, have been supplied since the arrangement entered into in 1817, for dividing the metropolis into districts?—I can furnish such an account.

Is there any plan or written document, specifying the line of demarcation between the separate establishments?—There is a plan that is in our office showing the line of demarcation.

Where was that plan prepared and made out?—By our engineer.

In communication with the other companies?—Since the line of demarcation was formed that plan has been drawn.

When was the line of demarcation formed?—In the beginning of 1818, I believe; somewhere about March 1818.

Where was it formed?—It was formed, I believe, at our office.

By

By a joint meeting of the proprietors of the different companies?—No; by a meeting of the officers of the different companies.

Is there any signature affixed to the line of demarcation?—There is not.

Who authenticated that line of demarcation?—It was left to ourselves to arrange it, on given rentals of each company.

You valued the rates payable to each distinct company, and then upon the average of those rates you made the division?—Upon the gross rental of each company we made that division.

Was it in proportion to the capital, or the rates?—That I am not aware.

Were you employed to make that calculation?—I was employed to make this line of demarcation.

Was that engagement entered into upon any penalty, upon the entry into a part that did not belong to you which you had surrendered?—No penalty whatever.

You each reserved the power of entering upon the other's territory if you thought proper?—We did, so far as relates to the west end of the town.

Not to the eastern side?—No.

There was a contract under a penalty?—There were writings between us, but I cannot give any information on the subject.

Was that boundary-line decidedly fixed at that meeting?—Yes; I believe it was.

Has there ever been any variation to that boundary-line?—I am not aware that there is any variation; what may have taken place with other companies I know nothing of.

Do you know the number of services that are now laid on per week, whether it is so many hours a day, or so many days in a week?—That is a question I cannot answer; it is not within my province.

In that arrangement that took place in 1818, for the division of the district, did any part of it go to the destruction of the pipes that you left in the ground that you surrendered?—The pipes were exchanged between each company, by the arrangements between us.

What was the date of that?—I think about March 1818.

Then if by that arrangement you surrendered the pipes, you rendered yourselves incapable of interfering with their district afterwards, did not you?—Without laying down fresh pipes.

Your district comprehends the very centre of the town, does not it?—It does.

Your district is therefore the most inhabited of any part of the town?—I should conceive so.

Can you show to the Committee any reasonable ground for an increase of rate beyond the rate of 1811, when you first came there, within your district, arising from any other grounds than those created by the expense of the competition?—We have been laying out a very large sum to increase our capital, and in the exchange of iron pipes for wood: I think that is one very great ground for an advance in charge; certainly the supply is very much benefited by the iron pipes.

Provided you had supplied 20,000 houses previous to 1811, and you still continue to supply the same number, what difference do you suppose there is in the supply?—I really cannot answer the question.

Nor can you answer any thing on the comparison between iron and wooden pipes?—No, I cannot.

You have stated that there is one reason for an increase of price for supplying water, that the company have been at a great expense in laying down iron pipes, do not you conceive that that expense will be compensated for in a certain degree by the smaller expense of repairing the iron pipes?—Certainly the expense will be materially reduced.

Have not you been very much benefited also by the reduction of expense of repairing the pipes?—I think we have.

In making that calculation, do you take into consideration the interest of the money laid out for the iron pipes?—That I have not considered.

Did you take that into account when you gave your answer, or not?—Yes, it was the impression on my mind at the moment.

Will the augmentation of the capital be such as to be equal to the expenses saved in repairs?—I should think, in the course of a few years that it would not.

Are you at this time the better or the worse for what you have done, in point of income, looking to the interest of the money laid out?—It is a question I cannot answer at this moment.

Mr.
John Paul Rowe.
(16 February.)

Then you are not certain there is any gain to the company at present?—No.
Do not you consider it was for the interest of the company to lay down iron pipes?—Yes.
In what way are the public benefited by the iron pipes?—The more regular supply, and the high service.
What expense is the steam engine and coals?—I do not know.
In consequence of the erection of steam engines you supply the higher ground?—We supply the high ground with steam engines about Mary-le-bone.
You have been under the necessity, in consequence of that supply, to have some addition to the steam engines?—We have had no additional steam engines lately; but we are obliged to supply all the high ground by steam engines.
When were those steam engines erected?—They were erected before my time.
Your mains are constantly charged during the night?—I believe they are; it is not in my department.
And the supply now is much better than it used to be?—Yes.
There are no complaints?—Very few complaints about it.

Thomas Simpson, Esq. Called in; and Examined.

*Thomas Simpson,
Esq.*

HOW long have you been engineer of the Chelsea company?—Since 1783.
Chief engineer?—Chief engineer.
Can you furnish the Committee with any information with regard to the quantity of water that you furnished the metropolis with, previous to the year 1810?—I am able to do it; but I have not it with me: I will make a point of preparing it.
Have you the same information to give for the period subsequent to 1810?—I can give the same information for, perhaps, seven years before 1810.
And subsequent to 1810 up to the present period?—To the present period.
What quantity of water can you supply daily, monthly, or yearly?—I am not prepared to answer that; but I will ascertain it, and give it in writing.
Can you supply water to the tops of houses in any part of the district?—All parts of our district.
Your district is principally the low ground?—Principally.
Can you inform the Committee what extent of district, and what number of houses, on an average, were supplied in the year 1810?—I cannot; but the secretary is in possession of it.
Is he here?—He is.
Can you, subsequent to the year 1810?—Yes; I believe he is enabled to do it.
Can you inform the Committee what the average quantity per house is?—He can do it more correctly; or, probably, I shall be able to do that better, from the quantity of water raised, when I get the number of houses.
Do you know the number of services that you employ during the week or per day; is there a service put on every day?—In some parts of the town there are; in others not: that I will also furnish.
Do you consider that you furnish a greater quantity of water now to the public, than you did in the year 1810?—We do a very little in proportion to the number of tenants we have.
Had you many more tenants in 1810 than you have now?—A great many.
Were you employed in making that arrangement which took place in 1817 or 1818, for dividing the metropolis into districts?—I was called upon, but I had no concern in making the arrangement; that was done between the boards.
Were you present at it?—I was at the New River board, and several others, to give an opinion upon several matters.
Were you consulted on the allotment of the districts?—No.
You saw the allotment afterwards?—No; I was told afterwards what they had allotted to Chelsea.
Have you any plan of your district?—I can furnish you with the line of demarcation, and I can inform the Committee of it now.
What is it?—The south side of Cleveland-row, Pall-mall, is our district, and the whole of Cockspur-street; then we strike through the Mews, and take the lower and higher Mews.
Can you show to the Committee any reasonable grounds for an increase of rate beyond the rate of 1810, within your district, arising from other grounds than those created by the expense of the competition which took place?—I think I could; I think the high service ought to be charged more than it is.

In

Thomas Simpson,
Esq.

(16 February.)

In the ordinary service?—The ordinary service, I think, does require it, on the ground of the great expense we have been at already, and which must be continued; we have laid down a great deal of iron pipes; we have erected new buildings for the new engines.

What was the object of those engines; for the ordinary service?—We certainly had not the means before we did erect them. The original intention was, looking forward to the serving Mary-le-bone and Paddington as we did; that was the first object; and the old works are upon a leasehold, and we are under the necessity of moving them to a freehold that the company purchased; the lower reservoir we shall have to remove in two years time.

Did that arise from the creation of the new companies?—No; we erected the new works in a great measure before they commenced.

With regard to the iron pipes, can you give the Committee any information with regard to the relative expense between iron pipes and wooden pipes?—The iron pipes are within a fraction double.

Do you think it was the interest of the Chelsea company, if they had the capital, to lay down the iron pipes in preference to wood?—I think it is.

Were any part of the new works which you have erected necessary to enable you to give that ample supply of water which you now give?—They were.

Could you have given so satisfactory a supply to the district you supply as you now do with the old works?—Certainly not.

Then the erection of the new works was necessary to enable you to give that supply?—That is my opinion.

How much more water do you supply to any given pipes?—I cannot exactly answer that; I should think it may be a third more.

Have you entirely changed your wooden pipes for iron pipes?—Not the whole; we have a great many.

Are you gradually changing them?—We have been gradually changing them.

And you will, ultimately, entirely have iron?—I hope so.

There are cases where the exchange of iron for wood has been perhaps cheaper?—In low services wood will do; but in high services it certainly will not.

You have stated that iron is within a fraction double the wood; in many parts of your district, has it not been an economy to substitute iron for wood, although it is double the expense in consequence of there being more wooden pipes?—If you take the expense of laying wood, and the difference between that and iron, you will find perhaps that wood is as cheap as iron; the expense of wood is in repairing them; upon the whole, perhaps there is very little difference in point of economy, but wood will only do for low services.

Do you mean to say that the expense of maintaining iron pipes is the same as the expense of maintaining wooden pipes?—No; supposing a wood pipe costs four shillings a yard, and the iron pipe eight shillings a yard, there is a difference of four shillings a yard in the price; then, I say, that four shillings will keep the wood in repair from time to time.

For what period?—That depends upon the quality of the ground; if it is a clay ground it will last twenty years or twenty-five; if it is sandy, not so long.

You have had much experience in iron, does that lead you to believe there is any wear on the iron at all?—Not in the least can I perceive they will require repairs.

To what period of time do you apply your reasoning as between wood and iron?—I calculate that the wood depends upon the ground; some ground will preserve pipes twenty-five years, in other ground they will go in three or four years; then I have taken the average upon fourteen years that a wood pipe will last.

What difference of water, in the mode of conveying it, have you found out between iron and wood of the same diameter?—I do not know, provided the diameter is the same.

Because you say it is more convenient to use iron than wood?—Certainly; there are several leakages in the wood which do not appear above ground.

But you say there is a difference of four shillings between iron and wood, and that the ease with which wood is mended makes very little difference between the two?—If you were to lay down a wood main that cost £.1,000, and an iron main that cost £.2,000, the interest of the iron main would keep that wood main in repair.

Then you cannot calculate what additional quantity of water is produced to the company

Thomas Simpson,
Esq.

(16 February.)

company by the iron pipes?—I have made calculations, and I think we can furnish one seventh more in iron, and that arises from the various leakages in wood which do not appear above ground.

Do you think it assists you as much as one third?—No; I suppose if the bore is the same the quantity is the same, provided there are no leakages.

Have you any idea, as far as you have gone, what the cost of the iron pipes have been over the wooden ones?—I can furnish that.

You only raise that by steam which is high service?—The whole by steam.

What is the difference of leakage between the iron pipes and the wooden pipes?—My calculation is one seventh; that is to say, that the wood will leak a seventh part more; there are various leaks which do not appear, and I conceive we can produce one seventh more water from iron than from wood.

Then with the iron pipes you have one seventh less to raise by the steam engine?—Yes, certainly.

Then of course there is a saving of fuel and of work by the steam engine?—There is, certainly.

And do you take into your calculation that diminution of expense when you say that the iron pipe and the wooden pipe come to pretty much the same amount?—No, I certainly do not.

You have enumerated several causes of expense which the company have been at, such as iron pipes, and changing their ground; is the Committee to understand that no other company could have furnished the district you furnish with water?—Yes.

Because those accidental expenses are not necessary for the furnishing the water, they are merely accidental?—Yes.

Other companies might have done it without resorting to those additional expenses?—I should conceive not.

You stated as one ground of the reasonable advance in the rates, the laying down iron pipes?—Yes.

Those iron pipes were partly laid down before the division of the districts?—They were.

Your view in laying down those pipes was to furnish a greater part of the town?—No; in laying down iron pipes, we did it with a view to high service.

You furnish nothing without force?—No; but we could not furnish the high service from wood pipes.

When you laid down the iron pipes it was not to enlarge the concern, but to effect a high service?—Nothing more.

In point of fact, if you had the capital, was it not the interest of the company to lay down iron pipes in preference to wood?—That is my opinion, but perhaps others may differ. I beg to state, that there is certainly a great convenience in that; it is less trouble.

Were there general complaints before 1810, in your present district, of an insufficiency of supply?—No; we always served well in my time.

You have said, that in order to give that efficient supply of water that you now give to your district, it became necessary to construct new works and additional steam engines?—The lease of our works will be out in about two years, or little better, then it was necessary to erect new works.

Who was the lease under?—Lord Grosvenor.

You said you could not have given the supply to your district with your old works?—No, our engines were in a great measure worn out.

That necessity did not arise from any arrangement with the companies, but must have existed under other circumstances?—Yes, it was begun prior to that.

In order to give a satisfactory supply of water, it became necessary you should erect new steam engines?—Yes.

And you found iron pipes were necessary?—Yes.

The wood gave an irregular supply?—It was not so satisfactory.

If it leaked much, and you were some time before you found it, you could not give a regular and constant supply?—No; but we ascertained it as soon as we could, and we keep the water constantly in the main now.

Is that a voluntary act of your own, or was it in consequence of some declaration that you made to the district your supply, for their satisfaction as a security against fire?—I am not aware of any such declaration.

Do you constantly keep your mains charged during the night?—The whole of the iron mains.

So

So that in case of fire in any part of the district, a supply of water can be had at once?—Not at any part, but where we have the iron mains.

In the arrangement for a division of the district, you purchased what pipes were within your district, and sold what you abandoned?—We purchased what was in our district.

And sold what was out?—No.

You retain them now?—Yes.

In preservation?—No, they lie in the ground; we did purchase some that were in our district.

But you did not sell those that were in the district you surrendered?—No.

You have not repaired them since?—No.

If you thought it advisable to enter into any other district, you must lay down new pipes and mains?—Yes.

How long will a wooden pipe last, according to your experience?—According to my calculation, upon an average fifteen years.

What experience have you had of iron?—Forty years; and I have taken up and relaid iron that had been down forty years before.

Have you found any corrosion in those pipes?—None whatever.

And is the water as good coming through iron pipes?—Quite.

You have had experience of iron pipes eighty years?—I have taken up a pipe that had been forty years in the ground and put it down again.

How could you supply the district round Paddington with water from Chelsea?—We did supply it from Chelsea beyond Paddington.

If a wooden pipe will only last fifteen years, and an iron pipe will last seventy or eighty, do not you consider the profit to the company must be great after fifteen years, because you have a new wooden one after fifteen years?—I have not considered that.

The expense first gone to, it finishes?—There is a little expense in repairing iron.

If you consider that the advantage of iron pipes is so little beyond that of wooden pipes, upon what ground were the company induced to go to the expense of laying down iron pipes?—We could not work the water through wood; we could not get pipes more than eight or nine inches, and we required iron twelve or eighteen.

You might have had several mains of wood running parallel?—We had, when I first came there.

Then do not you think, in that case, iron is cheaper as a substitute?—Yes.

You must have laid down three mains for one?—We did originally.

Then if the expense is nearly equal, it would have been nearly as three to one?—No, it does not bear that proportion; we used to get the seven inch pipes laid down at about eight shillings a yard, and the iron cost six-and-thirty shillings.

When you laid down the iron, what were you laying down wood at, at that time, of the common size you use?—When I speak of three to one, it is only in reference to the small pipes; but when you get at the large pipes, the size of the large pipe increases very much indeed.

Speaking of wood?—No; particularly iron.

You stated that an iron pipe, of a diameter of twelve inches, would serve equal to three wooden pipes of seven inches?—Yes.

What is the expense of an iron pipe twelve inches diameter?—The expense of an iron pipe laid down, is somewhere about nine-and-twenty or thirty shillings, and it used to be six or seven and thirty.

What is the expense of a wood pipe of seven inches diameter?—About eight shillings.

Then an iron pipe of twelve inches, would be equal to three wooden pipes of seven inches?—Yes.

An iron pipe of that diameter you said would cost 36 s.—That was the original price, but iron is down as low as 29 s.

Is not timber down now?—I do not find it down.

You would call the price of iron from 30 s. to 35 s.?—Yes.

Mr. James Gascoigne Lynde, Called in; and Examined.

HOW long have you been Secretary to the Chelsea works?—Six years.

Were you employed previously by them?—Yes.

As what?—Clerk to the secretary.

Therefore you are competent to give information previous to the last six years?—Not of my own knowledge; I was employed as clerk.

Mr.
James G. Lynde.

(16 February.)

And had access to the books and records?—I had ; but I am not competent to give evidence upon any thing that occurred before I was secretary.

Could you inform the Committee what power and capacity belongs to the Chelsea works for affording supply, and to what extent?—No, I cannot.

What number of houses, and what extent of district were supplied previous to the year 1810?—I believe that account will be presented to the Committee, as well before as subsequent to 1810 : we did serve to the other side of Paddington.

Do you know the number of tenants you have?—I have not in my recollection ; but I think that is comprehended in the account.

Do you know the number of houses that are supplied within your district at the present moment?—I do not. Upon recollection, it is impossible to answer that question without the account, and it is being made out.

You have in your office a plan marking the line of demarcation that at present exists for the company?—We have a plan of our present works.

And the extent of your district?—Yes.

Can you furnish the Committee with any reasonable ground for an increase of rate beyond the rate of 1810, in your district, arising from any other grounds than the expense of the competition?—We give a much better service than we did, and a greater quantity of water in the same district.

It is a limited district?—We send more water into the district we now have, than we did do before the arrangement, into the same district.

You send more water to the whole district now than you served to the whole district before?—No, I mean in the same district.

What is the cause of that increase within the same district, putting out of the question the high service?—From the iron mains that we have laid down : the iron mains we have laid down from the engine, will necessarily convey more water into the district.

Was there a complaint of the want of supply previous to that arrangement?—No, not for the low services.

Then more water runs away?—Yes, certainly.

Then you conceive that the additional supply that is offered is occasioned by that which runs to waste?—The rental left to us in the district that was assigned to us, without an increase would not pay the expense, or much more than pay the expense, of the service.

The daily expenses which are incurred by the company in giving that service?—Yes.

You say that the supply is more abundant now within that district than it was before the arrangement?—No doubt of it.

Is that in consequence of a greater demand by the inhabitants ; do they require more water than they did for the ordinary service?—I believe you will find that if a person has ten butts of water, he will use it, generally speaking ; if you were to increase that ten butts to twenty, he would use it if he had it.

How often do you apply the service ; every day?—Sometimes every day, some parts of the district, and some parts four times a week.

The iron mains, how often do you supply them?—They are always full.

How often do you supply the houses?—Some parts four times a week, and some parts every day.

You say, if you were to supply twenty butts they would use it ; how can they receive it?—They let it run to waste.

You conceive that that additional supply runs to waste?—A great deal of it.

And where does it run to waste ; into the sewers?—Into the sewers.

The water that runs to waste is very serviceable in cleansing the sewers?—Yes, it keeps the private sewers sweet.

And the town is benefited by it?—Undoubtedly.

The purity of the air is much increased?—I suppose so.

Do you consider that it was the interest of the Chelsea company, if they could raise the capital, to lay down iron pipes instead of wooden pipes?—I have not made that calculation.

Since iron mains have been laid down, are not the annual expenses of repairs diminished?—Not at all.

The laying down iron pipes has not diminished your annual expenses and repairs?—I do not think it has.

Then the iron pipes require as much repair as the wooden ones?—No ; I will give

give you a reason ; if you were to lay the whole district with iron you might save some expense, but if you only lay a part, it is a great outlay of capital without a saving of expense.

Are you in the progress now of increasing your iron pipes?—Yes, we are.

And eventually you look to laying down the whole with iron pipes?—Yes.

And you think the interest of the money sunk on them is as great as would repair the wooden ones?—Yes.

But when you have entirely iron mains, you consider the diminution will be considerable?—Something ; I will not state considerable, unless all the service pipes were iron too ; it would give a better service to the town without much diminution of expense.

The expense of your pipes is not much decreased by the iron pipes?—It has not much decreased ; we have only some iron mains ; we have not laid our district with iron pipes entirely.

You can furnish a greater quantity of water by the iron mains?—We do.

That which is wasted by the wooden pipes is saved in the iron pipes?—I do not know that.

Has your outlay been considerable in iron pipes?—Not very considerable.

Most of your pipes are wood?—Mostly wood ; we keep our iron mains full now, which we could not do before, to give a better supply in case of fire, and that is an additional expense to us.

What creates that expense?—A great deal of water runs to waste, because the cocks are not shut close always ; the turncocks do not turn them off.

And is there waste from that?—Certainly.

But the keeping your mains full, to supply water in case of fire, is a considerable expense to you?—No doubt of it ; a great deal of water runs to waste during the night.

Mr. Richard Till, Called in ; and Examined.

WHAT is your situation?—I have the honour of being superintendent of the London Bridge waterworks ; I have been in office there for forty-one years. I beg leave to say, that in consequence of the order that I received at our works, for the engineer to attend, I thought it incumbent on me, as a proper compliment to you, to attend here to inform you that we have no engineer, and that every thing I could answer your questions in, I should be very happy to do it.

The whole proceedings of this company are under your superintendence and management?—I was in the office of secretary, and about seven years ago I wished very much to decline part of the business, and I had a young man under me, and our directors accepted my resignation of part of the business, and appointed him to do the rest, but some lies on me, and I am answerable.

In what part of the town do your works lie?—Only in the city ; we are prevented by our leases going out of the city, and we are not connected with the west end of the town.

Do you supply the water by the force of steam engines?—By water-wheels.

The London Bridge water-wheels?—Yes.

Can you inform the Committee what was the quantity of water supplied by you, on the average, previous to the year 1810?—I can tell you what we raise every day, and there has been no alteration since the year 1810 up to the present time. We suppose that the quantity of water raised by the wheels is now 3,894,317 gallons daily ; our wheels I do not suppose work more than twenty hours in a day.

Every day?—Every day ; we take this as an average, because when the tides are very low we cannot raise so much, but then we make use of a steam engine to make up that loss.

Were you parties to that division of the town that was entered into by the companies? Nothing like it ; no combination, nor any thing like it.

And you have not therefore varied your district from the commencement of your undertaking to the present?—Not the least ; and I intended to ask you to exonerate us from being examined, because we are not authorized to go out of the city, and have no connection with any other waterworks ; and we are the oldest waterworks in the metropolis.

Do you now supply the public at the same price that you did twenty years ago?—No ; we supply it at less, and we supply it so bad, that we are upon the edge of ruin.

*Mr.
James G. Lynde.*

(16 February.)

*Mr.
Richard Till.*

Mr.
Richard Till.

(16 February.)

Your district, in point of population, has increased?—Very little. I am sorry to say that our tenants have not increased, because we have a very strong enemy against us, who has taken away a great many of them; we are in a state of pauperism, and are much to be pitied. The New River have the power of raising their water higher than we do; and the manner in which houses have been built within thirty years, have carried up their cisterns and their water-closets much higher, and from that we are much injured.

Do the New River come into your district?—All through it.

And there is a competition between you?—Yes.

You have suffered as a manufacturer suffers from not supplying so cheap as a person who starts up afterwards?—No; but we cannot supply so high.

Is not your water the most inferior of all the water supplied by other water-works?—So far from being inferior, in many instances all the distillers take our water in preference to any other.

Do not they have water from the New River, or some works in addition to yours?—No; some inhabitants may prefer the New River, but there are many that think our water vastly softer than the New River, and take it in preference.

Is it not so soft, it is not drinkable?—I never think of drinking it.

Was it your poverty and not your will that compelled you not to compete with those other companies?—No; but it was what we thought an honourable way of not doing it.

You are destroying yourselves by that point of honour?—We are; but the board of managers thought it was not very honourable to enter into a combination to raise their rates; they have gone on in this way always; and however they might lose their tenants, they thought it was more honourable for them to go on than enter into a combination.

Was it in consequence of your poverty that you were compelled to surrender the advantage to the New River, by not erecting the steam engines they did?—We did not stand in the way of a steam engine; we have one which we always work, and are bound to work when the tides are low, but we have no site to put a steam engine on; the neighbours would not permit it.

Can you form any account of the average charge per house for the water?—It would be very difficult: suppose we take a house of £.50 a year with one cistern and one water-closet, we charge them from 30s. to 35s. a house.

And have chiefly wooden pipes?—We have; we have gradually put down a few iron ones in particular places, but we have not a fund to authorize iron pipes in the whole.

A great portion of your pipes are wood?—All of them.

And you have as high service in the city as in any other part of the town?—Yes.

And do the persons complain that these water-closets are not supplied?—They do; we cannot supply higher than two stories.

Have your company ever calculated the relative expense between an iron and a wooden pipe?—Yes.

What was the result of that?—Completely double; and at this moment our managers would be very glad to put down iron pipes if we had a capital to do it; it would cost us £.60,000, and that we have not got.

It would save you a considerable sum eventually?—Yes; and I have always been putting down gradually two or three pipes, on different places, where we were likely to hurt warehouses in case a pipe broke, and our wish is to lay down the whole with iron.

And if you had a capital you would not hesitate in doing it?—Not a moment.

Luncæ, 19^o die Februarij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

William Chadwell Mylne, Esq. Again called in; and Examined.

If your machinery had been improved, and your steam engines enlarged, and your mains increased, could you not, at the period of 1810, have supplied a larger quantity of water?—The machinery was merely applied to distribute the water after it had arrived, and, therefore, it would not increase the supply of the New River.

William C. Mylne,
Esq.

(19 February.)

If your machinery had been increased and enlarged, would the New River head have afforded fund enough to supply a greater proportion?—A very small proportion; it would have lowered the head, and the velocity of the river would have been increased.

Could you now supply a larger quantity than was supplied at that time?—No.

You were asked, “Do you expend the whole of your means at the present time?” your answer is, “No, not in the supply of the town.” “Can you give us any idea of what is reserved?” “I have not got it here, but I have calculated it within the last month, taking it in general numbers; I forget what it amounted to.” “What do you do with it?” “Let it off.” Then it appears that there was a reservation of water, at that time, beyond that which was exhausted?—At the present time, not then.

It is now used to turn a water-wheel to raise water?—Yes.

Then there was no reservation at that time?—No.

There is a reservation at the present time?—Yes.

Could you supply more at the present time, if it was called for?—There is a surplus of about eleven million hogsheads in the year.

The eleven million hogsheads only applies to the distribution of that which went to the high service; the general distribution to the whole metropolis is about seventy-eight millions?—About seventy-eight millions in 1810; I consider it about sixty-seven millions in 1820, making a difference of about eleven millions.

And you have no estimate of the present moment?—No; I find I was in error, in taking the account from the engine books; the accounts were only made up to 1809, and not 1810. I will deliver in the account.

[It was delivered in.]

You are understood to have stated, that the same quantity of water came down to the New River head in 1810, as does now come down, or nearly the same?—Thereabouts.

Are you of opinion, that of these same quantities of water an equal quantity found its way into the houses, considering the state of the works in 1810, as does now find its way into the houses?—There is a greater quantity finds its way now into the houses than did in 1810.

The whole quantity that came to the New River head was at that time distributed among a much larger number of tenants than it is now?—It was.

The same quantity of water, with better and more saving means of distribution, is now distributable among a less number of houses; and, in point of fact, adverting to these questions, do you now consider the service to be better than it was then, in point of certainty and abundance?—Very much better.

Both in certainty and abundance?—Yes.

Do you consider it is better in respect to the means of safety afforded to the town in case of fire?—I do.

How?—The mains are at present all charged, which was not the case in 1810.

In what quantity do you suppose the increase now exists over and above the quantity that was supplied in 1810; in what larger proportion do you supply it now than you did in 1810?—I am not aware of the number of tenants the company has.

What quantity of water do you suppose is distributed now more than was in 1810 in any given district?—I am at a loss how to answer the question; the secretary

William C. Mylne,
Esq.

(19 February.)

can state the number of tenants the company had, then I state the quantity of water; I have stated the quantity of water they have at present, and he can state the number of tenants.

There is much more water given now than was in 1810, and antecedently?—Yes.

What increase of quantity is given to any district now?—I believe it will appear that the district the New River company has abandoned has about double the quantity of water they then supplied.

Was not the practice of keeping ball-cocks on those cisterns much more general in those times than it is now?—Certainly.

You have the same power to direct ball-cocks now?—Just the same; it was considered extremely irksome at that period, and would be thought much more so at present.

You say the cisterns are larger now than then; do you think the inhabitants have generally got larger cisterns?—It has been generally directed, on complaints, that there should be an enlarged cistern, which has been done.

Can you speak, upon the average, to the size of cisterns?—They vary materially.

Can you give the largest you know of in a private house?—About two hogsheads.

And the smallest?—About a single butt.

What do you mean by a butt?—Fifty-four gallons.

In gentlemen's houses, the largest is not more than two hogsheads?—Upon an average.

You say you have surplus water at this period; have you the same surplus during the whole year, or only at this period of the year?—I have averaged the surplus of the year at about eleven million hogsheads; it is greater in winter than in the summer.

Have you had any material increase of water since 1810 from the New River?—None whatever.

Do not the West Middlesex company alone supply to Mary-le-bone, and part of Pancras, a quantity of water equal and even superior to the whole that was supplied by you to Mary-le-bone, Soho, St. James's and St. George's?—I understand that to be the case, but I have never calculated it myself.

Have you any means yourself of knowing anything about their supply?—I have examined their engines repeatedly, and I went into the calculation certainly before the western part of the town was abandoned, to satisfy myself whether the powers of the two companies were equal to supply it.

Do you suppose there will be no continuation of expense on iron pipes after they have been once put down; do you expect and calculate they will remain perfect for any and what length of time?—It is a very doubtful question.

What length of time have you had experience upon that subject?—Not above ten years.

When iron pipes are put down, will there not afterwards be some continuation of expense, or is there a total cessation of it?—The immediate repairs will be trifling for many years; but in twenty or thirty years I have no doubt there will be a continual repair upon them; they are continually in motion, from the expansion and contraction of metal, but the socket joints being used now, each joint allows for the contraction of the pipe, but in the course of forty years, it is impossible to say what it may produce, the whole of the joints may require repair.

Is not tow used at the point of junction where the pipes unite?—Tow is used merely to prevent the lead passing into the pipe when the joint is made.

And as the tow goes to decay are you not obliged to drive up the lead further and further between the spigot and fosset?—No; if we take pipes up in two years, the tow will be perfectly gone.

The Committee were induced to think there was no constant expense on iron pipes; do not they frequently burst from pressure?—I do not recollect an instance in the last two years.

Have you had no bursting in your's?—No.

If there had been, would not that have been in the high pressure for high service?—No; more from contraction; I never found them fail from the pressure of water; the pipes that were used were flanch pipes screwed together, forming one rod; they generally pull themselves asunder at about 300 yards, from the contraction; a socket joint was then made wherever this occurred, and that joint generally gets out of repair in about four years.

That is to say, at the distance of 300 yards?—Yes.

Not

Not at a considerable expense?—No; the pipes are all in existence that were originally laid down; but those laid down since are all socket pipes.

*William C. Mylne,
Esq.*

Without any flanch pipes?—Yes.

To the old pipes you introduced a socket once in 300 yards?—Not in the first instance; but afterwards, wherever it failed, a socket joint was made.

(19 February.)

Are you of opinion that the old style of putting down pipes would make them of greater durability than the present one?—No; the present is a better mode, to prevent any great failure.

You have given it as your opinion, that any given district that is now supplied with water receives upon the whole twice as much as it used to do in 1810, and previous to that time?—No; I merely speak of the part which has been abandoned.

The part which you now cease to supply?—Yes, the part we abandoned receives, I believe, about double the quantity it did in 1810, from the New River company.

That is merely your belief?—Certainly; I have not calculated it.

You said likewise, that in the former way in which water was supplied through wooden pipes, there was considerable leakage from the pipes becoming defective?—There was.

Much beyond the present mode of supplying?—We have none now.

Mr. Till, of the London Bridge waterworks, stated, that for a house of about £.50 a year, 35s. a year was paid to that company for the service of water to the first story, and that the New River company charged 40s. a year to similar houses?—I am not aware of that.

What may probably be the view of expense in the decay of the joints at a subsequent period?—The expense of the joints, including the laying the pipe, amounts to twenty-five per cent. upon the cost of the pipe itself.

Supposing the whole required repair, at the rate of twenty-five per cent.?—In the first laying it amounts to twenty-five per cent.; I suppose relaying would require about the same.

The decay you speak of you think would require that expense to remedy?—Yes.

What part do you think will decay, is it the positive iron joint, or that which is put in?—The joint itself fails, and must be re-made; the iron itself will remain perfectly good for a hundred years; but the lead, labour and tow is entirely destroyed. I have seen a socket joint put in on a flanch pipe having contracted in its length, and having drawn the lead out of the joint; the moment the pipe expands, it returns without the lead, so you will see a ring of lead with five years contraction upon it marked upon the surface of the lead.

But now the one pipe goes within the other without any fixture?—Nothing but a collar of lead between.

And that collar of lead removes?—Yes, from expanding and contracting.

What decays besides the lead?—Nothing.

What other expense is there?—The labour and the tow.

What is the expense of labour?—Labour, the expense is twenty-five per cent. on the first cost of the pipe; but the labour and laying is about half that amount.

The whole together, the aggregate is twenty-five per cent.?—All together.

Do you mean that putting the pipes together again, including the labour and laying, would amount to that?—I think it would.

Would there be no wear of the joints of the pipes themselves?—I think not.

Have you ever considered the expense of maintaining your aqueduct of forty miles to be more or less than the expense of erecting and maintaining steam engines to raise it?—It is considerably less; the expense of maintaining the New River amounts to somewhere between £. 3,000 and £. 4,000 a year; to raise the same quantity of water to the reservoirs at Islington by steam would amount to about £. 16,000 a year.

Without calculating the expense of machinery?—Yes.

When you say it would cost twenty-five per cent. do you mean the transfer from the pipes to the spot?—The first laying of the pipes is twenty-five per cent. on the pipes when delivered in London.

That is the cost at the foundry?—No; if the foundry delivered them in London, it would cost twenty-five per cent. on that.

Would the foundry deliver them in the street?—No; on the wharfs on the Thames.

Some part of those pipes would not require carriage?—No.

What expense would be incurred in the repair of pipes, in case of the sockets being

William C. Mylne,
Esq.

(19 February.)

being out of repair, by the total repair of them?—It is impossible to say, because the loss would not be discovered in the first instance; the joints would become leaky, and the water would find its way into the sewers. You often have to clear two or three hundred yards in a street to find out one small leakage not equal to the size of a quill, at an expense of £. 30 or £. 40.

In your experience, have you frequently found, that when a calculation has been made as to the probable expense of an operation, it has amounted, when you came to pay the bills, to double the sum you calculated?—I can only say, that the work was executed within the estimate I had the honour of furnishing.

Have you ever valued the purchase of the land on which the New River aqueduct runs?—I estimated the whole of the New River company's capital in the year 1815, valuing it in detail, according to the prices of that year, supposing the land had been purchased at that time, and charging the labour at the current price: I have not that estimate with me, but I can furnish the Committee with a copy of it at the next meeting; in which, the river is separated from the pipes, and every thing taken in.

Before the year 1810, had not you constant complaints of a deficiency of the supply of water from your tenants?—From the high ground, certainly.

Then, speaking comparatively, at this time have not you almost no complaints?—Very few indeed; not above ten in a year.

What is the distance of the delivery pipe from the pump of the steam engine?—To the tenant?

Yes.—Previous to the year 1810, the whole of that water was delivered west of Tottenham-court-road, which is nearly two miles and a quarter; every thing now is to the eastward of that; the tenants are supplied direct. Some of the high services commence within half a mile, and the greatest distance I should consider two miles, or two miles and a quarter; St. Martin's workhouse is the greatest distance.

What is the greatest elevation of delivery?—Sixty feet is the greatest pressure under which the engine works at the head.

Above the head?—Yes.

What is the diameter of your cylinder?—I really do not recollect it; I believe it is fifty-four inches.

Now the diameter of the piston?—There are two pumps to one engine, a nine-and-twenty inches and a twenty.

Do you recollect what the mean pressure on that is?—The steam about eight pounds upon the square inch. Bolton and Watt made the engine, and they are made all on the same principle.

Do you know the number of strokes in a minute?—It varies according to the high service, as the mains open and shut.

And the number of hours in work?—We have two engines, but only work one at a time.

Do you know how many hours they work?—I have stated the quantity in the paper I have delivered in; it amounts to about nine millions of hogsheads in a year of water supplied, where there was no high service water.

How high is the source of your water from the river Thames?—Eighty-four feet and a half.

How much higher is the upper pond than the New River head?—When full, thirty-four feet.

And have you means of high service above the upper pond?—Yes.

To what extent?—The difference between thirty-five and sixty feet.

Are there not a large class of houses that have a supply of water from the London Bridge waterworks that likewise choose to have a supply from the New River?—I believe there are; in public buildings particularly.

Are there a large class of houses that are in some degree supplied from the London Bridge waterworks that choose likewise to have an additional supply from the New River?—Yes; from the certainty of one supply and the uncertainty of the other.

And being able to get a high service from one and not from the other?—Yes; and not only that, but the certainty of supply in case of fire; London Bridge wheels must stop at the turn of the tide; the New River supplies it constantly.

Is not the Thames water sent up from that part of London so inferior, that there is great preference, excepting for the vilest purposes, for the New River over the London Bridge water?—The collectors of the several companies can discover a difference; but I cannot say that I have discovered it.

In

In speaking of that high service, did you speak of the distinction high pond service, or of the distinction of what you also call high service, as to the upper part of the house?—Since the abandonment of one part of the district, the high pond reaches to every part of the district; it would supply the basement story of every one of those houses: that alteration has wholly taken place since 1810.

William C. Mylne.
Esq.

(19 February.)

You consider that nine million of hogsheads is raised by machinery?—Eight million and a half.

In consequence of an alteration which the inhabitants, for some reason or other, have made in what is called low service, you are now incurring the expense of throwing water up by machinery into a house which would not have been incurred if they continued to be supplied, as formerly, in the basement story?—Certainly; in some instances machinery will be employed to save capital; for instance, if a large brewery was erected upon the boundary of Tottenham-court-road, the present main would not throw the water to that point with the same head that is allotted to the district at present; therefore, if an additional quantity is required, it is obliged to be done by machinery, or a larger capital expended in pipe; it may be met either way.

The question related to the common and usual domestic supply?—The common level of the head would supply the whole of the district as it was supplied previous to 1810.

What is the reason it will not do that now; is it from an alteration made by the inhabitants in the lay of the cisterns?—Yes.

Why has that alteration been made by the inhabitants?—It is very beneficial.

What is the difference between the basement story and this first high service?—We have them at all heights, from six feet up to sixty.

In 1810 it must have been in the basement story?—Yes; there might have been a few instances to the contrary; previous to the high service being put on, the low service is always thrown in for a certain number of hours, that it shall fill all low cisterns to the extent of the pond head, perhaps four hours; by that time the whole of the lower cisterns are full, then the high service is thrown in.

Are there a great number of houses that are supplied at present not on the basement story but upon the ground floor?—Yes.

Does it not come under the ordinary designation of high service?—No.

The New River company do not call it high service till you get to the first floor?—No.

So that there is a good deal of service which is called low service which is higher than it was in 1810?—Yes.

And that is supplied by machinery now?—Yes.

In point of fact, have the cisterns been generally altered?—An immense number of houses have been built since 1810 on the Bedford estate and Foundling Hospital estate, and the principal part of the supply is confined to that part; but the old cisterns have been raised, wherever they had an opportunity; for the convenience of a shop, every man endeavours to get his cistern up stairs if he can. I do not know to what proportion, but the cisterns have been altered to some extent.

Do you think one half?—No, perhaps not a fifth.

A fifth, in the old houses, have been changed from a small cistern to a larger one?—Hardly that; the quantity raised now by the steam engine of the district is about a sixth of the whole, nearly as sixty-seven bears to nine.

But that alludes to what is properly called high service and all?—I am continually called on to inspect houses in consequence of applications for high supply.

What decides the difference between high and low service in their charge to the tenant, and does it depend upon the difference in height above the level of the source, or the level of the street?—The level of the street.

Will it not then follow that a house may receive water in the second or third floor without any additional expense to the company, whilst in another house the company will be put to an expense in supplying water to a first floor?—Such a case is possible.

Is it not generally so?—It is not generally so; for the ground falls from the New River head, and there are few natural dips. A house must have been situated, to have met with the supply you mean, in a dip of the earth. The houses nearer to the head can be supplied at a cheaper rate than the more distant ones, from the question of friction alone.

You have said that you reckon from the level of the ground; what do you estimate

*William C. Mylne,
Esq.*

(19 February.)

high service on, up to the ground floor, or the first floor?—Above the basement story, so as to supply the level of the basement.

A cistern so situated as to supply a room on the ground floor, is that low or high service?—It would be considered high if the house had never enjoyed it before.

And would have a different payment of course?—Yes.

You have stated repeatedly that the inhabitants have an additional convenience which they had not in 1810 in this respect, that in 1810 they were only served on the basement story, and now they are served on the ground floor, and that they were not charged for high service, because the high service did not begin till the first floor?—That is generally the case throughout the Bedford estates and the Foundling Hospital estates, because it has been established during the opposition; but if a house had never enjoyed that supply, and afterwards applied for a supply up to the first floor, we should consider that high service.

To supply the ground floor, do you esteem that a high service; the situation of a cistern so as to supply a water-closet on the ground floor?—If the house never enjoyed it before, it would be considered high service now.

In order to supply a water-closet on the ground floor you must carry your water up to the ceiling?—To supply the ground floor, in most cases would require machinery.

In point of fact, are not a great many of the kitchens towards the city on the first floor?—They are.

And have they not been regularly supplied without any extra charge?—They are generally upon the first floor, the cisterns being close up to the ceilings of the second floor; they generally pay something extra, but not to any extent.

What is the criterion?—There is no rule, the rates bear no proportion to one another.

Go back to 1809, and state whether the kitchens in the lower part of the metropolis which you supplied were not regularly supplied at the ordinary rates?—In the city they were, and they were called high tenants, but without extra charge, I believe.

You say in the city they were; do you mean to confine yourself to what is technically called the city?—To the city; in the western parts of the town they certainly paid more; the same house that paid in the city thirty shillings would pay three or four guineas at the west end of the town.

At what height in the houses in the present district can the water be supplied without the assistance of machinery?—That must vary according to the level of the ground; the water from the New River head with a sufficient capital, would supply the basements of all the houses within the district, save Islington.

That is below the street?—Yes.

What do you mean by sufficient capital; sufficient diameter of pipage?—Yes; there would be larger mains required, if the whole was to be sent for that purpose.

You stated that the expense of friction occasioned an additional expense to supply the different parts of the town; what do you mean by the expense of friction?—Mains will generally supply higher near their source above ground, than on a level; the main when at work, leading to Tower-hill, although the ground is between fifty and sixty feet below the level of the river head, will rise higher above ground nearer the source, than it does at Tower-hill.

You have stated that the greatest extremity of your waterworks is nine quarters of a mile; have you for every quarter of that distance, any proportion of what you call the expense of friction, and what is the proportion of that expense of friction on each of those quarters, as you advance from the source?—I cannot answer the question.

Are you aware that the company have any minute rule for tempering their prices in proportion to the height above the street, or distance from the head?—I believe within the last few years, an addition of something like thirty per cent. has been made; I believe there is a rule for high service.

Would you, in estimating the price to be charged, take the level of that house in any part of the town?—No; only from the street.

There is a difference between Islington and the city in height?—Yes.

Does it go more minutely than that?—No.

It is averaged, is it not?—Yes.

Could you supply even the ground floor of the high district of Mary-le-bone, and so forth, without machinery?—No, certainly not; the level of the New River head is about two feet above the pavement in Tottenham-court-road.

That would not do for a cistern for the ground floor?—No; the New River water never

never would flow up the New-road, without machinery, west of Tottenham-court-road.

Might not the rate of charging, in most districts, be regulated by the height of the cistern receiving the supply, above or below the level of the source?—I should consider it impossible, unless each house was supplied from a separate pipe to work itself: it is impossible to ascertain it: upon one pipe immediately connected with the engine, there may be 900 tenants, each at a different level, the lowest fills first, the ball-cock shuts up, and then it goes to the next, and fills the whole.

Has the average size of cisterns been increased since the new companies?—The cisterns within the New River district do not contain more now than in 1810; there are a great many houses that have enlarged their cisterns on the recommendations of the company, but many have no cisterns at all; they have found they can put their pipes on the main; they have sold their cisterns, and by paying 5*s.* a year addition, they have a constant supply.

In point of fact, in the old part of the town which you supply, there is no greater capacity to hold water than there was in 1811?—I should think not.

Is not the consumption, in fact, much greater?—Certainly.

Is not the supply much more certain into those cisterns?—As certain as the day comes; which it was not before.

But if the capacity to retain the water is not larger than it was in 1811, and the supply greater, the residue must go to waste?—Yes.

You have said that water would not flow up the New-road from Tottenham-court-road; how long is it since the New River company applied machinery to fill the cisterns on the ground floor there?—As early as 1767, I think.

Mr. James Dupin, Called in; and Examined.

ARE you Secretary to the York Buildings waterworks?—I am.

How long have you been secretary to this establishment?—About one-and-twenty years.

Does the company exist at this moment?—It does not.

How long has it been extinct?—Since 1818; they leased the pipes to the New River company.

That is to say, you sold your property?—Yes; we leased our pipes for the profit attached to them, and ceased working our engine.

The alienation of the pipes is absolute?—Yes.

At the time that the establishment was disposed of in that way, was it in consequence of it being a disadvantageous concern, or from what motive?—Quite so; we were losing about £. 1,500 a year.

Positively losing it?—Yes; we were positively losing £. 1,500 a year from the increased capital that was embarked in 1810 up to that time.

What was the inducement for that increase of capital?—A mere idea that they could make a fortune, as the New River company had done. We had some gentlemen in our concern, who were also large proprietors of the West Middlesex concern; they conceived that by changing the complete system, which they did, of the original York Buildings company, they could realize a very large rental. I think I have got a statement of that rental.

Then that increased expenditure arose from the speculation of some individuals belonging to your establishment?—Yes; not of the original establishment, for they completely bought out the old proprietors: these were a new set of gentlemen who came in in 1810.

These new gentlemen being connected with the West Middlesex?—Yes, they were; and also with the East London.

What was the nature of that expenditure?—Our original shares in the year 1810, previous to their purchase, were eighty-four in number; they raised a capital equal to 750 shares, of £. 100 each, just £. 75,000.

In 1810?—Yes.

They added 750?—They completely merged the 84 shares, and made it 750; in 1812 they doubled it; they took up the whole of the wood pipes and laid a complete system of iron mains and services, and erected a very large steam engine, and very expensive works also in the bed of the river: they never received a dividend out of any profit whatever: from 1810 they paid two dividends, of £. 1 a share each, but it was out of the capital.

This expenditure arose, at the time you are speaking of, from the competition between the other companies?—Yes; the doubling of the shares did completely.

Mr.
James Dupin.

(19 February.)

What is the power and capacity of your work for affording supply to the metropolis?—I think our engine would have supplied about 10,000 houses very well.

These works continue to supply the district that was apportioned by the division in 1818, or was the surrender made previous to that division of district?—We were certainly in treaty with the New River company previous to the abandonment of the west end of the town by the other companies.

Then you never were a party to that arrangement?—None whatever.

What was the state of your supply in 1810?—2,217 houses.

Your state then, before this new capital, was about 2,000 houses?—Yes.

Was 2,714 houses the whole of your supply before the arrangement?—Yes, it was.

Do you recollect, previously to your increase of capital, what was the average amount furnished to your tenants or houses per day?—No.

You say two dividends of £. 1 each were paid from the capital?—Yes.

Was that known to the subscribers generally?—Yes; I have the account of the gross rental, and the sums received for water, annually.

Before you began the great alterations you have spoken of, were not the York Buildings waterworks in a very ruinous situation?—No.

How long before that had you paid a dividend?—A dividend of 4 per cent. in the year 1804. This is an account of the dividends from the year 1789. In the year 1789 they divided £. 10 per share; at that time the shares were valued at £. 250.

Eighty-four shares, at £. 250?—Yes; the original shares were £. 100 shares: in 1790, they divided £. 7. 10 s. per share, and valued their shares at £. 200: in 1791 they divided the same, and they valued the shares at £. 220: that was a mere nominal value; in 1792 they divided £. 8 per share.

Have not you been driven out of the field in consequence of being underworked by the new companies?—Certainly; because in some cases they threatened to work for nothing; their object was, we want a numerical rental, we have plenty of money, and when we get that, we will turn you out of the field.

You have been so much underworked by the other companies, you have not been able to compete with them?—No, certainly not.

In order that you might compete with the new companies, did you wantonly and unnecessarily take up your wooden pipes and put down iron, or was it necessary that you should take up the wooden pipes and put down iron ones?—Our wooden pipes did not extend to where the main competition of the new companies came at all; but in laying down iron pipes we took up the wood.

Was it necessary you should change your system entirely?—Certainly.

And when you had done it you were not able to compete with the new companies, because they underworked you?—Yes.

The whole of your tenants did not go to the New River company, but some to Chelsea?—Yes, a part went to Chelsea, and part to the Grand Junction company.

Those works that you put down were put down under the direction of engineers, and not clumsily and awkwardly?—Very properly, I believe.

And you were fairly ruined by the undertaking, were not you?—Certainly we were.

The competition that was then going forward, you stated was carried to that extent of not caring what the price was to be paid, but determining to secure the custom?—Yes, that appeared to be the object entirely.

Not caring one sixpence for the price?—Yes; that used to be the general answer to the question whenever we asked their reasons for changing.

You do not mean to say they went the length of supplying gratuitously, for no pay whatever?—I believe for a very small pay.

Do you know any instance whatever where the service was given gratis?—No, I cannot say I do.

Are you able to say that the new companies, though they worked very low and at prices which would surprise you, they did not work at prices that did not produce them a sufficient profit?—I think so.

Have you had access to their books to see their profits and losses?—I know from the local advantage of our company they could not supply water in the Haymarket for one half of what we could.

And

And they did supply it for that?—They certainly did, at very little more.

Had you the means, by access to their books or otherwise, to ascertain this?—The very receipts produced by the tenantry convinced us houses that paid us thirty shillings a year quietly for seventy years, they supplied for a pound.

Had you the means, by access to their books or otherwise, to ascertain this?—No, I had not.

You state that as a mere matter of opinion?—No, I speak from facts.

Could you, or could you not, supply a great part of your service without iron pipes; does the height to which it is to be thrown require iron pipes?—It depends upon the power of the machinery.

Did not the iron pipes become necessary for the service of your tenants?—When we increased our machinery, it did, but not as we were serving in 1809; we supplied all our tenantry through wooden pipes.

Did you throw it a great height?—Yes, we did; we threw it up two pair in Piccadilly.

What height is that above the base of your head?—I should suppose between sixty and seventy feet.

You found it expedient to resort to iron pipes, because it was the only thing to enable you to compete with the other companies?—When we increased the machinery we were obliged to have iron pipes, because the wooden pipes would not bear the pressure.

And you gave a much larger supply?—Yes.

Was there much complaint against your company at the time when these new companies were introduced?—We certainly had a great many complaints.

Did this continue after your iron pipes were laid down?—Not so much.

Have you any doubt your supply was improved by that?—Yes.

Both with respect to quantity, steadiness, and certainty of supply?—Yes.

Mercurij, 21^o die Februarij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William Tierney Clark*, Called in; and Examined.

YOU are Engineer of the West Middlesex waterworks company?—I am.

How long have you been engineer?—Eleven years.

Ever since the establishment of the company?—I became engineer in 1810, early after the first establishment of the company.

What power and capacity belong to the West Middlesex waterworks to supply water to the metropolis?—We have two seventy-horse engines.

Have you had that from the beginning?—No; they were erected in 1811.

What has been the quantity of water supplied by the day, week, month or year, on the average, since the company was chartered, and the works put in activity?—In 1820 we supplied 12,169,300 hogsheads.

Can you go back and state the gradation to that?—I am not prepared now; but if it is wished I can go back to 1814, and give it in the shape of a return.

What extent of district, and what number of houses have been supplied previous and subsequent to the arrangement formed for dividing the metropolis into districts?—It is impossible to say the number of houses.

As tenants?—I cannot say; the secretary will furnish that information; I do not think I can.

Can you state what has been, and what is now the average quantity of water furnished to each house per day, month or year?—It is a very difficult thing to get at that; we have not been able to get at it accurately.

You have no information upon that subject?—No, none.

You have not the division, taking it by the streets?—No; as to the streets we have not.

There is no division as to the quantity?—No.

Is there any difference when families are in town, or out of town, as to the quantity

Mr.
James Dupin.
(19 February.)

Mr.
William T. Clark.
(21 February.)

Mr.
William T. Clark.

(21 February.)

quantity of water wanted?—Sometimes we find there is a little difference; but then it is made up by the quantity used in watering the streets, so that we find very little difference.

Although a greater number of families are out of town it makes no difference in the quantity supplied?—No; the difference is made up in watering the streets.

That takes place in the months of May and June, as well before the families retire?—Yes, it does.

Is it decreased more after they do retire?—No; for there is still watering going on during those months.

The watering the streets is to as great an extent in the month of June as any period of the year?—No; I find the most water is used for watering in July and August.

And in the month of June none of the great families have left London?—A great many have left London by the month of June.

You find no considerable variation from the difference of the families being in or out of town?—There may be some variation, but very little on the average.

What are the number of your services by the day or week?—We have a great many services, I cannot tell the number we have altogether; we have them upon different mains.

Does not your steam engine show that?—No, it does not at all show the services.

You must know how often the services are applied?—We give the low service four times a week.

What is the high service?—Three days in the week.

How long are those services continued, and do they furnish an equal quantity of water?—Some of the services vary in quantity, in proportion to the quantity of houses on them.

The question applies to the time they are on?—Some are on two hours, some three, some more, and some less.

Now as to the quantity?—It is impossible to tell the quantity of water that any particular service delivers.

You have no gauge to measure?—No.

If it is on for two hours do you not know the quantity of water thrown up?—No, it is impossible to ascertain the quantity.

With regard to the high service, can you give the Committee any calculation as to that?—We are not able to make any calculation as to the quantity of water of the high or low service.

How long are they continued?—Sometimes three quarters of an hour, or an hour, in proportion to the work they have to do.

Speaking of the high service, if it is on only three days in the week, one of those services must be equal to the supply of those houses for two days and a half, if it is on three days in the week, the supply put in on the Friday must be equal to last till the Monday?—Yes, till it comes in on the next water day; the capacity of the cisterns is such, as to hold enough for the inhabitants.

It must be so throughout the whole district, because if you have only four services in the week, it must be a supply for more than two days for the district?—I suppose it would be about enough; when we turn the water on, we find it is fully adequate to the demand.

That is to say, that any certain service is adequate to the supply of the houses for two days?—I should think, about two days or a day and a half.

What is the average size of your ball-cocks for cisterns?—I do not know what the average size is, they are so various, some are an inch, some three quarters, some as low as half an inch; the lead service pipe is generally three quarters of an inch.

You are speaking of the low service?—Yes; some of the low service cocks are five eighths or half an inch, but generally three quarters, the waterway of the cock is seldom equal to the waterway of the pipe; it is narrowed.

What is the extent of the service pipes to the high service?—They vary; some an inch, some an inch and a quarter, some three quarters.

Do you speak now of cocks or pipes?—The cock.

The pipe itself is of still greater diameter?—Yes, a greater area.

What proportion is there between the service pipe and the cock?—I cannot exactly say, without calculating.

As four to three?—I do not know, but I will prepare that with the return.

You

You have stated, that the average quantity furnished per day you were not able to tell?—Yes.

It would be fair to you to state what appears upon a former occasion before the Lords, that you stated then the average quantity to be from 200 to 300 gallons a day?—That is only the average; but I cannot say that each house takes that.

What should you say would be the average now?—I should think it might be near that; from 200 to 250 gallons.

Do you mean that for the low service?—I put that as the service generally.

Upon the statement of a former answer it appears that those services are capable of providing a supply for a house for two days and a half or three days; if they could supply a house for three days it would amount to 750 gallons?—Yes; but you must allow me to explain, that during the time the water is coming in, the inhabitant is frequently running away a great quantity of water down the privy.

But the fact of 750 gallons being provided to that house is what is stated, whether it is used is quite another question?—We turn the water on four days, and for those days about 200 or 250 gallons is about the quantity put in for each day.

Then your supply being four times a week must be four times 250 gallons?—Some of the houses get it every day; we turn on some of our services every day for houses where the cisterns are small, therefore they get it every day, and this is taking it upon the average.

In fact, the provision for each house, at the rate of 250 gallons a day, is 1,750 gallons a week?—I take it upon the real quantity of water delivered in London, the whole quantity of water we raised, that was the result of my evidence in the Lords; it would be impossible to select the quantity for each house.

Do you consider that 250 gallons, to a private house, could flow in one day through such an aperture as you have stated to be the aperture of the pipe?—Yes, certainly.

Could double the quantity flow through such an aperture?—Yes, that it could.

Could three times the quantity?—I cannot say exactly, but twice the quantity could.

Five hundred gallons could flow through such an aperture as you have described for the low service?—Yes, no doubt of it.

What is the distance of the delivery pipe from the pump?—From our engine-house to the reservoir is about three miles and a quarter.

What is the elevation of the delivery pipe above the pump?—One hundred and twenty-one feet.

What is the diameter of the cylinder?—Fifty-four inches.

What is the diameter of the pump piston?—Twenty inches.

What is the mean pressure on the piston?—From seven pounds and a half to eight pounds.

Per inch?—Yes.

What is the number of strokes per minute?—About fourteen.

What is the number of hours each engine works per day?—We work, upon the average, about 176 hours both engines.

In what time?—Per week. We have two engines, and they work the same number of hours.

Your answer then applies to both engines?—Yes.

What is the general description of cisterns used by the inhabitants?—I cannot exactly answer that question, some of them are large, some small, various sizes.

Could you make an average?—I cannot.

What is the least you know of for private families?—I have not any memorandum by me of the least sizes, we have some very large.

What have you known the least to be for private families?—I suppose there are some that hold three or four hogsheads of water, some more, and some less.

Down to half hogsheads?—Not so low as that, very few of that description.

Have there been any alterations in the enlargement of them of late years?—I do not exactly know whether there has or not; I have not had any particular cases come before me of enlargement; there have been several additional cisterns put down in houses.

And alterations in the positions of cisterns?—Yes, there may be some.

You do not know of any general enlargement throughout the district?—No, I do not.

You were speaking of the amount of the supply being 200 or 250 gallons per day; you

Mr.

William T. Clark.

(21 February.)

Mr.
William T. Clark.
 (21 February.)

you stated that the whole of that could not well be consumed, what becomes of the refuse?—I do not mean to say that the whole was not consumed.

The Committee mean in private families?—There is a much greater quantity of water used now than there was formerly, in the early part of our establishment.

What do you consider the amount of the refuse-water; that not used?—We have very little water runs to waste at present; we have enforced the putting on ball-cocks, as far as practicable; there may be some little going at the time that the water is turned on for the supply of the cistern, by running down the privies; there is a great deal goes that way, I believe, at times.

Are your services supplied to any of the houses from the main at once, without going into a cistern?—We have very few indeed from the main.

Have many of the houses more than one cistern in your district?—Yes; many of them have three or four cisterns.

Upon the average, have the greatest number of houses one or more than one cistern?—I cannot speak accurately, upon the average, but I know there are more than one in many houses; in some houses there are a great many cisterns.

The Committee speak of the ordinary service?—Yes, I am alluding to that.

Are you in the habit of remonstrating, or making any observation to your tenants if they put up a second cistern?—They often do it without our knowledge.

Do you do it when you do know of it?—If the water is required for other purposes than for domestic consumption, they are charged when they are found out.

In fact, your principle of ratage is upon the quantity of water supplied?—I have not any thing to do with the rating of the houses; that is generally managed by the Committee, assisted by the secretary.

Is there any authenticated plan, or written document, or reference paper, specifying the line of demarcation, or the terms on which admission into the districts was made by the different water companies?—There was a plan made by Mr. Milne, which specifies the line of district allotted to the West Middlesex waterworks.

That was an authenticated plan?—No; I do not know that it was.

Was there any authenticated plan, or written document, or reference paper, specifying the line of demarcation?—I do not believe there is any authenticated plan; it was only a common plan with the lines marked out.

Was it prepared for mutual consideration previous to the establishment of these divisions?—Yes, certainly, it was; because a line of demarcation for each company had been fixed upon.

You saw it previously?—Yes.

Was it a written agreement with signatures?—I never saw anything of that kind.

How was it prepared?—It was merely a plan upon which the officers of each company consulted as to which would be the best line of demarcation, the best way to concentrate the works of each company.

A plan marked upon the map?—Yes, upon the maps of the separate companies.

Was there any reference paper annexed to that?—Only a paper containing a list of the pipes.

Not a reference paper as to terms?—No; I never saw any.

Was or not that district allotted in conformity to some mutual written agreement or proposition?—I do not know of any written agreement; I had nothing to do with it.

There was no proposition you were a party to?—No.

You were one concerned in the allotment?—Only to mark out the line with the other officers.

All you know of that allotment was by seeing the line marked upon the map?—Yes.

You know of no written arrangement of any sort or kind?—No, I do not.

Previous or subsequent?—No.

Was there any alteration made in that division of the plan when it took place?—I do not know of any particular alteration in it; an exchange of a few houses was afterwards made with the Grand Junction company, for greater convenience of supply.

At what period was the West Middlesex company empowered to extend their works into the metropolis?—I believe in 1810 or 1811.

How long was it after this period that any interest was received on the capital expended?—That is a question more in the secretary's department to answer than mine.

Is it within your knowledge that all the tenants comprised in your rental have actually been supplied from your works?—Yes; I should think they have been.

There are no persons treated as tenants of your company, who, in fact, are supplied by another company with water?—I cannot answer that question; the secretary very likely can; it is in his department: there may probably be one or two instances where our pipes do not pass so near.

That is done as a matter of accommodation?—Yes.

Do you supply any part of the bishop of London's estate at Paddington?—We supply part of Paddington; I do not know whether it is part of his lordship's estate or not.

Is that part of Paddington which you supply, nearer to the Grand Junction works than the West Middlesex?—We had works at Paddington before the division.

Those works you use notwithstanding the division?—Yes; we use all the works we have there.

Though it is not in your district?—Yes, it forms part of our district.

Can you show any reasonable ground, independent of the expense incurred by the competitions at the commencement of your establishment, for an increase of the rate beyond the rate of 1810?—I presume from the very great increase of water to what was wanted formerly.

Before the district division?—Yes, long before. The New River did not use to above half fill the cisterns, and that only three days a week, and now they are filled as constantly and regularly as the water is turned on.

That is four times a week for the low service, and three times for the high?—Yes; and then there is an additional quantity of water used, from the additional state of luxury introduced into houses; a great many baths; a great many families brew and wash at home, and that all adds to the consumption.

Is it within your knowledge, that at the time this line of demarcation was made, which does not appear to rest upon any written document, but upon an understanding between the companies, that the West Middlesex company parted with the pipes which they had in the district beyond their line of demarcation?—They did give up a certain portion.

Did they not give up all?—They gave up all that were out of the district.

Did you mutually take and receive pipes?—Yes; there was an arrangement of that kind.

Throughout the district?—Yes.

Value for value?—Yes; it was understood in that way, and acted upon in that way.

Except that the ultimate balance was afterwards given up to the West Middlesex company, by the New River company, gratuitously?—Yes, it was.

In the estimate you have made, you must have reference to the general capacity of the cisterns to receive water?—No; it is merely an estimate of the number of houses, and dividing the number of houses with the total quantity of water consumed in the year.

You have said in one part of your examination, that the district marked in the maps for each company to supply, was, in the judgment of the officers of the various companies, the best in their power for the public convenience?—Yes, it was.

Was that the motive which guided you?—Yes, it was; the concentration of our works, so as to give the most effectual supply.

And in the judgment of the officers of the different companies, that district which they each took was the most calculated to give the best supply to the public?—Yes.

And upon that principle it could be done cheaper?—Yes, it could.

You do not mean that the division was made solely with reference to the public convenience; it was also with reference to the rental?—Yes, it was.

But the ample supply of the public was the chief motive for taking those districts you each of you took?—Yes.

The expense of the repair of iron pipes would be less than the repair of wooden pipes?—I have not had any experience in that.

Would there not be a considerable expense in the repairing iron pipes?—Yes, there would.

Do not the iron pipes burst?—Yes, from frost, they do, sometimes.

Is it not necessary frequently to repair the joints of iron pipes?—Yes, occasionally.

Does not the quantity of water always wasted, prevent you from making an average

Mr.
William T. Clark.

(21 February.)

of the consumption of each house?—We have not much water running to waste in our district.

Is not it a common practice to let a quantity of water run to waste, by leaving open the cocks to wash down privies and sinks?—Yes.

And when they are left open during the night, you cannot ascertain the quantity wasted?—No, we cannot.

Are you not liable to constant imposition on the part of your tenants, by putting down cisterns without notice, and taking off the ball-cocks?—We are.

Does it amount to any serious inconvenience, the consumption of water of which you are not apprised?—I conceive not much.

Do you keep your mains constantly charged for fear of fire during the night?—Yes; between seven and eight miles of main are full of water.

Is there any considerable expense in keeping the mains so charged?—Yes; the expense of the loss of water upon those mains.

In so far as you keep those mains charged for fear of fire, have you any remuneration or compensation for that?—Not to my knowledge.

Is not the parish of Mary-le-bone much better supplied than it formerly was?—Yes, much better.

Have you any complaints now from the parish of Mary-le-bone?—Not any; our supply is very regular.

And the actual supply now is far beyond what it was?—Yes.

In some cases, you say one water company has assisted another by a supply of water which they have not actually charged the waterworks receiving that assistance for?—There may be one or two instances.

Is there any sinister or bye motive in that, or is it done with a view of accommodation?—Merely for accommodation.

If you chose to run mains again into the parts you have relinquished by some implied agreement, is there any impediment to your returning and putting mains down again?—No; not that I know of.

Did you take any part of the district supplied by the Chelsea waterworks?—A very small portion of it.

Was there an exchange of pipes?—We had iron pipes there.

An exchange took place between you?—We had a very small proportion of iron pipes down there.

In laying down your mains, did not you lay down an extent of mains in point of size originally perfectly unnecessary for the district you occupied?—No; I should conceive not.

What is the diameter of your principal main?—Twenty-one inches.

What is your rule with respect to high and low service; what do you call high and low?—We call high service all above six feet six inches above the pavement.

And every thing below that you reckon low service?—Yes.

You say you have had no complaints from the tenants you have served?—Not as to the supply or quantity of water.

Is it to you the complaints are made?—The complaints go to the office where they are booked; and when I come to town, I examine it; but the foreman receives instructions immediately upon the complaint coming to the office.

You hear of such complaints?—Yes.

Therefore in answering that question, you are clear no such complaints have been made?—Yes, I am.

The Committee are not speaking of the quantity of water in the main, but the conduct of the turncock, and so on?—Yes; I understand it so.

And the times you mention here, four times for low service, and three times for high, are considered generally sufficient?—Yes, certainly; except some few instances where the water is turned on every day; where they have very small cisterns.

What is the mean distance of the tenants from the main?—Some of the tenants are ten feet from the main, some fifteen feet; we have not mains in every street.

What is therefore the mean distance; what is the extreme and the least?—There are some services forty or fifty yards from the main; we have not mains in each street.

You have stated that there is considerable expense in the repair of iron pipes?—Yes, there will be a very considerable expense.

You

You say you are not at all conversant with wooden pipes?—No, I am not; but with iron pipes I have been for the last ten years.

Did you not state that the leading motive of the division was to allot to the companies the parts most contiguous to their works?—Yes.

How do you reconcile that with the fact that part of Paddington is supplied by you when it is close to the Grand Junction?—The Grand Junction had no mains in that particular part of Paddington and we had.

You have stated that one of the advantages of your system is, that one of the mains is always charged for extraordinary services, such as accidents by fire, and that in consequence of that being so charged there is a loss of water; how is that occasioned?—In consequence of its passing through side cocks that connect the collateral mains with the great mains, these sluices wear, and in consequence of their wearing, they leak and admit the water to pass through other pipes, namely, small iron service pipes, and then the service gets water, and it gets to some of the tenants at night. We have done as much as possible in our district to prevent the water running to waste: we keep a man on purpose to watch the ball-cocks.

Mr. Matthias Koops Knight, Called in; and Examined.

YOU are Secretary to the West Middlesex waterworks company?—Yes.

How long have you been secretary?—Between six and seven years.

Were you employed upon this establishment previously to your being secretary?—No.

You can only speak to circumstances since you have been secretary?—Only since my time.

Were the works in a state of activity when you first became secretary?—Yes; to a considerable extent.

Not so great as they are now?—No; certainly not.

Can you inform the Committee what extent of district, and what number of houses had been supplied, previous to and subsequent to the arrangement formed for dividing the metropolis into districts?—The answer may be given in the shape of an account; the total number of houses we now serve is 10,350; that includes manufactories and other public buildings.

That is houses in distinction to tenants?—Yes; I believe houses. I have got the return from the collector. There are stables included in that number.

Can you tell what are the general descriptions of cisterns used by the inhabitants?—No; they almost every one have different descriptions of cisterns.

The question applies to private families?—I think it is quite impossible to tell.

As to the gauge of them?—I think it is quite impossible to say without a survey of them.

Were you employed at the time the metropolis was divided into districts?—Yes.

You were a party at that meeting when a division took place?—Yes.

Do you know of any other ground upon which that division took place than the actual district described upon the map?—It was founded upon the rental; the line was described according to the rental.

The rental of each company was previously produced?—It was to that effect; a rental was allotted to each company, and a line drawn to give to each company that rental.

Do you mean a rental for each company under any division, or that a portion was taken from each of the old companies and apportioned in an equal degree?—A portion of the rental was taken from the old companies and given to the new.

Your rental was produced?—Yes.

And the rental of other companies?—Yes; it was not so with respect to the New River and Chelsea companies; but with respect to the West Middlesex waterworks a line was drawn to give a particular rental.

You know of no plan or written document upon which this division took place?—There was a bill originally introduced into parliament for a partnership; that was a long time ago; but nothing with regard to this latter division.

Many of the tenants have more than one cistern?—Yes.

When they place up another cistern are they charged with another service?—That depends upon circumstances; if they want it for a mere matter of convenience they are not charged.

If it is a matter of luxury you charge them?—Yes; it is charged if it is a high service.

Mr.
William T. Clark.

(21 February.)

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(21 February.)

Can you show any reasonable ground, independent of the expense incurred by the competitions, at the commencement of your establishment, for an increase of the rate beyond the rate of 1810?—I can give several reasons.

State them?—In my opinion, the rates of 1810 never paid an adequate profit for the limited supply then given, (if I am incorrect in that opinion the old companies can correct me,) particularly in the high districts of Mary-le-bone, Paddington and St. George's, and St. Pancras also. I consider the supply very greatly superior now to what it was in 1810 in point of quantity; I also consider the circumstance of the mains being constantly charged, as a protection in case of fire, another reason: these are the principal reasons. I consider the last a very important alteration; so that now, in case of fire, the water is produced almost instantly: we can undertake to supply water in five or ten minutes from the time the turncock reaches the spot; and in several recent cases, where a fire has happened, the water has been so instant and abundant, that the houses have been only partially burnt. In the account of fires I have taken for the last three years, in the whole district, consisting of 10,000 houses, I do not think there have been more than two entirely consumed, and there are more than a dozen cases where the houses have been completely on fire, I mean the floors and window frames, but where the fire has been stopped by the great supply of water.

The whole of your supply is by machinery?—Yes.

Entirely?—Yes, entirely.

What is the level of the reservoir compared with the high service?—The reservoir is 121 or 122 feet above the level of the Thames. The water is first raised to that reservoir by engines from the Thames; it is then supplied from that reservoir to what we call the low service; we call the high service every thing above six feet six inches from the street: that height is given in order to protect the lower class of people, whose supply is afforded by butts standing in the yards, and which, but for that circumstance, would be chargeable with the high service rate: the intention was, that water-closets upon the ground floor should be charged a small addition, fifteen or twenty shillings, but if the cistern of the water-closet be lower than six feet six inches, no charge is made: as we found it necessary to draw a line somewhere, we said every cistern below six feet six inches, although it be for a water-closet, shall not be charged; but if it exceed that, we charge fifteen or twenty shillings, according to circumstances.

That is, on the ground-floor?—Yes.

Are there any water-closets that come below that?—Yes, the bulk, I should conceive; there are a great number of water-closets on the basement; a great many have lowered their cisterns to be below the charge.

When you stated the level of the reservoir was 121 feet above the Thames, do you mean at high or low water?—I believe it was taken at the mean tide; but the high service is pumped over a stand pipe thirty feet higher.

Is the ordinary supply from the reservoir above the level of the pavement?—It is raised 122 feet for the ordinary supply.

From that it flows into the ordinary supply?—Yes; that height will cover the greater part of Mary-le-bone; the high service is raised thirty feet above the reservoir.

The highest service you work is 121 and 30 feet?—Yes, within an inch or two. I should state, the reservoir will not supply north of the New-road for the ordinary supply.

What is the highest service in the New-road?—We are obliged to work over the stand pipe for the New-road; it is all high service there.

The extent of your high service does not go beyond 151 feet?—No.

Is there any such understanding existing amongst the companies, now, that in case of an accident happening to any one of the companies, the other would supply it with water during that time?—Yes; the mains of the several works communicate with each other, so that in case of an accident happening to either of the companies, the other companies can supply till the accident is repaired.

What mains do you communicate with?—With the New River on the east, and the Grand Junction on the other side.

So that in fact, according to the present understanding among the companies now existing, the public have the benefit of the whole, as if they were one entire company?—Yes; I conceive so.

Have any occurrences taken place in which that has been done?—Yes; about two

two years ago an accident happened to the Grand Junction engine: the Grand Junction company applied to the West Middlesex company for assistance; a communication was opened between the mains, and the West Middlesex company during the night worked their engines for the supply of the St. George's district, for a certain number of days, till the engine was repaired; it was no length of time.

So as to remedy the defect?—Yes.

Has any other accident occurred, to your knowledge?—Yes; there was a temporary stoppage, during the late frost, in the New River: the ice, I believe, was blown up by an easterly wind, and choked it so, that they could not get an adequate supply for the whole of their tenants; and the West Middlesex company, assisted by the Grand Junction, worked through their mains, and for two days, I believe, supplied their tenants.

Is that, in your belief, resulting from the arrangement that has taken place, and from the pipes being now so contrived as to afford a junction with one or the other?—Yes; I conceive that the three companies are so constituted as to comprise only one capital; and that the public derive the benefit of three capitals, having to pay the expense of only one.

In consequence of this arrangement, is it your opinion that the public are materially better off than they were whilst the competition lasted?—Undoubtedly, taking into consideration the competition, I conceive they are better off than they would be if they were to pay for two companies: if two pipes were laid in the street, and the public were charged rates which should pay an adequate interest upon those two pipes, the rates must of necessity be nearly double what they are now.

Is it your opinion, that from the arrangement that has taken place, the separate companies taking separate districts, the public are much better supplied than they could be in any other way?—Certainly.

What was the amount of the rental allowed to your company at the partition?—A reduced rental of £. 15,000.

What do you mean by reduced?—The reduced rates, as they then stood upon the books.

What is the amount of your present rental?—Our present rental, taking every thing into the calculation, is £. 23,700.

That is the gross rental?—Yes, the gross rental.

The other was gross?—No; there was no high service there.

When did they first make a dividend?—There was a dividend made in 1810, but it was out of the capital.

What was the extent of that dividend?—Four pounds per share; the shares then were £. 100 shares; but that dividend has been expunged from the books, and deducted from the capital.

Was that the only dividend you made upon the capital?—The whole amount paid back to the proprietors was twelve thousand four hundred and odd pounds; that was paid at different times; but having been paid to the proprietors out of the capital, it has been deducted from the capital now standing upon the books of the company.

What is the date of the real dividend?—We have paid four half-yearly dividends.

Did you divide a farthing before the partition?—No; nor for some time afterwards.

As the public have felt a very lively interest in the arrangement made between the water companies, the Committee would wish to know whether it is within your knowledge, that if any accident had happened to any one of the works of the companies before that arrangement, any of the other companies would have had the kindness to supply that defect when it arose?—No, certainly not; the contest between them was very acrimonious.

The public are very much benefited by the arrangement?—Yes.

They had no means of doing it?—No, certainly not.

There being no communication between their pipes?—Certainly.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(21 February.)

Sabbati, 24^o die Februarij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

William Anderson, Esq. Called in; and Examined.

*William Anderson,
Esq.*

(24 February.)

HOW long have you been Engineer to the Grand Junction water company?—Ever since the commencement of the works.

What power and capacity belong to the Grand Junction works for affording a supply of water to the metropolis?—The original part of the works was supplied from the Grand Junction canal.

The question applies to the quantity of water?—The quantity of water now supplied to the town is 36,000 hogsheads per day, 252,000 hogsheads per week, and 13,104,000 per year.

This is upon the average?—This is the whole quantity supplied to the district that we serve.

At the present moment?—At the present time.

Has it been gradually increasing up to the present time?—It has been much the same from 1819.

What was the quantity in 1817 and 1818?—I have not got that quantity.

Was it much under that?—We did not supply the same number of houses as we have since supplied: that quantity is taken since the partition of the town.

What is the average quantity you could give, or do give to each house supplied per day?—Taking the number of houses according to the last account that I have, they amounted to 7,288 houses; the exact quantity of houses at present, owing to the alteration in the new street, I cannot give, but I should apprehend about 7,200 would be nearly the quantity we now serve; that would be an average upon those houses of $4\frac{1}{2}$ hogsheads per day for each house.

On an average of every house, including manufactories and every thing?—Yes.

Does it include brewhouses?—Yes; we have but one, I believe.

Have you any average of the supply to private families in distinction from trade?—It is impossible.

This is the result of a calculation you have gone into for this very purpose, is it?—Yes.

What are the number of your services by the week and day?—We serve five times a week, six times a week, and seven times; but the greatest proportion is about six days a week that we serve our houses; we serve a great proportion of every house six times a week.

None less than five?—Yes; we do serve some four times.

Are you speaking of high service or ordinary service?—Ordinary service only.

Do the number of your services differ when families are in or out of town?—We have never found any difference; and if you will allow me, I will explain something on that head. In taking the number, or greatest number of tenants out of town at one time they amounted to between three and four hundred tenants; or I should wish to say, taking the number when I thought the town was most empty, they amounted to between three and four hundred tenants: the proportionate part of those tenants will be, in taking the daily service at six times a week, that is, averaging between five and seven days a week, it is allowing about two hours per day for a thousand tenants; consequently, if a thousand tenants require two hours of our engine to supply them, the question will be, what will between three and four hundred require, which will be about forty minutes supply per day with our engines. Those absent are not wholly in one street, but they are in a number of between forty and fifty streets; you will then see that it will be somewhat between about a minute saving upon each street. But this is not the whole of it; for as many of the streets have only two tenants out of it, and others ten and fifteen, the consequence will be, that in proportioning the saving of two tenants, that probably will be about twelve seconds upon that street. I think I need not go further than to say it is so unnecessary to expect a saving upon such a principle of waterworks, that we have never considered any alteration necessary as to the working of the engine.

Do the engines work the same number of services each week in the year?—Yes, they do.

How

William Anderson,
Esq.

(24 February.)

How long are those services per day continued?—Some services are on half an hour, some an hour.

Do they furnish an equal quantity of water?—The services are proportioned to the demands of the houses, and that in a large way.

If they are on half an hour, or an hour, must they provide the same quantity of water, or can you regulate the supply in the course of that time more or less?—We can regulate it, certainly; but we find it necessary to get through with our services as quickly as possible, in order that the whole service of the district should be performed within a given time per day, say fourteen hours per day.

Then you find as much water flows as you can well produce in each of those services?—Yes, it does.

You stated, that upon an average the service supplied each house is $4\frac{1}{4}$ hogsheads per day?—Yes, about that.

But six days is the extent of your service in general?—No; that is taking the whole of it.

But in private families, do you mean to say all private families are served six days each?—The greatest portion, for low service.

Have you any reason to suppose that the supply furnished is greater than is wanted?—No, I have no particular reason for thinking so.

The supply is infinitely larger, at that rate, than what was supplied previously to 1810?—I consider much so.

Has your supply been adapted to what was considered and has appeared to be the wants of the district?—Yes; I consider so.

Can you give the Committee any information with regard to the difference in the amount of the supply between 1810, and this supply of $4\frac{1}{4}$ hogsheads per day?—I have heard it proved before a Committee of this house, that the quantity of water that was necessary to supply the parish of Mary-le-bone, was 324 gallons per week for each house, and to raise that quantity of water, would consume 300 chaldrons of coals per year, amounting to £. 750; and whereas it requires a consumption for the present supply of water, equal to about 1,300 chaldrons of coals per year, to supply the 7,200 houses; but the quantity stated before was to supply 12,000 houses.

What do you consider the expense of the 1,300 chaldrons?—It would be about £. 3,200, taking the price as stated in the estimate for St. Mary-le-bone, at 50 s. per chaldron.

All this is ordinary service?—For ordinary and high service.

What is the proportion of increase in your supply, beyond the supply in 1810, to each house?—I have always considered the calculation as therein stated, that is, that 324 gallons per week, appeared to have been about the supply of London in 1810.

324 gallons for 12,000 houses?—324 gallons for each house.

That is one hogshead per day?—Yes.

Can you account in any way for this increased demand on the part of the public?—There is the luxury of the times; there is a vast number of water-closets that are used below, that never were used in 1810.

Do you consider much of that goes to waste?—In some water-closets there is; but in many of the principal houses they have a pipe attached from the upper cistern to the lower water-closet, and I think that the servants have as much convenience in the way of water-closets, as that of their masters, which was not had before; there is also brewing to any extent; there are gentlemen's stables supplied with soft water now, which were not formerly; carriages are washed with soft water, which were not formerly; in short, there is hardly any thing you can mention in which water has not formed a considerable consumption in the last ten years.

What is the average size of the ball-cocks?—The greatest part of them are about three quarters of an inch in diameter.

What is the diameter of a service pipe?—Three quarters of an inch, but the opening of the ball-cock is generally smaller than the diameter of the pipe, it is contracted; the diameter of the cock is the exact diameter of the pipe, but the casing inside of it reduces the diameter.

Can the quantity of water which you have stated as $4\frac{1}{4}$ hogsheads per day, flow through such an aperture as you have stated in the time of your service?—No doubt it can; if the quantity is not supplied in the half hour, an hour longer will produce a greater quantity.

And that would enable you always to supply such a quantity?—Quite so. I should also observe, that where any difficulty has occurred with small pipes, the

William Anderson,
Esq.

(24 February.)

services have been altered very much, and consequently the supply has been given quicker, that is, by serving a less number of houses in a shorter time.

What is the general description and dimensions of the cisterns within your district?—It is impossible to say the exact quantity they will hold; there are many of them that will hold from two to forty hogsheads, and some hold forty.

Do you mean to say that in a private family there is any cistern that contains twenty hogsheads of water?—I do; I can name them.

What is the average size of your cisterns in the whole district?—If the number of houses were equal in proportion, that is, the large houses in proportion to that of the small houses, I think one could come to an average; but it would be impossible to come to an average without they were equal in point of number, for some of the small cisterns may not be above 100 gallons.

Have those cisterns been enlarged, or their situations altered, within a late period?—To my knowledge many of the cisterns have been raised, from alterations having taken place in the houses.

More raised than enlarged then you mean to say?—Yes.

Any enlarged?—There have been cisterns added.

When a cistern is added to any private family do you make any alteration of charge upon that?—Not for domestic purposes; but when it is added for the use of a water-closet we do.

That you consider as high service in general?—That is high service.

Are there in general more than one cistern to a house?—Many houses have three and four cisterns.

But upon the average?—Generally one cistern, but many houses have two.

Was the old system of supply in 1810 liable to more or less waste than the present?—I think they never had any water to spare for waste then.

Did they take more pains in preserving the water than you do at the present moment?—They have stated so, and I have no doubt they did.

You conceive, that the inhabitants of the district consume as much more water at this period than they did in 1810, and previously, as to be in the proportion of more than three to one now?—That is my opinion, in point of quantity.

Is all the water supplied by the Grand Junction water company derived from the Thames?—The whole of it now, within the last few months.

When did they cease to supply from the canal water?—It was in the beginning of September last, but there have been various supplies taken from the canal since.

Is the Thames water delivered directly into the cisterns, or first into the reservoirs at Paddington?—It is delivered occasionally into both. If you will allow me, I will state how the town is supplied. The engines at Chelsea are set to work at five and six o'clock in the morning; the water is then pumped into the reservoir at Paddington; and allowing the water to run from the reservoir into town from five o'clock in the morning till nine and ten o'clock in the day, every day, for the purpose of performing all the low service, I believe there is not one of our tenants who does not receive a portion of that water every day for low service; and in order to perform the next service, owing to the removal of cisterns, such as laundry cisterns, and various other cisterns that stand eight and ten feet above the level of the streets, the water is then shut off from the reservoir, and it is worked till about two or three o'clock in the day, in order to get rid of this second service. The high service is then performed, between that and seven, nine, and ten o'clock at night.

From the Thames itself?—From the Thames itself.

Without passing through the reservoir?—Yes.

All your high service is from the Thames itself?—Yes.

But the ordinary service is from the reservoir?—Yes.

What company now supplies the whole of the bishop of London's estate?—The West Middlesex and our company.

It is divided?—It is divided.

Can you state what is the total quantity of water raised by the Grand Junction engines daily from the Thames?—I have already stated the quantity.

What is the highest extent of your high service?—Sixty-one feet five inches above our upper reservoir.

What is the height of your reservoir from the Thames?—At high water of a spring tide it is eighty-eight feet nine inches.

The highest service you perform then is one hundred and fifty feet two inches?—Yes.

Do you know of any authenticated plan or written document, specifying the line of

*William Anderson,
Esq.*

(24 February.)

of demarcation, and the terms on which the division of the districts was made between the water companies?—I do not.

The arrangement was made according to a calculation of rent?—That was one part of it; but the capital also formed another part; and I should say the convenience of the mains that had been already laid by each company, in order to make as much saving as possible in regard to the capital of each company.

Capital of property you mean?—Yes.

An allotment of rent was surrendered by the old companies to the new in that arrangement, was not there?—There was.

Do you consider that iron is very superior to wood for the purpose of affording supply?—Most certainly, as to a supply.

The wooden pipes were constantly subject to accident, and decayed repeatedly?—Yes.

Can you give any information as to the average duration of wooden pipes?—I cannot, from my own experience; I never had any.

Do you consider that the iron pipes are liable to decay (the pipe itself) at any period?—I think the main pipe will last a great number of years; but I apprehend the service pipes, from the action of the water, which is much quicker in the service pipes than in the mains, they being constantly filled, and emptied at all times of the service, will wear out much sooner than the mains.

What do you consider the wear of those pipes; how do they wear; in what way?—They oxydize very much in the inside: and I have found in one instance also of our own company, where a three-inch pipe has been so much oxydated in the inside, that I was obliged to take it up, and put one of four inch diameter, and I found that the rust of the pipe had obstructed the bore of the pipe, and consequently the oxydation must have had some effect in reducing the width of the middle of the pipe.

That is a single instance?—That is one instance.

How did you discover it?—The service being bad, we could not perform it.

How was that displayed, that service being bad?—By complaints; we could not fill the cisterns.

Was it from the water being tainted, or from the want of the water?—It was solely from the want of the water, not from the quality of the water.

You consider, however, that in the construction of works for the supply of a great and populous city with water, there can be no question as to the preference for supply of iron over wooden pipes?—None whatever.

In point of interest, you would not hesitate to put down iron pipes in preference to wooden?—Provided I had capital.

Can you show any reasonable ground, independent of the expenses incurred by the competition at the commencement of your establishment, for raising the prices beyond the prices of 1810?—I have already stated a considerable consumption of coals. I consider the town very much benefited, with regard to the security against fire. I also consider, that from the size of the mains being much larger than those which were formerly used, a considerable additional capital has been employed to furnish that extra supply to London: the engines also have been constructed upon, I may say, better principles, and much larger in power than any hitherto constructed: this, I think, taken with the extra consumption of coals, with the extra capital upon the size of those mains, are much more than sufficient grounds for the increased demand of rate.

What is the diameter of your principal main?—Thirty inches.

The Oxford main?—The Oxford-street main.

Have you any means of knowing how the town was supplied with water previous to the year 1810?—I have already stated, that it has been proved in a Committee before the House the quantity of water supplied.

Do you know, of your own knowledge, how the town was supplied with water previous to the year 1810?—No, I do not.

You have no knowledge upon the subject?—Nothing further than from the calculations made then.

Have you any means of ascertaining whether the town was or was not supplied sufficiently with water previous to the new companies?—It was not.

Were there constant complaints upon that subject?—I have heard that there were constant complaints.

At that time the New River company had merely wooden pipes; was it possible, in the nature of wooden pipes, they could supply the houses?—I cannot answer the question.

*William Anderson,
Esq.*

(24 February.)

Was it possible they could have high service?—Certainly not.

Have you heard that houses were sometimes days, and even a week, without a supply of water?—I have heard so.

Were there not a large class of houses without tenants, because they could not get water?—I have heard so.

In consequence of the institution of the new companies, all houses have water, and there are none without tenants on account of the absence of water?—I know of none.

Is it not a common practice for servants to take water from cisterns above, when they ought to take it from the cisterns below, to save trouble?—I have no doubt they wish to save themselves as much trouble as possible.

Is the great quantity of water that goes to waste without any benefit to the town?—I have not said a great quantity goes to waste; I do not know what quantity goes to waste in the sewers.

Is not that water that goes to waste beneficial to the public at large, though not to the houses from which it is wasted?—I consider it beneficial to the drains of the house where the water is wasted, and to the public at large.

Do you think it possible to ascertain the quantity of water that is given separately for the high service, and the ordinary service?—I do not think it is possible, at least accurately.

Are people much more lavish now in the use of water than they formerly were, relying on the accurate supply of water?—I have no doubt of it; for to my own knowledge, there is hardly a door that you pass in which water is not applied to the washing the pavements in front of the house, which was not done formerly.

Are not the companies liable to constant trick and imposition by the introduction of cisterns, without their knowledge, by having a water-closet, and by taking the balls from the cocks?—We have found some.

Have you not many more mains in your district than you formerly had of a large size; and are not those mains kept constantly charged, with a view to fires?—The mains are kept constantly charged night and day.

And have you not larger mains in your service, and more of them?—We have more mains in the district that we now serve, I think by about twenty times the area, than there were formerly.

In keeping the mains charged, with a view to the prevention of fires, and likewise in the supply of water for watering the streets, have the companies any benefit or advantage whatever?—No benefit whatever; no remuneration whatever, except from the watering of the streets.

It is done entirely gratuitously?—Yes.

So that the public have that advantage, and not the company?—The companies have no advantage, except from the watering the streets.

And in being paid something for the watering of the streets, do you think you are remunerated for the pains and trouble to which you are put?—I think not; for I would be glad almost to pay the money out of my own pocket, rather than have the interruption of the service by the watering of the streets; I think the company do not gain more than £.5 or £.10 a year throughout the whole of their district.

Do you mean that that £.5 is actual profit?—Actual profit.

That is setting off against it the expense?—The expense of coals.

When so much is said about the charges for high service, do you think that the company are fully and fairly remunerated by their charges?—At present it is not, for we have expended a large capital, that is something considerable, for the high service only.

Can two companies in the same street serve as cheaply and effectually as a single company, and as certainly?—Not without the tenants paying double rates.

Then would it be beneficial to the metropolis to be served throughout by several companies together, or by one company in each district?—I should think one single company.

Have you any doubt upon that subject?—No doubt whatever.

Have your directors endeavoured to find out a scale for rating houses, so as to put each tenant on an equality with his neighbour?—I do not know of any scale.

Have they endeavoured to equalize it as well as they were able?—Yes.

Have you now any considerable sums to expend before you have completed your works?—I made an estimate in order to give as full a supply of water as it was possible our district could require, and that estimate amounted to seventeen thousand and

and odd pounds, but we have never been able to raise the means to lay out any of that money.

Do you think there are any peculiar difficulties in the district you serve, owing to the inequality of the ground?—Yes, I do consider that there are more difficulties in our district than any other.

Is there not a considerable saving to each parish in consequence of the use of iron pipes?—In point of paving, I should consider very much.

Is there a considerable saving in each parish in their plumbers bills?—I cannot speak positively as to that, but that would go in reference to high service, comparing that with force pumps.

But for one reason or another, do you not conceive there is a great saving to the public in plumbers bills?—I consider so.

So that there is a saving to parishes as to paving and as to plumbers bills, a saving to individuals, and is there not a great saving in manual labour to the servants, in the high service?—No doubt.

There is such an arrangement between the companies, that in the event of accident, from frost or other circumstances, you can contribute to each other's assistance?—Yes.

You have spoken to the decay of a particular pipe which had begun to oxydate or rust; was it owing to its being in calcareous or siliceous earth?—No, I think not; but it was the inside of the pipe that oxydated.

It is probable that iron pipes might not decay in argillaceous earth; have you ascertained how it will be in calcareous earth?—No, I have not; it is more from the interior of the pipe that we expect decay.

Have you had many instances of the bursting of a pipe?—We have had a few.

That is an accident which occasionally happens to iron pipes?—Yes; but it is occasioned by frost when it does take place, from the contraction.

In point of fact, have you had many pipes burst?—We have had a few.

Was there any high service whatever before the year 1810?—No, there was not.

So that the benefit of high service has been entirely derived to the town since that time?—Since that time.

Did none of the other water companies afford high service?—No, not any.

Not the Chelsea?—The Chelsea had some partial high service, perhaps eight or ten feet in some situations, where the mains were.

If your mains were of much less capacity, would you not require larger reservoirs?—The part where the company would suffer most is the greater time of the working of the engines; and if you will take the per-centage upon the increased diameter of the pipes, and compare that with the size of the smaller pipes, the annual expense of fuel to push the water through the small pipes is much increased, much more than what I have already stated; and consequently it would become a greater annual expense with small pipes, than what it does in the first expenditure for large pipes.

If you had not those large mains you would be under the necessity of increasing your reservoir, consequently that increased reservoir would be a greater increase of expense to the company than the expense of the main?—No; we should have no occasion to increase the size of our reservoirs.

You were asked as to the capacity of the cisterns, and you stated that they ran from two to forty hogsheads; in answer to a subsequent question about them, you said that some small cisterns contained not above two hogsheads; do you consider that two hogsheads is the smallest capacity of a cistern that is contained in the houses you supply?—There are butts; and the very small houses have all butts and not cisterns.

What is the capacity of those butts?—They hold two hogsheads, some of them.

Then in fact, cistern or butt, the smallest receptacle for water in your apprehension, generally speaking, may be two hogsheads?—Yes.

You have stated that of the seven thousand two hundred and odd houses you consider five thousand of them to be small houses?—I consider so; but that account can be delivered in quite correctly, perhaps from three to five thousand; I know I have overstated it at five thousand.

Will you say four?—I should say the smaller houses would be 3,000, and the next description about 2,000.

Should you suppose, one with another, that it would be fair to state the capacity of the smallest receptacle at two hogsheads each, for the 3,000 houses?—Yes; I certainly think that would be about fair.

William Anderson,
Esq.

(24 February.)

In the next class can you give the Committee any information, as matter of opinion, what the average capacity of cisterns may be stated at?—In many of those middle sort of houses they have two cisterns, and I should not suppose that there are any of those cisterns that hold less than 100 gallons, and above 100 gallons.

What are the two cisterns generally; one of them is a lower cistern for the purposes of the house?—They have generally been put for the convenience of servants, that they should not go to the front area to draw all the water; that has caused a cistern to be put in the back part of the house; and to say whether those cisterns are of the same dimensions I cannot, but they are something thereabouts, at least 100 gallons each.

Then you would state, as matter of opinion, that the receptacle in this middle description of houses was about two cisterns of about two hogsheads each?—Yes.

You state the cisternage, in some houses that you could name, to amount to twenty hogsheads?—Yes.

Are those instances numerous at all?—No, they are not; they are very few.

Do you think going out of your middle class of houses, that cisternage does in very many instances rise above four hogsheads?—I should state that would be a very good average, or thereabouts.

You say there is but one brewer in your district?—Speaking from my recollection.

Have you many distillers in your district?—We have two.

Have you many other trades that largely consume water at the rate brewers do; dyers for instance?—We have a few dyers, I do not recollect the number.

Do you apprehend, from your recollection, that of this whole quantity supplied, of 36,000 hogsheads per diem, those largely consuming trades take up any considerable portion per diem?—I cannot state that correctly, but I think it is one brewer, two distillers, and I think not more than eight or ten dyers, which are the principal consumers of water, and three chemists.

You cannot form an opinion of what quantity of water may be taken by them?—I cannot; there are a few fishmongers.

Dividing the quantity that you supply per diem upon the whole, by the number of houses supplied, without taking into account those largely consuming trades, would make a domestic supply of $4\frac{3}{4}$ hogsheads per day; if the average cisternage be only four hogsheads per diem, it would appear that the cisterns were emptied every day, and indeed that there was not cisternage enough to hold the supply furnished?—There is a proportion of houses of a very large class, from 5,000 to 7,000, the proportion of which has not been named.

The first class you state at 3,000, from 3,000 to 5,000; 2,000 have two cisterns of four hogsheads per day?—That was averaging the first 5,000 at four hogsheads.

Is it not true that many of the houses served by you have no cisterns at all?—I do not know of any at present.

That was so formerly, was it not?—It was so.

Has that then lately been corrected?—Yes, it has; the number was very few that were served without cisterns.

But now you believe there are none?—I do not know of any.

You have stated that the supply of 1820, per week per house, is in the proportion of $33\frac{1}{4}$ hogsheads now, to six hogsheads in 1810; do you consider that the increase of cisternage in the district is capable of receiving that difference?—Not with regard to the size of the cisterns; but as the supply, as I have already stated, is four, five and six times a week, whereas it was only three times a week formerly, that will account for the extra supply of water.

What is the distance of your furthest supply from your works and reservoir?—Taking it in a straight line, it would be about two miles from the reservoir.

How far from the reservoir to the Thames?—About two miles and six or seven hundred yards from the Thames to the reservoir.

What is the extent of your high service first from the Thames, that does not go into the reservoir?—We cannot define that.

What is the furthest house you throw the high service to?—We throw it all over the district.

What is the extreme distance which you throw the high service from the Thames?—It will be four miles.

It goes up as if it was going to the reservoir, does it not?—Yes.

It is then stopped at the reservoir?—Yes.

And then you force it up to the high service in different parts of the district?—Yes.

William Anderson,
Esq.

(24 February.)

In your service, you calculate upon the time necessary to drive your water to the farthest extent of the district?—We take the whole of our district to be served in a certain number of hours.

Supposing, in that part of the district which was near to the supply, that people generally were to allow the water to run away to cleanse the sewers, the water would not reach the further end?—We do not supply the further end of our district and that close to the works at the same time.

Not in the ordinary service?—Not in the ordinary service; for the elevation would be such, that we could not get any water in the high districts by attempting to send it to the low at the same time.

You have said, that in the proportion of 6 to 33 hogsheads a week, you now actually serve six days instead of three?—We do.

The proportion you state as 6 to 16 $\frac{1}{2}$?—If I supply a house six days a week, I make it more than 24 hogsheads a week, because 6 times $4\frac{3}{4}$ is $28\frac{1}{2}$.

What time do you suppose that, under the pressure of ordinary service, it would take for four hogsheads and three quarters of water to run through a pipe of the orifice that pipes guarded by ball-cocks ordinarily are?—I cannot tell.

Do you think it would run through in half an hour?—It depends on the situation and the length of the pipe.

Can you give any average?—No; not as regards the supply of water.

Have you ever happened to observe what time it took to fill one of those cisterns?—I have, when our general supply has been on; when our regular pressure has been on; and I have found it in half an hour giving a supply to a street, and filling every cistern in that street.

But supposing those cisterns all to be empty, and to be of the capacity of four hogsheads, would that be the case?—Yes, in the mode we have constructed our works, generally speaking.

You think four hogsheads and three quarters would flow through a leaden pipe of the ordinary orifice in half an hour?—It is impossible to say; but we keep the service on half an hour and three quarters.

Could you not, by actual observation, be enabled to tell the Committee what quantity of water would be discharged into one or more given cisterns in the ordinary service in a given time?—It will be very difficult; and I will give you an instance of what occurred yesterday. I had a complaint from a house that was supplied with a three-quarter pipe; and from what cause, I cannot ascertain, yet the water was on two hours and a half in that service, and filled every cistern except this one, and it did not half fill this.

Would it not be possible for you to go into the house of any acquaintance where your water was on, and by a common rule take the depth from the top that the water stood at, at any given time, and staying there any given time, say what water had flowed through that pipe in the time?—I could state that, certainly; but if you are to put it as upon a general supply, and that every house ought to get the same supply, you will be very much mistaken. I consider it impossible to give any thing more than an average.

Are the cisterns all filling at the same moment, or do the different heights create delays?—Yes; perhaps the first lower cisterns may be full in twenty minutes; the upper ones may be half an hour or an hour, as I stated.

Have you any regulation what time such and such services should be on?—We have.

Has not that reference to your experience as to the work that will be done by this service or that service in a given time?—We know that by turning on such and such services, it occupies many hours of the engine at a time; we can tell then the quantity of water worked at that time, but how it is distributed to the different houses we cannot get at by any statement that will satisfy this Committee.

Are all the supply pipes in the houses of the same dimensions?—No.

Give the principle in writing upon which you calculate four and three quarters hogsheads per day per house?—I can give you that now. I have already stated to the Committee, that 36,000 hogsheads of water, divided among 7,200 houses, will produce an average of four and three quarters hogsheads per day; that is the general average; I can give no other average at all.

It has been stated to the Committee by an officer of another company, that the average supply to the houses furnished by that company appears by the same method of dividing their whole quantity by the number of houses, to amount to three hogsheads and a half; can you account for that difference between their average

William Anderson,
Esq.

(24 February.)

and your's?—I think I can. In some instances the houses in the parish of St. George are much larger houses; the increased quantity that has been used for the supply of stables for those large houses, carriages for those large houses, in my opinion, will give some reason for the increased quantity.

In a gentleman's family, supposing that any individual puts up a cistern, is it necessary that he should apply to the company?—Not at all, for the low service; but for the high service it is expected they will apply for it.

If it is done upon the high service you consider it a fraud on the company?—Yes, certainly.

And you have, in some instances, found it to be done?—We have, in some few, they are not many.

You have been stating to the Committee the great benefit to the public by the increased quantity of water; do not you consider that there will be a proportionate waste agreeably to the surplusage of water; because you were understood to infer that the whole benefit from the surplus of the water is in favour of the public?—I have no doubt when the public find that they receive an abundant quantity of water they have so much more reason to waste it.

Are you, as an engineer, in the habit of going from house to house occasionally, to ascertain the increased number of cisterns, or, on the other hand, to see the ball-cock is not let off, because there must be the waste?—Where high service is performed, and our district comprehends a great number of the better sort of houses, we find all the ball-cocks generally pretty correct.

Do you look for them?—We know it generally, because the high service will not be performed if the ball-cocks are not acting properly below.

You have ball-cocks in the lower service?—We have, or we could not get the water to the tops of the houses.

Are those ball-cocks watched?—They are, I think to the utmost extent, without we were putting a sort of excise, or something very troublesome to the inhabitant, who is even unwilling to let the turncock into the house when a complaint of want of water takes place.

Those are carelessnesses, which you cannot immediately call frauds; which you cannot avoid?—I do not call that a fraud; it is only cisterns being put on high services, unknown to the company.

Then supposing there were four cisterns unknown to the company, added to the original one, would not the quantity of water, and the force you throw it with, fill four of those fraudulent cisterns?—I think to the extent spoken of, without they increased the diameter of the pipe, it would not do so.

Take two additional cisterns?—Then I think it might.

That would be a fraud on the company?—Yes.

You have said that you would in no case whatever have wooden pipes, when you could afford the price of iron ones, and that in some measure the occasion of not laying them down to the extent you would have done, was in consequence of the expense?—There are two particular circumstances which demand iron pipes; the first is, with regard to the quantity of supply; the second is, that the wooden pipes would only furnish such mains of a small diameter, and which present supply could not be furnished without increasing the number of lesser mains, or an expenditure of fuel, and the iron pipes have been much larger in diameter, and that has of itself increased the capital. The supply to the town in case of fire is certain in iron pipes, and very uncertain in wooden pipes. In keeping a regular account of the alarms of fire that have taken place from October 1819 to the present time, there have been 132, and only one house burnt down out of that number.

You were asked whether you conceived that the inhabitants received as much water now as in 1810; you stated that you considered there was an increase in the supply in the proportion of three to one; now you having stated that it was twenty-eight gallons and a half to six, it is as four and three quarters to one?—Yes.

How many houses do you reckon in a service, or do you apportion it according to your convenience?—Generally in proportion to our mains; some are twenty in a service, some thirty, and some forty: I think forty is the greatest extent we have in one service.

How many hours a day does your engine work?—Sixteen; the service to the houses is completed in about fourteen hours; but as it takes out a considerable quantity of water out of the reservoir, we work two hours more in order to fill up that surplus quantity of water.

You

You stated that the total quantity of hogsheads was 13,000,000 in the year, does that include the high service and the low?—The whole service, high and low.

Do you obtain that quantity by gauging your reservoir?—We do.

You stated that for the high service it was not thrown into the reservoir, how do you obtain that quantity?—I cannot obtain the quantity for the high service.

Do you reckon the sixteen hours the total of the possibility of the engine's working, or could you work it more hours?—We can work the engine twenty-four hours, because we have a spare engine.

Would your reservoir suit that?—Yes, it would.

So that the supply of water is not limited to the sixteen hours?—By no means.

Are there not some situations in your district which cannot be supplied below the pavement from your reservoir?—I think not any; I do not recollect any below the pavement.

You mentioned that the areas of the mains were in the proportion of one to twenty as now, that is 1820 or 1821, with what other period?—It was the early period, wherein it was stated four seven-inch mains.

What was that period?—Before the year 1810.

Your principal main you state is thirty inches diameter?—Yes.

The principal main goes along Oxford-street?—Yes.

And the supply mains running north and south, what is their diameter?—We have three twelve-inch mains.

That is what you call collateral mains?—Yes, we have three twelve-inch mains, three nine-inch mains, and three seven-inch mains.

That is up to Poland-street?—Yes; there is also one nine-inch main into Mary-le-bone, and one seven-inch into Mary-le-bone.

You stated there was a considerable estimate that you had made, of £. 17,000; for what object was that?—One is a main along Piccadilly, to communicate the whole length of Piccadilly, another main down Regent-street; one twelve-inch main in Piccadilly, and the other nine; and there are some other cross mains; there is another nine-inch main, called the Stanhope-street main. It is also proposed in the estimate to make another reservoir, higher in elevation than the present, in order to give a full security to the town in case of any accident happening to the engines and with a supply of these increased mains, there is no probability of the district of the town we supply being in want of water in case of any accident happening to the works.

Do you reckon those works, according to the best of your judgment as engineer, necessary for the good supply of the district?—I do, in order to secure the supply.

It has been stated to the Committee, by the engineers of all companies, and yourself as well, that one of the great advantages of this good understanding between the companies, was the facility of assisting each other in case of an accident; now it occurs to the Committee it would not be necessary to have another reservoir, because, in the case of accident, the other companies have the means to supply you?—I take it for granted the more secure any thing of that sort is made, the more secure the public will be. Supposing, in the present state of the works, that any thing was to happen to the great main in Oxford-street, which would require two or three days to repair it, the advantage by laying the Piccadilly mains and other cross mains I have named, would be, that the supply would then be stopped at Oxford-street, by Tyburn Gate, and the engines working from the river would send a supply of water into the town and throughout the district, without communicating with the great main at all; and that may be done in half an hour's notice at any time.

You would then force it up the Piccadilly main into all your services?—Yes. Then supposing any thing happens to the engines, and it may occupy a fortnight, perhaps, or three weeks, as took place with our engine at Paddington, wherein it was three weeks before the repairs were completed, and with another extra reservoir of water placed at Paddington, that would give ample means for securing the district that we supply, independent of drawing it from other sources; it will also afford a reservoir full of water, equal, perhaps, to a week's consumption upon our tenants, as a reserve for any other of the companies that may require it.

What are the contents of your reservoir now?—Our present reservoir, the large one, holds nearly one week's consumption.

Have you two reservoirs now?—We have a smaller one that will hold a little better than two days, hardly three days, consumption.

The whole of your present supply for high and low service, throughout your district, is obliged to come through the great main in Oxford-street?—It is.

William Anderson,
Esq.

(24 February.)

And what would be the consequence, in case that main was broken, to the town?—It would totally depend upon what it was.

Would not other companies be immediately enabled to form a supply?—No.

By the construction of a great main along Piccadilly, the supply of the whole district might pass through that, in case of the one in Oxford-street being destroyed?—It is so contrived through the Piccadilly main, through Stanhope-street main, and through our seven-inch mains.

Those are projected improvements, but they are not necessary?—In case of fire what would be the event.

In case the Oxford-street main should fail, and you had a new main in Piccadilly, how long would the town be without water before you could fill it?—About as long as we could be going from Oxford-street to the Thames.

What thickness are the pipes of this main?—About an inch, or a little better.

In the scale of chances, what probability do you suppose there is of an accident happening to that main?—I cannot say; it may be a long while before any wear will be produced, but in case of accident it may want repair.

Is there such a thing as a ground plan in any of the companies of any of these mains and works?—Yes.

What is the size of it?—It is to the scale of Harwood's Map of London, one third of an inch to a chain; but we have a smaller one which you can look at.

William Matthew Coe, Esq. Called in; and Examined.

William M. Coe,
Esq.

HOW long have you been Secretary to the Grand Junction water company?—Almost from the origin of the concern.

At what period after your act passed, did you first begin to furnish the town with a supply of water?—I think the first supply was given in 1812, but the engineer could have answered that question better than myself.

Can you state under what circumstances the allotment of the districts took place?—I understand the boards to have settled the amounts to be apportioned to each company.

Was it upon the principle of rental?—Yes, upon the principle of rental, having due regard to where the mains of each company were placed, which were most effective in giving the service.

When the company was first chartered, an agreement existed for furnishing water from the Grand Junction canal?—Yes; it was an agreement to vest the power which the Grand Junction canal company obtained, under the act of the 38 Geo. 3, to supply Paddington and the parts adjacent with water, in a gentleman of the name of Hill, who agreed to lease this power of the Grand Junction canal company.

To you?—No, to himself and others; and he got several of his friends and other persons to join the concern. The lease was, I believe, first granted to Mr. Hill.

In 1810?—Yes.

What is the nature of your agreement with the Regent's canal company?—The principle upon which it was arranged, was, that we should be placed in as good a situation as we were.

What is the Regent's canal company bound to provide by that agreement?—They are bound to erect engines, and to provide a main; and the expense of pumping the quantity of water that we were entitled to from the Grand Junction canal, was not to exceed the expense we should have incurred in paying the rental to that company.

By your agreement, do you pay the same rental to the Regent's canal company, that you pay to the Grand Junction?—We pay it in coals, estimating the rent that we should have had to pay at the expiration of 1826, when the greatest rent accrued, of £. 2,000 a year, and calculating the value of the fines payable at the expiration of the lease.

You pay to the extent of £. 2,000 a year now?—No, it has not commenced yet; the agreement is still in an imperfect state.

Is it like the agreement with the Canal company, a graduated payment?—No, it is not a payment to the company at all; we ascertained that we should have had to pay in 1826, £. 2,000 a year to the Grand Junction canal, if they chose to accept that in preference to a quarter part of the gross rental: and the principle upon which the arrangement was made with the Regent's canal company, was, that we should pay for the pumping of our water, and such further sum as

might

might be agreed upon as a sum equivalent to the fines that were to be paid to the Grand Junction canal company at the expiration of the lease ; so that in fact we consider ourselves as standing in about the same situation, in point of expense, as if we received our water from the canal.

What was the great object of that alteration?—It was a matter of accommodation to all parties. The Grand Junction canal company found us very disagreeable lessees, inasmuch as we could draw any quantity of water from their canal, and injure their navigation. Our company considered it in some manner an accommodation, though I have not found it so, that we should have the Thames water, because the town seemed rather to prefer it ; and the Regent's canal company considered it the easiest mode by which they could obtain a plentiful supply of water for their navigation.

Is all the water supplied by you at this time from the Thames?—It is, except in case of a stoppage of the engine by any accident ; water has been taken from the canal under such circumstances.

The principle of this agreement was established merely for convenience, but you personally did not consider that your company were benefited by the alteration?—No further than that the town seemed to prefer Thames water, and that had its weight of course with the board of directors.

Being under agreement to furnish the same quantity of supply, the difference of supply to the public was nothing?—That undoubtedly had weight, because we had constant disputes with the canal company ; we used to draw down their water and injure their navigation, and we considered that we should have a much greater power of obtaining water without constant disputes about the quantity.

Do you in fact supply a greater quantity of water since you had your supply from the Thames?—That the engineer is more able to answer than I am.

What part of the Thames is that water taken from?—It is within a few hundred yards of where the Chelsea supply is taken from, near Chelsea hospital.

Upon the ground of supply, do you see any reasonable ground, independent of the expense incurred by the competition at the commencement of your establishment, for increasing the rates beyond the rates of the year 1810?—I certainly do, in point of supply : the expense that has been incurred in competition is very trifling indeed ; I conceive it to have arisen in nothing else than the expense of plumbers work, and the laying on houses, and changing houses ; I do not know any expense occasioned by the competition beyond that : from my own knowledge I can state that the supply of water previous to the establishment of this company was very indifferent. I was, previous to the establishment of the Grand Junction company, employed as secretary to the Manchester waterworks, the board of which company used to hold its sittings in London, in the early part of its establishment : it was one of the gentlemen of that board that first established the Grand Junction waterworks company, and many of the gentlemen of that board were asked to embark their property in the Grand Junction waterworks : previously to their having so done, they requested of me to obtain information for them relative to the deficiency of supply, particularly about Paddington and St. Mary-le-bone. I employed myself several days for that purpose, and I almost found, universally, that there was a deficiency in the supply of water ; that the price never appeared to be an object with the parties receiving it ; and the reply I generally received was, that they would not mind paying a greater sum, provided they could get a greater supply.

What do you consider high and low service?—We have taken the separation between the two, according to the proposition that was made in Parliament two years ago, under Mr. Taylor's bill, at six feet six above the level of the pavement.

It has been stated that one of the great reasons of the additional consumption of water has been the turning the old-fashioned conveniences into water-closets for servants ; do you charge high service for those which are placed below the level of the pavement?—I do not know that we have so charged them where we have found them, but if they are erected now we charge them, because we do not consider that as a supply for domestic purposes.

Supplying a water-closet below the level of the pavement, you consider as extra service?—Yes ; we consider all water-closets either high service or an extra supply.

Have you cut off the supply of water in cases of refusal of payment?—We have.

In several instances?—Yes, in several instances.

Have you served general notices with respect to that?—Yes, we have.

Determinable at Lady-day?—Determinable at different times.

Generally, to all who refuse to pay?—Yes ; there have been instances where

*William M. Cor,
Esq.*

(24 February.)

*William M. Coe,
Esq.*

(24 February.)

persons have not given a positive refusal that we have served notice on, they not having paid the rate, but wishing for delay.

Is a notice served, stating that it is on account of the nonpayment of this additional rate?—I think the notice states, that in consequence of their having refused to pay the rate, they are to take notice that, &c.

All in one form?—A printed form.

Are there any prosecutions now depending, in consequence of that, against the company?—Not that I am aware of.

After having given notice to them of your intention of cutting off, in case they do not pay that increased demand, have they then subsequently signified their intention of paying it?—Yes; we have found that many to whom the notice was delivered have afterwards denied that they refused to pay it; they have no objection to pay it; they have not all paid merely in consequence of that notice.

Have persons subsequently signified to you that rather than suffer the inconvenience of losing the supply of water they would pay the increased demand?—Yes.

Many?—Yes.

Taking the proportion of the notices, have half agreed to pay under them?—No, certainly not; in fact, there are many of them have paid without my knowing the reason; after they have received a notice, the collector has called and has been paid.

But have they paid rather than suffer the inconvenience of the loss of their water?—Yes; some have, but very few.

Have you any means of knowing what is said between the collector and the individual renting the house?—No; I only speak of appeals that come to the office; the collectors seldom report unless it is that any tenant wishes to see some one from the office; then I have called, and after an explanation of what the company are likely to gain by it, they have readily consented, without suffering the water to be cut off.

You have not considered that they shall bind themselves to continue to pay that rate?—We consider that the tenant may give us notice to discontinue our water at any time: a person will come to our office and say, I do not wish my supply continued after to-morrow, which is quarter day.

Have you no contracts on leases with tenants?—I do not think we have more than one; I believe we had one six or seven years ago, and I do not think it is out yet.

Were not the notices given generally and indiscriminately to all tenants, without reference to those who had refused?—When we first began to give a notice, there were from a thousand to fifteen hundred persons who had not paid the rate, and to those we gave notice.

The Grand Junction water company is now cutting off supply, on the ground of refusing to pay the high rates?—No; upon the ground of their refusing to enter into contracts with us for a future supply.

That refusal is founded on the high rates?—Yes.

Have you not this power of cutting off, in the case of nonpayment, under your act of parliament?—We conceive so.

And you have likewise a power of bringing actions, in case of nonpayment for your water supply?—I consider so.

Is it not thought to be a milder mode of proceeding, the cutting off water, rather than bringing actions?—The person receiving the water can give the best information on that; it is less expensive to us.

Have you ever cut off water wantonly and capriciously, or only for the non payment of your demand?—Not that I am aware of.

In the allotment of districts by the boards, is there any instrument that is legally obligatory on you?—None that I am aware of.

So that if you thought fit to break the verbal agreement, you might still enter any district you thought fit?—Yes.

Is there, to your knowledge, even a verbal agreement that the companies shall not go into the other districts?—None that I am aware of.

Do not you know it has been declared by all of them, that they may go into any other district to-morrow?—Certainly, we rather understand that; if we practise any system of extortion, the New River company would come into our district.

At the time of that division you surrendered the works from each respective district, and purchased or sold the mains and the pipes belonging to each district?—Yes.

Consequently

*William M. Coe,
Esq.*

(24 February.)

Consequently you disable yourself from entering into that district without new works?—Without laying new pipes.

That was the virtual division?—Yes.

You have spoken as if you considered that your power of commencing a water company originated about the year 1810; are you not aware, that at the original formation of the Grand Junction canal there was that power in them to make a water company forty years ago?—I have so stated.

When you diverted your service, and took your water from the Thames instead of the canal, was it not in consequence of the water being foul, which was supplied by the river called the Brent?—No; we had got rid of that altogether.

Had you not foul and impure water, in the estimation of many people?—When we first began.

And subsequently, was it not thought more impure, by many persons, than the Thames water?—It might be with many persons; I have never found it.

When you had the supply from the canal, it was in some measure limited, and now it is unlimited?—We had as much as we wanted from the canal; we consider we have a greater power of supply from the Thames.

What is the extent of your powers?—I am not able to speak to that; but I understand the evidence of the engineer to go to that point; but by working longer we can supply more.

You stated that your reason for not bringing actions was, that it was a cheaper mode to cut off the supply?—It has always been considered so, not with reference to this particular question only.

Does not your act authorize you to distrain?—Yes; and in some instances we have.

So that you have three remedies; either by action, cutting off the water, or distraining?—We have never brought actions.

Have you actually distrained?—In some instances.

And that led to payment and not to action?—We have never distrained for the high rate; we very seldom distrain, excepting in the event of a person running away, or becoming bankrupt.

Have you not been invited to distrain, for the purpose of putting the question at issue, without suffering the loss of the supply?—I think the board have received a letter from what is called the Anti Water Monopoly Association, to that effect.

Are you prepared to state the grounds upon which you refused that proposal to distrain for the sake of bringing the question to a legal issue?—We considered that it would not decide the question; the proposal was, that a case should be drawn up and submitted to a court of law for decision.

A case founded upon a real grievance which was forthcoming?—Yes.

Do you imagine that there is such a great distinction between those resistances on the part of the public to pay this increased rate, that one decision at law would not have gone to decide the question?—I really do not see how a court of law ever could have settled it; they must have gone into all the inquiry that you are now instituting; it did appear as if there would be a great deal of difficulty attending it.

You did not see the possibility of making it a general issue?—We did not.

Not so as to put the question at rest?—No; one action would not meet every case; no single case could be selected that would answer every purpose.

Was this question agitated in the Court of Chancery?—Yes, with respect to the West Middlesex company.

Do you know what the decision was?—I can only state that the Lord Chancellor refused the injunction.

[The following papers were delivered in, and read.]

“ IN respect to the durability of cast iron pipes in the streets of London, I believe there exists no difference of opinion; all the persons with whom I have conversed being confident that they will be as perfect at the expiration of 100 years as they were in the first instance; but how far the joints will remain perfect, and the pipes answer all the purposes for which they were intended, is a very difficult point to determine, from their having been in use so short a time.

“ From the experience I have had, I consider the capital expended in the pipes to remain unalterable, having seen some which had been in use eighty years, so
706. perfect

William M. Coe,
Esq.

(24 February.)

perfect that no corrosion was visible; but the contraction and expansion of the metal, with the temperature of the water with which they are filled, is constantly acting on the joints, the effects produced from which, in my opinion, will be equal to a complete relay in every thirty years; for it must be considered, that as all such repairs must be executed without interfering with the supply of the town, it must, therefore, be done under every disadvantage.

“It is also necessary to observe, that the velocity with which the water passes through the pipes, materially affects their future efficiency. In all pipes that I have seen, immediately connected with engines, I have observed no material incrustation, there being nothing more than a thin film on the surface, resembling what is produced in the interior of a tea-kettle; but in pipes where the velocity is not so great, a material incrustation takes place, and more particularly with Thames water.

“In the New River waterworks I have seen a sixteen-inch pipe taken up, which had been down about twenty years; it was reduced from incrustation at least one inch in the diameter.

“In Kensington gardens I understand a five-inch service pipe was laid down of iron in the year 1751, and it was in 1819 taken up from inefficiency, being reduced to about three inches in diameter in many parts of its length, which consequently affected the utility of the whole. A similar circumstance happened at Windsor palace.

“These are the only instances with which I am acquainted; but if such should be the case with all the pipes in the streets of London, there will not only be an annual expenditure in coals (or other ways) to overcome the temporary resistance arising from such incrustation, but also a complete relay, for the purpose of cleansing, once in about fifty years.

“I must also observe on the capital employed in cocks, which is by far the most perishable, a considerable part of them being made of wrought iron, from the experience I have had, the screws will all require to be renewed within seven years, and the doors fresh faced, which may be considered as being equal to a complete renewal of that portion of the capital in every ten years.

“February 1821.”

“*William Chadwell Mylne.*”

“IN my evidence of Friday the 16th instant, in answer to a question respecting the duration of iron pipes, I stated, ‘That iron pipes would not require repairs.’ This question I understood related to the time that iron pipes would last, without a reference to the repairs, and I beg to state there will be an expense attendant on the repairs of iron pipes. With respect to their duration, I have not had sufficient experience to fix a period; but what I have taken up did not appear to be diminished in substance.

“*Tho’ Simpson,*

“February 24th, 1821.”

“Inspector-general to Chelsea waterworks.”

“PARTICULARS of the method of rating the Tenants of the Chelsea Waterworks Company, in the year 1810.

“First Class of Houses:—From 8 s. to 12 s. per ann.; average about $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per day.

House or shed, with one room	-	-	-	-	8 s.	per annum.
D° - - d° - - two d° - -	-	-	-	-	10 s.	„
D° - - d° - - three d° - -	-	-	-	-	12 s.	„

“Second Class:—From 14 s. to 22 s. per annum; average about $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day; the ground plan containing 250 superficial feet, and not exceeding 400 superficial feet, charged at $\frac{2}{3}$ d. per foot.

“If the above are more or less than three stories, add or deduct 10 per cent. and if in a good or inferior neighbourhood, add or deduct 10 per cent; also add for watering gardens from 2 s. to 5 s. according to the size.

“Third Class:—From 24 s. to 36 s. per annum; average about 1 d. per day; the ground plan above 400 superficial feet, and not exceeding 600, charged at $\frac{2}{3}$ d. per foot.

“If the above are more or less than four stories, add or deduct same as in 2d class.

“Fourth

(24 February.)

“Fourth Class:—From 40 s. to 52 s. per annum; average about $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day; the ground plan above 600 superficial feet, and not exceeding 850, charged at $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per foot.

“Fifth Class:—From 56 s. to 70 s. per annum; average about 2 d. per day; the ground plan above 850 superficial feet, and not exceeding 1,000, charged at $\frac{4}{5}$ d. per foot.

“Sixth Class:—From 80 s. to 105 s. per annum; average about $3\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day; the ground plan above 1,000 superficial feet, and not exceeding 1,460, charged at $\frac{7}{8}$ d. per foot.

“Seventh Class:—From 120 s. to 160 s. per annum; average about $4\frac{3}{4}$ d. per day; the ground plan above 1,460 superficial feet, and not exceeding 1,900, charged at 1 d. per foot.

“Eighth Class:—168 s. and above, per annum; average about $6\frac{1}{2}$ d. per day; the ground plan above 1,900 superficial feet, charged at 1 d. per foot.

Water-closets, extra each - - - - - 12 s. per annum.

Coach-houses and stables, viz. for a coach and pair - 12 s. „

Each single coach-house - - - - - 6 s. „

„ Dwelling above - - - - - 8 s. „

„ Horse and chaise - - - - - 8 s. „

„ Horse and cart - - - - - 8 s. „

Livery stables, per stall - - - - - 2 s. 6 d. „

„ „ each coach, or stand for ditto - - - 5 s. „

Manufactories, &c. if delivered into a low situation, $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per barrel; but if from ten to twenty feet high, 1 d. per barrel.

Breweries, if delivered into a low situation, at per barrel, taken from the excise books, 1 d. but if delivered from twenty to thirty feet high, 2 d.

Watering streets by scoops or carts, per superficial yard between the foot-pavements, 1 d. per annum.

“*Tho^s Simpson,*

“February 24th 1821.”

“Inspector-general to Chelsea waterworks.”

“COMPARISON of original Expense between an Iron and Wooden Pipe of four Inches diameter.

Four-inch iron pipe, laid down in the year 1810, cost 11 s. 9 d. per yard.

Four-inch wooden pipe, laid down in the year 1810, cost 5 s. 2 d. per yard.”

“ESTIMATE of the Expense of probable Repairs of Iron and Wooden Pipes of four Inches diameter, during the course of thirty years.

Four-inch iron pipes:—Expense of repairs during thirty years, including proportion of taking up, cleaning and relaying, which will be necessary once in fifty years, 3 s. $1\frac{1}{4}$ d. per yard.

Four-inch wooden pipes:—Expense of repairs during thirty years, including twice renewing and proportion of two years more, 11 s. $2\frac{1}{4}$ d. per yard.

“Pursuant to an order of the Select Committee respecting the supply of water to the metropolis,

“*Tho^s Simpson,*

“February 24, 1821.”

“Inspector-general to Chelsea waterworks.”

“REMARKS on the Comparison of the original Expense between an Iron and Wooden Pipe of four Inches diameter, and Expense of probable Repairs of each during the course of thirty years.

“With respect to the cost of four-inch iron pipe laid down in the year 1810, it is necessary to observe, that 11 s. 9 d. per yard is for straight pipes only; and there will be an additional expense for branch, elbow and plug pipes; also for cocks, and for fining ferrules, all of which are greater in iron than in wooden pipes; that is to say, the extra expense will amount to $2\frac{1}{2}$ d. per yard, in a pipe of four inches diameter.

(24 February.)

“ The following are three particular instances of the contraction of the orifices of iron pipes, which came under my observation :—

“ In the year 1789, in consequence of the great difficulty experienced in supplying Windsor-castle with water, I was ordered by the surveyor general of His Majesty’s office of works, to ascertain the cause, if possible. The engine which supplies the castle is worked by the fall of the river Thames, and the pumps are supplied from a spring. Upon examination, I found the leaden conveyance pipe for the engine to the castle, very defective, and recommended two-and-a-half inch iron pipe to be substituted, which was done. In the year 1816, the same deficiency of supply took place as in 1789, but not from the same cause. I had, from my observations, experienced the incrustation of iron pipes, and concluded the pipe was almost stopped ; and having recommended the pipe to be taken up, I ascertained the orifice was little more than one inch diameter, the incrustation being nearly equal all round the internal surface of the pipe.

“ In the year 1791 it was found necessary to take up and relay a twelve-inch iron main (of flanch pipes, which were originally laid down in the year 1746) from the Chelsea waterworks engine to the reservoir in Hyde Park, in consequence of the joints being perished. The incrustation on the internal surface of this main was in irregular lumps, and upon an average about half an inch thick ; the diameter of the pipe being contracted to nearly eleven inches.

“ In the year 1819 the difficulty of supplying the reservoir in Kensington Gardens, near the palace, had increased to such an extent, that it became absolutely necessary to ascertain the cause ; and having taken the proper steps, I found the pipe was contracted by incrustation. The pipe was originally five inches diameter ; and from the Chelsea waterworks books was laid by government in the year 1751. The pipe was contracted to three inches diameter, and the incrustation covered the internal surface in irregular lumps.

“ From the foregoing observations an inference may be drawn, that the incrustation on the internal surface of iron pipes will, in the course of fifty years, so contract the orifices, that it will be absolutely necessary for the pipes to be taken up, cleaned and relaid, during which process some of them may be injured. It had long been discovered, in the instance of the pipe which supplies the reservoir in Kensington Gardens from the Chelsea waterworks main, that great difficulty had arisen in making the service, and the cause was unknown until the pipe was examined, so that the incrustation had, it must be presumed, originated some years before that period. It is necessary to observe, that by the progressive incrustation, and consequent contraction of the orifices of the pipes, the friction of the water passing through them will be increased, and either a greater power or longer time will be required to force the same quantity of water through iron pipes at the end of fifty years, than was originally allowed. Upon this computation it may be stated, that the progressive requisite increase of power or of time, will occasion a corresponding increase of expense, which in the fiftieth year may amount to fifty per cent. more than was found sufficient in the first year. It is also necessary to observe, that this progress of incrustation in iron pipes is calculated upon a supposition that the river Thames water only is used in the pipes.

“ There is another material consideration in the expense of the probable repairs of iron pipes, which is not included in the estimate ; viz. the expense of the probable repairs of cocks will be greater in iron than in wooden pipes ; and having carefully estimated such extra expense, I find during the course of thirty years it will amount to three pence per yard in a four-inch iron pipe.

“ With respect to the duration of wooden pipes in the district supplied by the Chelsea waterworks, the water being forced through them by engines, on an average they do not last more than fourteen years, and the estimate of the probable expense of the repairs is made out accordingly.

“ *Tho^s Simpson,*

“ February 24th, 1821.”

“ Inspector-general to Chelsea waterworks.”

Lunæ, 26^o die Februarij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *John Southam*, Called in; and Examined.

WHAT is your situation?—To attend the flood-gates at the open part of the King's Scholars Pond sewer.

Flap-keeper?—Yes.

How long have you held the situation?—Upwards of twenty-years.

Explain the nature of the business you have to perform as flap-keeper?—To keep the gates shut to prevent the Thames water getting up the Scholar sewers, and to see that there is no impediment in the drains.

Have you any distinct recollection of the average quantity of water received from the town into the open parts of the sewer at dry seasons of the year in and before the year 1810, as compared with the average quantity that now flows into it at similar seasons?—It is a hard case to say exactly; to the best of my information I should think there may be an increase of one-third.

More water is discharged down the sewers than there used to be?—Yes.

If the quantity of water supplied by the water companies to the inhabitants of that part of the town drained by your sewer was generally reduced to one half of its present amount, do you believe that that diminution in the supply would produce such a difference in the height to which the drainage-water rises in the open sewer as to be perceived by you?—I should think it would.

What sort of difference would it make in the level of the sewer, when it is coming down, in the height of the water?—I should think as much as a foot.

What is the depth of the whole?—I should think about three feet; and it would make a foot difference.

What is the height of the drain now?—About three feet.

You never made a measurement?—No, never.

Do you consider there has been much variation in consequence of the supply of water from the companies since 1810?—There certainly has been an increase; I cannot say to what extent.

In the last two or three years particularly, do you consider there has been an increase beyond the years preceding that?—I should think not.

From your own experience, what benefit do you attach to this increase of water?—I do not know of any benefit particularly, except that it cleanses the sewer.

Mr. *John Dowley*, Called in; and Examined.

YOU are Surveyor of the Westminster sewers?—Yes.

Have you any recollection of the quantity of water formerly collected in the open parts of the sewers in dry seasons, compared with the average quantity now collected in them at similar seasons?—I have some knowledge.

How long have you been in this situation?—I have been with them ever since 1810.

Do you consider that since the year 1810 there has been a considerable increase of water in those sewers?—Not a very considerable quantity.

To what extent do you consider that increase?—Not more than one-fourth; but at all events, not more than one-third: but it varies according to circumstances.

Have your sewers been improved in the construction since you have had the inspection of them?—Yes; particularly the lateral sewers: some years past they have undergone a very considerable improvement; and the main sewer has lately undergone a considerable improvement.

And that would create an increase of the passage independent of the water?—Not of the quantity; it would let it pass off with more facility; their ill construction would not prevent the flowing of the water.

The channels are wider?—Yes.

Mr.
John Southam.

(26 February.)

Mr.
John Dowley.

Mr.
John Dowley.

(26 February.)

Do you take that into calculation when you say one-fourth increase ; do you take that into consideration as well as the increase of water thrown into the sewers?—Yes, both.

Do you judge merely by the increase of levels?—No ; I judge from the works going on in the sewers where the breach has happened : we have the means of conveying the water by troughs during the repair of the sewer.

Have you perceived any increase in the last two or three years more than there was in 1810, 1811, or 1812?—It has been gradually increasing since 1810.

Not more particularly in the last two or three years?—No.

Do you consider in the district drained by the King's Scholars Pond sewer a great portion of the water supplied by the public companies is suffered by the tenants, through negligence, to run to waste more than formerly?—Not more in proportion than as the town extends : we always found a great run of water at the time the water was laid on at the houses ; there was apparently a great waste.

Do you find it to have increased since the water has been applied to the district, and the water companies have been established?—Not particularly.

Your acquaintance with your present office began in 1810?—Yes.

You have no means of speaking before 1810?—No.

You have a perfect recollection of the state of the sewers in 1810?—Yes.

And you have mentioned an improvement in the lateral sewers?—Yes.

And putting that aside, do you consider the increased supply of water since 1810, tends to cleanse the sewers more than before?—Yes ; but that is not the principal improvement ; it has been in the improvement of the lateral sewers.

Are the works more immediately under your direction affected by the water being on in any particular part of the town more than another?—No.

You have said that you perceive a difference in the quantity of water discharged into the sewers at the time the water is on?—I am alluding now to the lateral sewers ; but the main sewer varies : the water in the main sewer generally begins to be increased visibly about eight o'clock in the morning, and we attribute that greatly to the use that is made of it in houses, and it keeps running with great velocity and in great quantities till four in the afternoon.

Mr. George Saunders, Called in ; and Examined.

Mr.

George Saunders.

YOU are Chairman of the Court of Sewers?—I am.

How long have you been in that situation?—Now about sixteen years.

Did you belong to the Court previous to your being chairman?—I have belonged to the commission about twenty-six years.

Many improvements that have taken place in the sewers, have been from your suggestion?—A great many of them ; they have been in a continual course of improvement ever since I have been in the chair.

You heard the evidence given by the surveyor and sluice-keeper in respect to the quantity of water passing that sewer, the product of the waterworks at the present period compared with the period immediately preceding the establishment of the new water companies ; the Committee wish to be informed whether you concur in that evidence, and to receive the observations you may think it fit to make thereupon?—I have not myself observed any increase in the ordinary flow of the water in the King's Scholars Pond sewer. It should be observed, that sometimes our attention is not called to the common flow of the water from household uses, but to the great flow of water in floods ; we pay very little regard as to taking account of the common flow of water ; and therefore, if there has been an additional flow of water, it has escaped my notice. I should add also, to show that the flow of water from household uses makes but little show in the sewers as to attracting one's notice, that the King's Scholars Pond sewer drains a district altogether perhaps ten times as large as that drained by the Hartshorn-lane sewer, which discharges in Northumberland-street : our sewer discharges by the side of Tothill-fields, Westminster. On the west side of Tothill-fields, the Hartshorn-lane sewer drains a district of the town, not half so much as the district of town drained by the King's Scholars Pond sewer. I am confining it now to the town drainage ; but the district drained by the Hartshorn-lane sewer, is carrying as much of the ordinary flow of water as the King's Scholars Pond sewer, or thereabouts, and that is owing to several works with steam engines being upon the district drained by the Hartshorn-lane sewer. I mention this to show how little difference the ordinary household uses of water will make in the show of water ; but in times of floods

Mr.

George Saunders.

(26 February.)

floods the King's Scholars Pond sewer is carrying perhaps ten times, or twenty times more than the other districts. I am stating the difference that takes place in the ordinary time, and the time of great flood.

Is it within your knowledge that the supply of water afforded by the New River and Chelsea companies to the respective tenants residing southward of the New-road, was very generally complained of as inadequate to the wants of the inhabitants before the establishment of the new companies in 1810 and 1811?—If I may be allowed to speak from what I have heard, I must say I did hear complaints; but from my own knowledge, at my own house, I was abundantly supplied; in short, I had no ball-cock, and they never required it; but my water was laid upon the main of the New River company, and it had served another house before it came to mine.

Have your sewers suffered any particular grievance by the exercise of the powers vested in the water companies, which you think necessary in any new Act to be passed to amend?—Our powers are so ample, I do not apprehend we want any more.

As regarding their abuses or their means of injuring your sewers?—I believe they have no means in their power, but what we have the means to correct; they cannot touch a sewer without coming to the court for leave; they are liable to punishment if they do.

Has any case of the kind occurred within your own knowledge, which you think ought to be provided for in any other new act for the regulation of those companies?—Nothing has occurred to me, conceiving our powers perfectly ample.

What is the nature and constitution of the court of sewers?—It is a commission issued from the King.

You consider a house supplied with water more valuable than a house without it?—Yes, certainly.

You would think it reasonable that the company should have the power of obtaining the rent somehow or other?—Yes; and that they should have more power than they have.

You think the powers are deficient at present?—Yes, of the New River; they have no remedy but to cut off the water.

Have your works belonging to the commissioners of sewers sustained any injury from the laying down the pipes or the aqueducts of the companies?—There have been, at times; when they have been driving their works they have been discovered to have done mischief, but in all those cases they have been sent to in a proper way; the mischief has been remedied, and they have made some apology; such as the necessary haste of the thing.

So that they have always corrected what was amiss?—Yes; I do not know of any thing remaining.

You are aware, that being a court of law, you have a power above the committee of managers of the water companies, therefore you would control whatever they were presuming to do amiss?—As far as their acts of parliament will allow us to do; but sometimes acts of parliament for bodies like them get clauses which restrict the powers of the commissioners in some small degree.

Are you aware that the powers of the commissioners of sewers have been at all interfered with by those water companies?—Not at all, I believe, by any one of them; I believe there is a saving clause in all of them.

No mischief has been sustained by the commissioners from any of those companies?—I do not know of any.

Do you look at the periodical floods as the great source of cleansing out the sewers?—In summer particularly we do.

In point of fact, if there were no floods, you would find the want of them materially?—Oh, yes, very materially; there are parts of the town, take Grosvenor-square, for example, where, during the summer, there is scarcely a drop of water in use in the whole square for household purposes; those sewers get very dry, and nothing but a thunder storm or a good flood of rain would move it; but fortunately our main sewers have been very much improved; we understand that business much better now than ten or twenty years ago; we give our main attention to that: formerly the fall was so irregular, it was sometimes hollow, and sometimes raised so much, it was an obstruction to the lateral sewers; and by giving our attention to that, the water flows off in a manner much better than it did, and more perfectly.

Mr.
George Saunders.

(26 February.)

In the discharge of the sewers, does not the river Hay produce a very beneficial effect?—There is a spring under the Hampstead Hill which we have been very careful to get Parliament to preserve, to prevent a diversion of it in any other way; because in summer that is more beneficial to us than any other water coming into the sewer; that forms, I imagine, what was formerly called the Hay brook.

Is it your opinion that no greater profusion of water flows into the sewers, nor are the sewers and drains kept more clear than ten years since?—I have not observed the increase of water; if there has been, I have not observed it, our attention being chiefly drawn to the flood-water.

You have mentioned that the powers of the commissioners of sewers are very extensive; do the commissioners of sewers in the town of London act under particular local acts, or the powers of the general act?—Originally under the general powers of the act of Hen. VIII. extended to the districts about London by many local acts, because that would not enable us to act above the tide level.

In case of any disagreement with the water companies, or with any other body, with respect to your works, what is your impression, from the experience of twenty-six years in this commission, of the mode of proceeding for compelling a restoration of any damage that may be done to your works?—By bringing them before the court of sewers, and then requiring them to do what the court orders to be done.

Have you ever had any further resistance to the powers of the court of sewers, so as to require compulsion?—In no instance, that I recollect, from the water companies.

The question is general?—It requires a great deal of recollection to ascertain that; I am endeavouring to recollect a case of resistance.

Did you ever go the length of fine and imprisonment?—Oh, yes, fines every quarter.

Have you recovered fines?—We send them into the court of exchequer; they are always returned every quarter.

Do you make use of a jury upon such an occasion, or not?—Not for fines or amercements as they are called.

Do you generally make use of a jury, or not, upon settling a question?—Not ordinarily, but upon particular occasions we do. I should say we never find any effectual resistance.

Mr. Joseph Steevens, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
Joseph Steevens.

YOU are Engineer to the East London waterworks?—Yes.

How long have you been engineer?—Between seven and eight years.

Were you long in any situation regarding this company previous to that time?—

No.

How long has that company been established?—I believe in 1807; I am not particularly able to speak to it before my attendance there.

What power of capacity belongs to the East London waterworks to supply water to the metropolis?—It consists of a water-wheel working six pumps and four steam engines.

What are the powers of the steam engines?—One at 20-horse power, two of 40-horse each, and one of 100. I would here beg to observe, that when steam engines are employed to raise water, they are not altogether estimated by horse power; it is more so when employed in machinery; for the same engine which is estimated at 100-horse power, by the increase of the force of steam might be made to perform the work of 120 horses, and so on with engines of a less size; so that the horses power, when applied to raising water is not so definitive as when applied to the grinding corn, or turning other machinery where a rotatory motion is necessary.

How do you account for this difference; what is the cause of it?—Merely the mode in estimating; that where corn is ground they grind the same quantity with an engine of a given power, which before was ground by horse; but the language in estimating an engine to raise water is generally the quantity of water raised, for you have no occasion to regulate so much the velocity of an engine to raise water as other purposes; and therefore, though I could not use an engine for rotatory purposes beyond a given velocity, still I could increase or decrease at pleasure an engine to raise water; that is, I could make the same engine perform ten strokes per

per

per minute, twelve strokes, or perhaps even eighteen or twenty strokes, therefore they are more at command than engines applied to other purposes.

What is the quantity of water you supply by the day, month or year to the metropolis?—I have the statement per diem, per annum, and I have also taken it in barrels and gallons, that being the general denomination for measuring vessels of large capacity.

Can you give it in hogsheads?—The number of hogsheads would be one third less.

Give the Committee the gallons or barrels for 1814?—In 1814 we raised 50,313 barrels per diem, of thirty-six gallons each.

What do you raise now per day?—121,300 barrels per day.

In 1814, per year?—In 1814 the quantity was 18,364,245; in 1820, 44,274,500 barrels.

What is the average quantity you do or can give to each house per day?—We are raising at present, including all houses, three barrels and three quarters per day; we could give one third more; this is including manufactories.

You could give four barrels per day?—Yes, we could.

What is the number of your houses?—I think at present 32,000.

Is this information you have given us the result of any calculation gone into for the purpose?—It is.

What are the number of your services by the day or week?—Our whole number of services probably consists of about 500, they are supplied generally four times per week; there are a few only supplied three times a week.

Do the engines work the same number of services each week in the year?—Each week in the year they do.

How long are the services continued?—From one hour to two hours; there are others which are obliged to be continued from four to six hours; that depends upon the number of tenants to be supplied upon each service.

Do they furnish an equal quantity of water?—Very unequal, some services having not more than forty houses upon them, and others 150.

If your services are only three times a week upon the average, the supply must be equal to the demand of the house for three days?—It is so in most cases in the three days service.

Have you any reason to suppose that the supply furnished is greater than is wanted?—I apprehend it is, and particularly so in certain parts of the eastern districts, the houses are so small and the tenants poor, that they have it not, perhaps, in their power to provide means, either of receiving water sufficient to last them from one water day to another, and some not having any vessels, they allow it to run to waste a large proportion of the time it is on.

Are any of your houses supplied from the main?—There are some, not to a very great extent.

What would you say was the proportion of the 32,000?—I apprehend we have not more upon the main than 200, where we have services, because it happens in some places that they are upon the main till the service is driven, and therefore I should consider on the main, where the services are, not more than 200 houses.

You supply more than what was supplied to the same district previous to the establishment of your company?—Clearly so; the greatest proportion of the district was without a supply.

To what extent more?—We are supplying now more than double the quantity that was supplied in the year 1814.

Previous to 1807?—I cannot speak to that fact; it was before I was upon the work; but I should apprehend there is now supplied twenty times the quantity more than in 1807, taking the district altogether.

Do you consider that much of this supply, at present, runs to waste?—A very considerable portion of it: a considerable portion of it is a very poor and low neighbourhood, inhabited by the very poorest of inhabitants, who have themselves no means of preventing the waste; and when the landlords have provided anything, some of them are so low from distress and other circumstances, they have even destroyed those modes of receiving it.

What is the size of your ball-cocks and service-pipes?—The service-pipes will average about three quarters, some an inch and a quarter, and we have some as much as an inch and a half; for private houses, waterway of the ball-cock increases pretty nearly in proportion to the increase of the service-pipe.

Mr.
Joseph Stevens.
(26 February.)

You have stated that your supply daily to each house amounts to three and three quarters of a barrel; do you consider that this quantity can flow through such a service-pipe in such a time?—Yes; and in many instances, twice or thrice that quantity; we have no service, except in one or two cases, but what is on an hour.

What is the general description and size of your cisterns?—They are various; and if I would speak of the cisterns, I should say they hold from 100 to 150 gallons. I would here beg to observe, as many of our tenants have various small receptacles, merely a pail or a tub, therefore the quantity they can receive will amount to from 8 or 10 gallons to perhaps 50 or 60; but where cisterns are used, they will average as I have stated. I am speaking of private houses, for we have some that contain 50,000 gallons.

You supply a great many brewers?—Yes, we do.

A very considerable proportion of your supply is given to manufactories?—A considerable portion of it.

Probably larger, in that respect, than any other district in the metropolis?—Undoubtedly so.

Have your cisterns been enlarged or altered of late, speaking of private families?—Finding the supply of water abundant, parties have added cisterns, and others have added butts and small casks.

Do you add an additional rate when that takes place?—We have not.

Do you consider that in private families there are more than one cistern upon an average to each house?—I apprehend not more than one upon the average; I should say, perhaps, if we were to take any number, say take 3,000, that 2,000 of them, at any rate, have but one.

Your supply is from the Thames?—The river Lea; supplied ultimately from the Thames.

The river Lea at high water?—Yes; it flows up all from the Thames.

You raise from the river Lea?—We are lower than the Thames; the average level of the Lea is considerably lower than the high water in the Thames. The entrance to the river Lea is a narrow entrance; it is a winding river; and in all cases the tide rises higher in the Thames than it does in those small outlets from it. If it were a wide outlet at the mouth, and the river a straight one, there are cases where it would naturally rise above the actual spot where the water comes from: this is produced by the velocity of the water passing from a wide mouth channel into a narrow one.

Is the whole of your service raised by engine?—Entirely so.

Your ordinary service?—Yes; we have no distinction of high and low tenants; we have made no distinction, nor have we any distinction in charge; we supply them at considerable heights.

What is the highest?—We are working under an average pressure of 120 feet, but occasionally 150 feet above the level of the river Lea.

Where is your reservoir?—We have two reservoirs to receive the waters from the Lea, and we have a small reservoir in Mile-end-road from which we supply a small portion of the district; that is also raised by the power of machinery.

What is the size of your largest reservoir, as to affording supply?—The two reservoirs are competent to hold two days supply, but we have the power of filling them every twelve hours.

You replenish these as you supply the town, daily?—We do.

What height is the reservoir above the level of the river Lea; the highest of them?—We pump from two; the average level of those will be about five feet below the average level of the river Lea.

The water runs in them from the Lea?—Yes.

What is the third reservoir?—Above sixty feet above the level of the river Lea; that is at Mile-end-road.

That is raised by an engine?—Yes; this reservoir at Mile-end will supply only the lower parts of our district, the upper parts being supplied entirely from the engines.

From this reservoir at Mile-end it flows into the lower parts?—Yes; to the extent of about 2,000 houses.

Do you conceive the inhabitants of your district to consume much more water now than at the commencement of your establishment?—Yes, much more so: at the commencement, and probably long after, they had not so much as was actually necessary.

Mr.
Joseph Steevens.
(26 February.)

Can you say in any proportion?—We are actually supplying to the district double the quantity we were in 1814; the district is rather less than it was in 1814.

Have you in your recollection the largest supply you give to any manufactory?—Not the actual gauge; but I should suppose we are supplying a back that contains not less than a thousand barrels at a distillery.

Whose manufactory is this?—It is a distillery in Mile-end-road.

Is this quantity supplied per day?—It is not filled every day; but the supply is kept up, and it is occasionally filled in twenty-four hours.

From emptiness?—Yes: the tenants of that description are supplied daily; they do not come into the denomination of four days per week.

But your average estimate included them?—Yes, exactly; if a distinction is made, the large classes of course, and the small houses, formed the average; but they do not actually receive it, nor could they consume half of it, if they did receive it.

At what period did your agreement with the New River company take place?—At the autumn of 1815.

On what account did that agreement originate?—Two or three circumstances occurred to induce the parties to withdraw from either side of the given line. While we were so in contact with each other, the changes from one company to the other were incessant; the streets constantly broken up; the expenses very material, and the supply very uncertain in the parts near the line given: the ordinary expenses of the companies, when the utmost economy was observed, were but little more, or perhaps no more, than covered. Upon the retiring of the parties, the district became more concentrated, and each found immediately that it fell incumbent upon the parties so retiring, to take especial care (and it was a strict and serious understanding) that the district should be amply provided for. The East London company in consequence (and I apprehend all the others did the same) expended a very large sum of money to increase their machines, their mains and services, and did, in fact, send in double the quantity of water.

Did you exchange, by purchase or arrangement, the works belonging to each other?—I cannot speak to that particularly; but it was generally this: the parties retired behind a given line; the rental and pipes on the one side turned out to be a balance for the pipes and rental on the other. I am not aware that a shilling of money passed between either party.

Was the agreement entered into upon the principle of rental?—It was arranged chiefly with the view of concentrating the works so as to produce the best possible supply to the public; and the line therefore became a crooked line, having respect to the number and size of the mains and services, and the competency of the parties to supply the district so limited.

Is your agreement of that nature to prevent your now re-entering upon your respective districts?—Oh, by no means: if a deficiency of supply called for it, the New River would enter on us, and we should enter on them in the same case.

Do your principal mains connect?—They are not actually connected, but they lie contiguous to each other. I should state, that in case of non-supply for a certain number of days, we have the power of re-entry.

If any defect existed at the present moment, it could not be immediately relieved by the adjoining company?—Not immediately; but probably twenty-four hours would afford us an opportunity of connecting.

What is the diameter of your principal main?—Issuing from the engine, twenty-four inches, one of eighteen inches, one of twelve inches, and another from the water-wheel, of twelve inches.

Are your mains and pipes of wood or iron?—Chiefly iron; we have a small proportion of wood still to change out, but all on the hither side of the river Lea are iron.

You laid down nothing but iron?—Nothing but iron.

Considering that superior to wood?—Yes.

Those pipes which are of wood are those which existed previously to the establishment of the company, or did you lay them down yourselves?—They were found in the district when the company commenced, but they did lay down some wooden ones before they could provide those districts with iron ones.

But from motives of interest you now lay down nothing but iron?—We could not with the force of our engine, supply through wood, except in the very extreme parts, where, from the remoteness of the power of the engine, wood might

Mr.
Joseph Steevens.
(26 February.)

bear it; the capacities of wood pipes are so small when compared with their external diameter, that much inconvenience would have arisen to the public had such pipes been laid down in the streets by all the companies.

What water establishment did you succeed to in the year 1806?—It is a continuation of the Shadwell waterworks, who were incorporated by act of parliament, and the West Ham waterworks. We began our works in about 1807.

Are your rates very much increased since that period?—Not a great deal; I apprehend about 20 per cent.; I apprehend that the secretary is prepared to state that more particularly.

How many hours a day do your engines work?—Fifteen hours a day, the whole force; the twenty-horse engine is kept in reserve, in order that we may be prepared for accidents and other casualties; the two forty-horse engines, the hundred-horse engine, and the water-wheel, work in the day-time; the water-wheel works as long as the tide will drive it, night and day.

The others work fifteen hours?—Yes. When I speak of the twenty-horse engine being reserved, it is taken alternately for one of the forty-horse engines; and where we have alterations to make, so that the supply is interrupted, we then employ an additional power, and supply by night, so that the district shall be again re-instated in its quantity of water, as if no such interruption had taken place.

Do you conceive that you could increase your supply of water, if necessary, very much?—We could increase the supply at least one-third, without adding a single machine. If we were to work more hours, or work the whole of our force, we could work twenty-four hours, and still keep the reservoir untouched, or work the whole power twenty-four hours.

Have you ever had any serious interruption by damage or the non-competency of your engine?—No; having four engines, we are not liable to interruption by accident; for suppose one of them was to be destroyed or incapacitated from working for a week or a month, we could, with our power, so supply the public, that no difference would be discovered in the supply; if we were to discover more than one fire, we should start another.

Are your mains kept constantly charged by night?—Yes.

Was this the case previously to the New River company leaving the district?—Certainly not.

Is there any considerable expense incurred by charging the mains by night?—Very considerable.

Are you not enabled to keep your mains constantly charged from your reservoir?—Not to depend upon it.

What extra quantity of coals do you use, to keep your mains constantly charged for the benefit of the public in case of fire?—From an eighth to a tenth part more than would otherwise be required.

In case of fire, have you any precautions taken to direct an additional supply of water to that part where the fire may rage?—We have.

Is that at a considerable expense?—Yes; the company have provided a watchman to be constantly on the look-out, and to call me at every fire that happens at whatever time of the night it may be; and further, they give rewards to watchmen or to any one who will give early notice to myself, to the superintendents, or to the turncock; and immediately such notice is given, the parties are further rewarded if they come to the works, although we have a watchman constantly employed; and the company, to insure the supply in case of fire, are at the further expense of paying messengers in case it might be possible the watchman had not seen the fire.

Is not this done solely for the benefit of the public, without any recommendation to the company?—It is a great advantage to the public, but a great drawback on the company.

Are your works, as now constituted, liable to be interrupted by a severe frost?—Not by any means; water-wheels in general are not only interrupted, but stopped; but our wheel never has been stopped in consequence of frost, by its being inclosed.

During the time the competition existed between the New River and yourselves, was it not used as an instrument to reduce the rates, and sometimes of evading the rates altogether?—It was to a considerable extent; and great inconvenience arose to the company, and great inconvenience in the public streets, in consequence.

During the time of the competition, was not it usual for a tenant, from half year to

to half year, to refuse payment, and dare the company to take any measure for the recovery of what was owing?—It was very frequently so.

And during that time, they threatened to resort to the other company, and so shift from one to the other when payment was demanded?—Yes, most assuredly they did; many of them were so unreasonable as to declare, and perhaps actually carried it into effect, that unless the company would be at the expense of breaking up the pavement and thawing their pipes during the frost, they would then go to the other companies.

In consequence of the lenity shown to poor tenants, did your arrears of rates increase to a large amount, and what amount?—I cannot speak to the amount, but very considerable.

Any thing near £. 16,000?—From £. 15,000 to £. 20,000; a very large amount.

At the time of the New River retreating from your district, and you from their district, was it done solely for the benefit of the companies, or equally with a view to the advantage of the public?—With regard to the companies, the competition was destructive to themselves and the public; the supply was uncertain, and the only mode of rendering it more certain without an enormous expense to the public, was to withdraw from behind a certain line. If two companies were again to exist in one district, the competition could not be carried on in the ordinary way of other competitions; each must have his whole capital in the district, there fixed, and not to be removed: if the district were divided, both companies, or if there were three or four, must be utterly ruined, or the rates must be increased in the ratio of the number of companies; that is to say, double, and treble, or quadruple, if they are all to live.

When you made the advance of your rate, did you find many cases where, owing to the misrepresentation of the parties, the premises had been very unequally rated?—That was the case: that arose, perhaps, in two or three ways; the secretary, perhaps, will be able to inform the Committee more minutely; but two or three cases came under my notice: it happened with a sugar baker who had been rated twenty or thirty years ago as a one pan house, they had, however, from time to time increased to two, three, and even to four pans; this undoubtedly was without the knowledge of the company, and therefore they had been paying this given small rate, but upon being rated agreeable to the number of pans, without any actual advance per pan, they conceived they had been doubled or trebled, and hence there was some murmuring, but they submitted when they found they were employing four pans and had been only rated at one.

Among the small houses in the eastern district, is it usual for the supply of water to be farmed by the landlord, or for them to agree to pay a rate for the houses, full or empty?—They are farmed by the landlords, who agree, in consequence of having it at a less water rate, to pay full or empty.

Did not, upon many occasions, the landlords actually make a profit by so doing?—There were many cases where they did; there is one comes to my recollection at this moment, where houses were rated at 12s. per annum by the waterworks company, and the tenant paid the landlord 20s. per annum.

Previous to 1808, was the supply from the Shadwell waterworks constant and plentiful for that district?—I have reason to believe it was not, from my own knowledge; for although I was not in the concern, I had much to do with the sewers; I know it was so uncertain, that there were parties for twelve or twenty days without water, and the answer upon application was, we cannot control the tides; the quantity flown into the bason has been exhausted for sugar-bakers and others, and you must wait till the next spring tide.

Were the rates of the Shadwell company lower than your present rates?—They were, at the time the company took possession of them, arranged to be advanced by the London Dock company; the advance was not carried into effect, but I apprehend it was considerably more than subsequently took place when the works came into the hands of the present company.

Has the increase in the Shadwell district exceeded 25 per cent.?—I cannot speak precisely, but I apprehend not equal to that.

Have not the advantages gained been infinitely beyond that?—I believe it may be generally said, the advantages have been at 50 per cent.

Where one individual has been advanced more than another, has not it been owing either to misrepresentation, or being unequally rated throughout, and is

Mr.
Joseph Stevens.
(26 February.)

that the ratio of proportion?—It has been uniformly so where an exorbitant advance happened.

Have your company been always ready and willing to hear any appeal and complaint, and give redress wherever a real grievance existed?—They have been always ready; and it is the instruction of the board of directors to each of their servants, to allow every one to be heard, and introduce him to the board where there is the least ground for complaint.

You have mentioned that the average height you throw water is 120 feet?—Yes; about that.

That is with your steam engine?—Yes.

What is the height you throw it to with the water-wheel?—Not above from 90 to 100; the force of the wheel is not sufficient.

Above the level of the Lea?—Yes.

Does the wheel work at every flood tide?—At every flood tide.

Both at spring and neap, and the intermediate tides?—Yes; the wheel works at least twelve hours out of the twenty-four, taking spring and neap tides together. I have known instances where the wheel has worked what is termed through the whole tide; it has not stopped when there has been some land water flowing, and also the retiring of the neap tides; the wheel has worked nearly the whole of the twenty-four hours.

You said, in answer to a question put to you, that formerly the public had facilities of evasion in the payment of the rates during the competition?—Yes; by leaving the company.

The partition has prevented that?—Yes, to a great extent.

Then you could afford to supply water cheaper now?—We are so doing; we are supplying double the quantity of water.

For the same rate?—No; we supply double the quantity for about an increase of one sixth.

Was it a very capital trade during the competition?—Most assuredly a ruinous one; and it would be utterly impossible, if the East London company were now put back upon the same rate again, with their accumulated power of machinery, to exist.

If matters had gone on as they were, without any such arrangement, it must have ended in the ruin of one or both of the companies?—Very shortly it must.

In point of fact, during the competition, you were obliged to supply at almost any price?—We were very much reduced in consequence of that; it was thought at the moment, before we had greater experience, a mode of establishing ourselves in the district, which ruinous mode incommoded the public, for they had not that reliance they have now; for at night, when there were three or four companies, one looked to the other and thought probably the mains would be charged, but as none of them were paid, it frequently happened none of them were charged, and you had to go to the fountain head to get a supply; but when the companies retired from the line, the public must and did look wholly to them for the supply, and a large sum of money was expended for that purpose. I was instructed to take every possible care that the confidence of the public should not be betrayed, but that we should meet it, and be able to say to them, you have now a dependence for a supply at all times, because the court of directors felt themselves responsible for every deficiency in a case of that kind, and therefore especial care was taken, and a large sum of money was expended in increasing the power of the machinery and extending the mains and services.

Does the whole of your supply go through one principal main?—Through four mains.

There are four mains it goes through previous to the services?—Yes.

There is no one principal main through which it goes previous to going into the other mains?—No; and those mains are so constructed as to be capable of being connected immediately with any other main.

In case of any injury to any one of those mains, the supply would not be stopped?—It would not.

In point of fact, did not the London Bridge company go beyond the city?—They do supply many hundred houses out of the city; in Goodman's Fields and Whitechapel, the old Artillery Ground, Spitalfields, and the upper part of Shoreditch, and those parts which clash in with us, we have reason to know it, particularly in frost,

frost, for we then supply their tenants by our stand-pipes, inasmuch as their wheels become generally stationary.

Mr. *Thomas Nelson Pickering*, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
Joseph Stevens.

(26 February.)

Mr.
T. N. Pickering.

YOU are Secretary to the East London waterworks company?—I am.

How long have you been secretary?—From the incorporation of the company, in 1807.

What was the origin of the institution of this company?—The eastern district, before the incorporation of the company, was chiefly supplied by the New River, partly by London Bridge, and partly by the old concerns of Shadwell and West Ham waterworks, but great part of the district had no supply at all.

Do you mean they got it from the Thames in buckets?—In any way they could: those were the allegations proved before the House, and which induced the House to incorporate our company: the company was incorporated by the 47 Geo. 3, c. 72.

Was there any evidence to show the extent of the supply of all those resources within the district at that time?—I do not think there was.

You have no means of knowing that?—No.

Were there no returns of the Shadwell or West Ham supply at that time?—I believe not.

How long was it after your incorporation you began to supply this district?—In 1809 I think the works were completed at Old Ford, but I think it was two years afterwards before we could supply the district; I think it was in 1811.

You have heard most of the evidence given by the engineer; do you agree to the quantity of water supplied and the number of tenants?—I am not competent to speak to the quantity of water, it is out of my department; but so far as I have heard the engineer, I believe what he has asserted is strictly correct in every particular.

When was the first dividend paid?—Before I answer that question, I would state that there was a part of our undertaking originated from the Shadwell and West Ham establishment; for by the act of the legislature of the 48 Geo. 3, our company were enabled to purchase the Shadwell and West Ham waterworks, and they were incorporated with us as one concern; from that time, from the Shadwell and West Ham waterworks, a rental arose to the East London; from that period, and out of that rental, a dividend was made to our proprietors so early as 1809, of one per cent. that was made out of the gross rental of the Shadwell and West Ham works.

How were the expenses paid?—The expenses were paid by the East London company out of their capital.

That was a dividend out of their capital?—Yes, it was.

The Shadwell and West Ham companies were a part of your concern?—Yes.

At the time you paid it out of the rental?—Yes, it was.

When was the second dividend paid?—In July, in the same year.

From the same source?—Yes.

How much?—Two pounds.

Do you recollect the estimated value of your shares previous to the dividend being made?—Such was the rage for concerns of that kind that the price of the shares was very high; I believe, previous to the dividend, there was as much as £.60 premium upon £.100 shares; the capital was £.380,000, raised in shares of £.100 each.

Do you recollect the price of the shares after the second dividend?—They gradually increased till they got up to the enormous price of about £.130 premium.

Did you make a third dividend?—In January 1810, of two pounds.

From the same source?—Yes.

Was there any further dividend?—In July, two pounds more.

From the gross rental?—Yes.

Any further dividend?—Yes; in January 1811, two-and-a-half, from the same source; in July 1811, two-and-a-half.

Any further dividend?—In January 1812, one pound; in July, one pound; in 1813, no dividend whatever.

In 1814?—No dividend whatever.

1815?—In January 1815, one pound; in July 1815, one pound; in January 1816, one pound; in July, one pound; in January 1817, one and a quarter; in July of the same year, one and a quarter; in January 1818, one and a half.

Mr.
T. N. Pickering.

(26 February.)

Have you had any dividend from the net rental?—Yes, from 1814; the dividend of January 1815, of one pound, was out of the net rental.

That was after the partition?—The partition was at Michaelmas 1815.

What was the price of your shares when the agreement took place?—They were then at a considerable discount, as much as £.45 discount; there has been no dividend paid since February 1820; the last dividend was in February 1820, of one and three quarters.

You have heard the former witness state the system of competition, and the other many expenses incurred, and the means resorted to to gain custom; give the Committee your opinion of the reasonableness of any ground to increase the rates beyond what they existed at the formation of your company?—The engineer has very properly told the Committee the difficulty we had in collecting the rates, and the undue lowering of the rates.

The question was upon what ground you consider you are authorized to increase the rates beyond those which existed when your establishment took place in 1807?—Inasmuch as we could not make a dividend without.

Do you know what the average of the rates were at that time previous to your establishment?—No; I do not know that.

You are in the habit of compounding for your rates?—Yes, with the proprietors of large numbers of houses.

Farming them?—Yes, full or empty.

What is the charge for houses of one or two rooms, when compounded for, and when not compounded for?—Ten shillings, when compounded for, and twelve when not; but that depends much upon the size of the house; we have some that are not farmed, at ten shillings; the rates are generally two shillings less where farmed.

Were the West Ham and Shadwell establishments losing concerns at the time your establishment was formed?—I was led to understand so from the former proprietors, the London Dock company, although they had made a rise in the rates.

When your establishment was formed, did you purchase out those companies?—Yes.

What was the amount of the purchase money?—£. 130,000; the transaction is recited in the act of 48 Geo. 3, c. 8.

Was part of the £. 380,000, your capital, employed in that way?—It was.

The London Dock company did not supply water?—No; in the formation of the docks, they excavated a part of the district, and the legislature compelled them to purchase the Shadwell waterworks.

Is the London Dock company a water company now?—No.

At what time were the shares at this enormous sum of £.130?—I cannot exactly tell: I think about 1810 or 1811.

You think about Michaelmas 1815 they were at forty per cent. discount?—Yes.

Have they decreased or increased since?—They have been pretty much the same up to within a few months since, when they looked up a little; the last transfer in my office was done at £.66 per share. I have heard £.70 asked lately.

At the period when this dividend was made out of this gross rental, were the proprietors generally aware of that fact?—Certainly; because they knew we had no income whatever from the original undertaking.

The purchasers could not be aware of that fact?—I cannot answer that; I should apprehend not.

Were the proprietors informed by the court of directors of the state of the concerns?—Certainly, by their half-yearly reports and accounts.

Why has not there been any dividend since 1820?—There have been no means; there has been an additional capital actually expended on the undertaking, beyond the capital of £.380,000, to the amount of £.45,000.

How was that raised?—Instead of making a dividend from the revenue.

You did not have recourse to the bank, or any public company?—We have borrowed of individuals to the amount of £. 22,000 beyond the before-mentioned sums of £. 380,000 and £. 45,000.

Were the works of the West Ham and Shadwell companies of very considerable value to you in your undertaking?—Their pipes were of wood, but it gave us immediate possession of the district.

What proportion of the £.130,000 was in actual value of works?—I cannot answer that question.

What proportion of it was for the mere good-will of the district?—That I cannot answer.

Have

Have you made any dividend from net profits?—Yes.

What part of the dividends have been from net profits?—Those which have been made since 1814.

When this fever of speculation went off, did the injury accrue to the speculators or the tenants?—To the speculators only.

So that no mischief accrued to the water tenants?—Certainly none.

Of the arrear the engineer has stated to accrue to the company, how much ended in total loss?—The amount of the arrears up to Christmas 1820, which have been parted off as irrecoverable, is £. 15,348.

Does not your water rate amount to 20s. a house, at the average, taking the houses great and small throughout?—Yes; including the manufactories, and making allowances for houses actually empty, it is as nearly as possible 20s. a house: the gross rental is £. 34,000; and making allowance for houses actually empty, it is as near as possible 20s.: upon further reflection, I think it would be 22s. or thereabouts.

What is the difference between the gross rental and the actual receipts?—I can hardly tell that at present.

Does it amount to about £. 2,000 or £. 3,000 a year?—Not quite so much; but that would appear by the returns directed.

Is there not a considerable difference between the sum actually received, and the sum which ought to be received?—Yes.

Can you tell the amount of the rental expended in the increased capital?—I cannot.

When you made your equalization, did you do it with a view to justice and fairness as much as you could?—Yes, certainly.

Is your work in such a situation as to the work, that you can form a calculation as to what the expenditure will be in the maintenance of it?—I think it is.

What is the expenditure?—I apprehend the permanent expenditure to be £. 11,000 a year.

In the whole of the establishment?—No, not including repairs; I am not able to state that.

What does the £. 11,000 allude to?—The permanent expenses, salaries of officers, coals, and so on; near £. 4,000 a year is expended for coals, but including no repairs whatever.

Have you any ground-rents to pay on account of your works?—Yes.

Are your reservoirs on ground purchased by you or on rented ground?—The works at Old Ford are upon freehold ground.

The two larger reservoirs?—Yes.

Is the small one too?—The Shadwell works are upon leasehold.

Do you pay any considerable sum in taxes or rates?—Yes, we do.

Do you know about the amount?—No, I do not.

Do you consider as part of the loss that which goes in taxes or rates?—No.

There is no other expense except empty houses?—And tenants removing.

How can that happen when the landlord is bound to pay?—Where landlords pay it does not happen, except in a very few instances.

Mercurii, 28^o die Februarij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Matthew Chitty Marshall*, Called in; and Examined.

WHAT is your situation?—Secretary and chief Clerk to the South London Waterworks.

When were your waterworks first established?—In the year 1805.

What establishment was supplying your district at that time?—Not any that I am aware of.

What does your district comprehend generally?—It takes Clapham, Brixton, Acre-lane, the Kent-road and Bermondsey; those are the principal districts.

Most of it, then, is on the other side of the water?—On the Surrey side of the water; entirely on the Surrey side of the water.

706.

What

Mr.
T. N. Pickering.

(26 February.)

Mr.
M. C. Marshall.

(28 February.)

Mr.
M. C. Marshall

(28 February.)

What is the quantity of water that you give in the course of the week or year?—About 42,000 hogsheads per week; I have it 42,740 hogsheads per week.

The whole year round?—The whole year round.

What is the average quantity you give to each house per day?—I calculate about eight hogsheads per week.

How many houses do you serve?—5,200 houses.

That is rather more than a hogshead a day then?—Eight hogsheads per week.

Have you many manufactories in your district?—Several in Bermondsey.

Fellmongers?—And leather-dressers.

You take that calculation that you have made upon the gross quantity, including manufactories?—Yes, I do; there are many small families that do not require one half of that quantity.

What are your number of services by the week or day?—We divide our services into three parts; the Clapham, Brixton and Acre-lane; and another called the home service; the other is considered one, and is called the Bermondsey service.

Are the services put on every day?—Every day.

All the three services?—To Clapham, Acre-lane and Brixton three days a week, and Bermondsey three days a week, so that each tenant is continued three days a week.

How long are your services generally continued?—Eleven hours.

Not on for each house eleven hours?—No; the whole day's service eleven hours.

It supplies the lower houses first, and so gradually rises and supplies the higher?—Yes.

How long is each service on?—Not more than an hour.

Do your engines work the same number of services during the whole year?—The same number of services during the year.

And your services are equal to the demand completely?—Oh, completely.

Do you conceive that your supply is greater than is wanted by your district?—We could supply double the number of houses we now do.

You do not furnish more than they require, only what they demand?—We do not.

How was your district supplied previously, by pumps and by private mains?—I believe so, there was the Lambeth company which can come up to our present gates.

Does it work in the same district as you now?—It works in the same district; but the Lambeth company have it in their power to come into our district, though we are prevented from going into theirs.

Do they come into your district?—Every day.

So that there is a competition of water companies?—Yes; but we have it not in our power to serve the same district which the Lambeth company do.

What is the general size of your service-pipes?—Three quarters of an inch.

What is the size of your main?—The largest main is twelve inches.

What is the general description and size of your cisterns?—They are generally butts that we supply.

Butts of two hogsheads?—Yes.

Are there generally more than one to each house?—Generally two to each house; I ought to distinguish particularly on the Clapham road, where they require a greater quantity; Clapham, Brixton, and Acre-lane; because they are quite a different description of customers from those in Bermondsey.

Is all the water in your district drawn from the Thames by your works?—Yes.

Have you a reservoir?—We have two.

Where?—Close to the works, from which the engine works.

What height is your reservoir above the Thames?—I calculate about fourteen feet.

Is the whole of your supply given by engines, forced?—Entirely.

What is the high service you supply from the Thames?—I have taken the elevation from our own works, and from the works to the high service which is at Clapham, and the highest is sixty-five feet from the reservoir.

That is eighty feet the whole height from the river?—Yes.

Near Clapham church, is not it?—To the Plough at Clapham.

Can you give any information with regard to the difference of quantity in high service and ordinary service; do you make a distinction in your rates between high service and low service?—No, not any.

Every thing is charged alike, whether it goes to the top of the house or to the basement story?—No; upon cisterns at the top of the house some little addition is made, perhaps 20s. more, not more than that.

Upon what rental?—Forty shillings.

Then

Then you do make a distinction between high service and ordinary service?—We do not call them high services, we call them cisterns on a high elevation, but there are very few.

Have you any scale of those elevations?—No.

It is merely upon your own observation?—Entirely.

Are your mains and pipes of wood or iron?—Now they are principally of iron.

In your first establishment you laid down wood?—They were entirely of wood.

But since, they have been altered to iron, most of them?—Most of them to iron.

From that circumstance, you consider iron superior in quality and most advantageous?—Most certainly.

State your reasons for this opinion?—From their durability, and being less subject to repair.

How long has your longest iron main or pipe been put down?—Ours were put down immediately on the establishment; that was in the year 1805.

One of the principal mains?—One of the principal mains.

And some of the smaller pipes?—And some of the smaller pipes.

Have you ever had an examination of these pipes since?—I have seen these pipes since, that were then laid down; the iron pipes as well as the wooden pipes.

For what purpose were they taken up?—The joints were imperfectly made; they were done by contract, and done improperly.

Did you make any observation at that time upon the pipes?—I did.

When was this?—This was two years ago.

They had then been down about fourteen years?—Thirteen years.

Did you observe any defect about them?—Not any; neither inside nor out.

You said you forced water sixty-five feet above the level of the reservoir, is that the extreme point of your highest elevation?—That is the extreme point we can serve.

Is that on Clapham Common?—There are some water-closets there about sixty-two feet; we have a few water-closets above that elevation.

In point of fact, you can supply the top of the houses in the Clapham district?—We could; and there was a proof of it in a fire that took place at Clapham: the Plough at Clapham was burnt down, and we supplied that with water.

Upon the taking up of those iron mains, that were originally put down, you mentioned the joints as being imperfect; did you consider it to be in consequence of the imperfect formation of the joints, and not in consequence of a fair decay of that joint?—Entirely to an imperfectness of the joints.

In consequence of an evasive contract?—Not being done in a workmanlike manner.

What joints were those; do you know the difference between a socket joint and a flanch joint?—Those were flanch joints.

You say in a part of your district, the South Lambeth supply also?—The Lambeth.

In that part of the district was there any competition of rates between you; did you acquire any of their tenants by supplying at a cheaper rate than the Lambeth?—We never held out that inducement; and I do not think we did.

Did you supply cheaper?—No; exactly the same price, as near as possible.

Did you gain any tenants from them, or did they gain any from you?—I believe it is not from any reduction of prices; we imagine that we supply clearer water.

But, in point of fact, you do gain upon them, as you suppose?—And from the increase of population in our neighbourhood.

Do you take tenants from them, or do they take from you?—I do not suppose we take from either of the companies the value of ten houses a year.

On either side?—No.

Have you any regulations between you, about taking tenants from each other?—Not any.

No understanding?—Not any whatever.

How is your reservoir supplied from the Thames?—The tide brings it into our reservoir.

Then it is a rise you get by the tide?—Yes.

What is the size of your reservoir?—One hundred and fifty feet; the two basons will give four days supply.

You are secretary?—Yes.

What have been the dividends the company have derived from their concern?—Not any.

Not any whatever?—No.

Thomas Simpson,
Esq.

(28 February.)

What have you done with your rates received?—Laid down the iron pipes.
Then you have added it to your capital?—Yes.

Thomas Simpson, Esq. Again called in; and Examined.

WHAT situation do you hold in the Lambeth works?—Engineer.
As well as for Chelsea?—Yes.

Are those very old works?—They commenced in 1785; the act was obtained in that year, I think.

Was it in the room of any other works that then existed?—There were none in that district.

Is it a company?—A company of proprietors.

Does it furnish water on the Middlesex side at all?—None, whatever.

All the Surrey side?—All the Surrey side.

What district does it comprehend generally?—It goes a small way into the Borough, and it goes as far as Kennington Common, Vauxhall and Walworth; it goes through Walworth, and then to the Kent-road, near the canal bridge of the Grand Surrey canal.

What are the number of houses supplied?—The secretary is here, and will give the number of houses.

What capacity do those works afford for supplying water to that district?—The annual quantity raised is 7,193,830 hogsheads; but we have means to supply 26,163,590.

What you supply at this time then is as much as is demanded?—Fully.

From whence is your water produced?—Immediately from the river, opposite Hungerford.

The whole from the river?—The whole from the river.

Have you any calculation as to the quantity to each house at the present moment?—Some years back I made it out, and it amounted then to one hogshead and three quarters per house.

Have you reason to think it is increased since then?—I should think it has; but the houses are of a very small description, principally four roomed houses.

Then the great consumption is by the manufactories in that neighbourhood?—There are some manufactories and two brewers.

Any distillers?—No, I believe not.

Any tanners?—We did serve two tanners; but I think we only serve one now: but the secretary will be able to give that statement.

Do you apprehend the consumption of the manufactories to cut a considerable figure in your whole consumption?—No, a very small proportion; they are principally hatters.

What are the number of your services per day?—I cannot say; I am not in possession of that.

If you do not know, who does?—I must procure it.

Is the whole of your water raised by engines?—Wholly.

What reservoirs have you?—We have none.

Then what is the highest elevation you raise at present?—Sixty feet.

That is the very extreme height of your elevation?—The very extreme height.

Have you any distinction between high service and ordinary service?—None whatever.

Your rates are calculated exactly the same?—Exactly the same.

And yet you serve to the top of houses?—We do not profess to serve above two or three and twenty feet above the level of the pavement.

In no instance do you serve above that?—No.

The power of your engine does not exceed sixty feet above the level of the Thames?—No.

And that you consider about twenty-three feet above the level of the pavement?—We could go six-and-thirty, or forty, I dare say.

What is the construction of your pipes and mains, iron or wood?—The mains are principally iron, and some of the pipes. Of late years we have increased the size of our mains very materially, and likewise we have laid down a number of iron services.

Originally you laid down wood?—Originally the whole was wood.

And you laid down iron in consequence of finding the advantage of it?—Yes; when it commenced it was a trifling concern, but in the increase of buildings it required larger engines, which we have put up since that; we have built two new engines since the original.

And

And in consequence of the largeness of your means you have laid larger mains?—
We have laid down an eighteen-inch iron main, and a twelve-inch, a ten-inch, and two nine-inches.

Do you happen to know much about the proprietors of this concern?—Certainly I do.

Do you know whether many of them are also proprietors of the South London?—
Not one, that I am confident of.

You have never had any disputes with the South London at all?—No.

Do you take many tenants from each other?—We take rather more from them than they do from us.

It is not much either way?—No.

A part of your district is confined to you?—Yes.

But you may enter upon theirs?—Yes.

And have not pushed into their district?—No.

You have rather fought shy of entering the enemy's country?—Yes; it would not pay one per cent.

Your supply is confined to your own district?—No, we extend beyond it; upon the line of demarcation we have a large quantity of tenants.

Speaking of the line of demarcation between you and the South London?—Yes.

You were in possession of those tenants before they came?—Yes.

Since they came on the field, you have not found it your interest to extend your works in that district?—No.

And the result has been, you have kept the same number that you had when they came?—Very nearly.

Do their works actually run parallel with yours in that district?—They do in many streets; in most of them towards Walworth and that neighbourhood.

And you have not lost many tenants?—No.

Then they have laid down their works at a loss?—I think so.

Is there not a greater facility of obtaining water by wells and pumps on the south side of the river Thames than on the Middlesex and Westminster side?—
Certainly.

Is not the supply of the inhabitants on that side therefore much greater by those private means, than by having recourse to the supplies of the different companies that are established on that side?—Certainly. Proportionally with my experience on this side of the river, I beg to state, that in all old houses in general, there are many have pumps, which they do not alter, and several of them keep the pumps and have rain water; pump water will not do for washing, it is very bad water in fact.

You were the inventor of the spigot and fosset joint?—I was.

How long ago did you lay them down?—I tried some experiments six or seven-and-thirty years ago, and then I laid a long main for Chelsea waterworks.

And you have never found them want repair?—Those that were laid down for the Chelsea waterworks were taken up and relaid after twenty-seven years, but the first that I laid down had been laid down six or seven-and-thirty years, and I never knew them fail yet.

Was this experiment on a large scale?—No; the first I tried was with some joints we could not make stand in any other way; and we run them in lead, and it has not failed.

Is it upon a large scale?—No, it was one joint I tried.

You still use the oakum behind the lead?—Yes.

You tried one joint at first?—Yes; it answered for seven years, and never leaked; and then I ventured on laying a main, perhaps 1,500 or 1,600 yards, for the Chelsea waterworks.

How long ago was that?—They had been down twenty-seven years; they were taken up two years ago, and relaid in Pall Mall.

This main was down about twenty-seven years?—Yes; about 1,500 yards long.

New joints were put to them when they were relaid?—They were relaid in Pall Mall, then they were joined in the same manner with lead.

When you took them up you found no defects in the joints?—None whatever.

And they had been down twenty-seven years?—Yes.

Your experiment of thirty-seven years does not go beyond one joint?—Two or three joints, perhaps, I tried the experiment on.

Do Chelsea waterworks make any distinction whatever between high and low service?—

Thomas Simpson,
Esq.

(28 February.)

*Thomas Simpson,
Esq.*

service?—None; we charge nothing extra for high service; and I beg to state, it is the same at Lambeth.

(28 February.)

How high do you serve in Chelsea?—Sixty or seventy feet; we serve houses in Pall Mall to the top, and particularly in Grosvenor-place; we serve Saint George's Hospital up into the roof.

What is the reservoir above the Thames?—Our reservoir above the Thames is only eighty feet, and then we raise it up higher by the stand-pipe.

Is there any additional expense to you to throw it up to the tops of the houses?—Yes, considerably.

Are your high services very numerous?—No; they are principally in Grosvenor-place and Pall Mall, and Whitehall and Great George-street: they are rather numerous.

Do they take a third of your consumption?—No; I should think not more than a sixth.

If the supplying of those houses costs more than a lower level, what is the reason for not making a higher charge?—I do not know; we did not do it originally, and we have not altered.

Mr. Joseph Nelthorpe, Called in; and Examined.

*Mr.
Joseph Nelthorpe.*

YOU are Secretary to the Lambeth company?—I am.

How long have you been secretary?—About five years and a half.

What are the number of houses within your district?—11,487.

Are there any manufactories in the district?—There are several establishments in the district of that description.

About what number?—Between twenty and thirty.

Have you ever made a dividend since the establishment of your company?—Several.

Upon the gross rental, or upon the net rental?—They have made a dividend when they have found their funds equal to such a dividend, from £.15 to £.40 per share: there have been some years, in fact I believe as many as ten or eleven years, in which no dividend has been made, and then a dividend has been made for two or three years, and then suspended again.

Very irregular?—Yes.

Were your shares £.100 shares?—There are thirty-two shares, but it was never expressed what sum should be advanced upon the shares in the act of parliament.

What was the original subscription?—The original subscription was £.185 each share.

That was the outlay of the original proprietors?—Yes.

What has been the market price of the shares since?—There have been none sold since I have been there.

Have they increased the number of shares?—No; that cannot be without an act.

What dividend have you paid in the last five years?—From 1817 to this time, the dividend has been from £.40 to £.70 per share.

Yearly?—Yearly.

Taking £.55, would be about the average?—Yes; for six years previous to that, there was no dividend at all.

You have never made your dividend from capital?—Not on the original capital.

For some years they were forborne altogether?—Yes.

There never has been a dividend made without assets from the revenues of the company?—Never since I have known it.

Mr. William Rudge, Called in; and Examined.

*Mr.
William Rudge.*

WHAT is your situation?—Engineer of the Southwark waterworks.

This is a very old work, is not it?—Yes.

It is now in the hands of one proprietor only?—Yes; Mr. Edwards.

What capacity does your work contain for the supply of your district, as to quantity of water?—We raise about 8,000 gallons an hour.

How many in a day; how many hours do you work?—Seven hours and a half or eight hours, upon an average; we are not tied to an hour.

How many houses have you, do you recollect?—I cannot tell indeed; it is out of my department.

Is your's an improving concern or a losing concern?—We are improving in point of number of houses.

Is

Is your's a supply by wooden pipes or iron pipes?—Wood pipes.

Entirely?—We have a few iron pipes; we have iron pipes in the yard to lay down, but we have not laid them down.

Does Mr. Edwards ever receive any interest for his property?—I cannot tell, that is out of my line to know that; all I have to do is to send them plenty of water.

Does the London Bridge take from you customers?—Sometimes they take from us and we from them, there is very little difference between us, we are very good friends, I believe.

And your proprietors very unanimous?—Yes.

You never knew a difference of opinion between the proprietors?—No.

Do you force the water?—Yes; we raise it about seventy feet.

Is the whole of it raised by engines?—Yes; we have only one engine, of eighteen-horse power.

Have you any reservoir?—No; only a cistern to receive it, about seventy feet high, and then it comes down to its level again.

Mr. *Joseph Steevens*,

Again Called in; and Examined.

ARE there not whole streets within your district, in which your iron service-pipes are laid, but in which there is not any inhabitant taking your water?—I am not aware of any thing of the kind: it is certainly not the case.

Are there any cases in which, though the whole of the inhabitants may not resist the taking of water, yet there are only a very few who do take?—There are some; and even in the older districts, where the iron has been laid for some years, that perhaps not more than two thirds take the water; the others have means, perhaps, of getting it from those who do receive, and hence a fraud, and that to a considerable extent, is committed upon the company. In the streets that have been recently driven, the largest proportion by far do receive the water. It has happened in some cases, and particularly a few years ago, where an application has been made and signed by perhaps almost the whole of the parties in a street, and upon having the pipes laid down, there being other pipes in the same street, I think there is one case, and that where they utterly refused, unless the rents were very much lowered, there being other pipes in that street at that time (the London Bridge pipes;) after having applied almost to a man, they refused to take it.

In the case or cases to which you allude, were the parties informed upon their application what the water rents would be?—Most assuredly so.

Previously to laying down the pipes?—Yes.

Then you mean to say, that with that information, and having made no objection beforehand, they did, after you had laid down the pipes, object to take the water unless the rent was lowered?—They did.

And in the cases you allude to, the London Bridge company had pipes in the same street?—They had pipes in the same street.

Are there not at Poplar whole streets in which your iron pipes are laid, and in which, notwithstanding, there are no inhabitants taking the water?—There are many inhabitants who do not take the water; there is not a whole street, or any thing like it, in Poplar, who do not take it; but many inhabitants do not take it: say in the High-street of Poplar, it is probable that we are not supplying more than two thirds of the inhabitants; that was the street I was alluding to, when I said two thirds; they had means, I apprehend, of getting it clandestinely, and it has been so in many instances; the other streets are supplied in much larger proportions.

Do you know of any street in which you have iron pipes, and in which the proportion of inhabitants taking the water is so small as one third only?—I am not aware that that is the case in any street.

Mr.
William Rudge.

(28 February.)

Mr.
Joseph Steevens.

Veneris, 2^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. James Weale, Called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

WHAT is your situation?—I hold a situation under the crown, in the office of Woods and Forests, and I reside in York-buildings, New-road.

Have you any connection of any sort or kind with any of the companies, or any of the water undertakings of the metropolis?—None whatever, and never have had.

No connection of any sort or kind?—None whatever ; nor have I ever been engaged in any scheme for raising a new company.

Has your attention been particularly directed to the subject referred to the consideration of this Committee?—It has ; besides the general knowledge I have had of subjects of this kind for many years past, my attention has been particularly directed to it since the partition of the town into districts. I was a petitioner against the bill brought in by Mr. Michael Angelo Taylor, and I appeared personally in support of that petition in the House of Lords ; I heard all the evidence given by the companies, and by the petitioners against that bill in the House of Lords, and I was also heard against it ; the documentary evidence delivered in to the Committee was also furnished to me : since that time, I have devoted almost the whole of my leisure time to inquire into the grounds of the complaints which have been made by the inhabitants of the western parishes of London, and have taken great pains to inform myself generally upon the subject.

Are you of opinion that works of the description now existing are essentially necessary for the supply of the inhabitants of London with water?—They are essentially necessary, because a supply of water could not otherwise be furnished to the inhabitants of the metropolis ; that necessity arises from the nature of the strata which forms the site of London. London is situated upon a bed of clay of great thickness, and the ground rises gradually to the north and west, from the banks of the Thames, so that the only means by which a supply of water could be procured under ground would be by sinking wells of the depth of from one hundred to three hundred feet and upwards, an operation which would be far too expensive for the inhabitant householders generally ; they cannot associate together to sink a well at the expense of any given number of persons to supply themselves with water by means of pipes to be laid down in the streets, because they have no power to break up the pavements ; then there are no back streams or rivers flowing through the town into the Thames, from which the inhabitants in the upper districts might be supplied. This want of water for the supply of the inhabitants of London was felt at a very early period. It appears by Stowe, that as far back as the reign of Henry the Third, the corporation of London constructed some conduits at Tyburn for the supply of the inhabitants of that city ; for it is upon record that the foreign merchants, who had not at that time the privilege of housing their goods, but were obliged to sell them on board their ships, purchased the privilege of housing woad upon condition of paying to the corporation fifty marks yearly, and £. 100 towards the improvement of the conduits at Tyburn. From that time down to the end of the reign of Elizabeth, all the means resorted to for supplying London with water proved to be insufficient, until the establishment of waterworks. There is one other fact which I would wish to state : it has been said that water may be procured at a depth of twelve or fifteen feet beneath the surface generally. There are a great variety of wells which furnish water at that depth, arising from the circumstance of there being inequalities in the surface of the clay, occasional hollows or basins, filled up with gravel, from which a moderate supply of hard water may be procured. A case has occurred within these last three days, where the inhabitant of a house in Conduit-street, who has a well which furnished him with hard water, has had it laid dry by his next door neighbour also sinking a well.

State to the Committee any particulars concerning the old water companies, which you think might elucidate the subject of their inquiry?—The London Bridge works were the first waterworks established, towards the close of the reign of Elizabeth, and under the patronage of the corporation of London. In the early part of the reign of James the First, the corporation of London took, by an act of parliament,

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

parliament, powers for constructing a trench, which is now called the New River. The London Bridge works having succeeded in supplying a part of the city with an adequate quantity of water, the corporation began to think that it was an useless expense going on with the New River, and they assigned their property to Sir Hugh Myddelton, who undertook to complete the work at his own cost, upon condition that all the rights and privileges of the city should be vested in him. Sir Hugh Myddelton was under the necessity of taking partners to assist him in that undertaking; and from the costliness of the work, his affairs fell into great embarrassments; and upon an application to the city to assist him, they refused, and he then applied to the crown. The king took a moiety of the concern, under an engagement to pay one half of the costs which had been incurred up to that time, or which should thereafter be incurred in completing the New River.

Will you state how far, in your opinion, the old waterworks companies accomplished the public purposes for which they were instituted, and what are the defects to which you have alluded in the present system of supply?—The defects to which I have alluded are all involved in the fact, that the supply is vested in the hands of trading joint stock companies: now the supply of a large town with water cannot be assimilated, I conceive, to a trade in grain or other commodities. Water must be considered as one of the elements necessary to existence, the same as light and air; and not merely as an article of subsistence like corn, nor of convenience like coal; and therefore its artificial supply to a great city ought not to be the subject of free trade, nor of any kind of trade: the supply ought not to be limited to the ordinary wants of domestic consumption, nor ought that consumption to be kept down by the artificial checks which a high price to be paid for it, or any price to be paid for it, by the poor and needy, would produce; but on the contrary, the supply should be profuse, rather than merely sufficient, and gratuitous to the poor. The costs of the works required to provide the supply, and the expenses attending the delivery of it, should be defrayed out of a local revenue, in the same manner as the expenses of the pavements, drains, police, &c. are, raised by an equitable assessment on the property of the district; and the management of such an establishment should be placed in the hands of local commissioners, under the like regulations as the commissioners of sewers, and other similar bodies. These principles were sufficiently obvious to the ancients; and hence the construction of their aqueducts, public fountains, and public baths at the public expense: nor has a different system obtained in modern times in any great city or town, except in the United Kingdom. That our practice is not in this respect an improvement on the municipal polity of other countries, will not, I think, be questioned by any reflecting person. The salutary principle of the system I have attempted to explain was first broken in upon by the assignment to Sir Hugh Myddelton of the privileges granted to the corporation of London, and afterwards in the establishment of a succession of joint stock companies for the supply of water. If the supply of water had been placed, as it ought to have been, under the exclusive management of independent local public boards or commissioners, in the same manner as the sewage, pavement, &c. of the metropolis are accomplished, it would not have been necessary or expedient to incur the expense of two concurrent sets of works, because the satisfaction of the public wants and convenience might have been fully provided for by a single establishment on an adequate scale; while the inhabitants would have had the best security that no higher rates would be imposed on them than were required to discharge the necessary expenses of the works, and therefore that they received the accommodation at the lowest possible charge. Not so while the supply and the charge are left at the discretion of trading companies: the first and sole principle to be observed in the administration of the affairs of such establishments, must be the realization of profits; and to accomplish that object, it will be the constant study of the directors to reduce their current expenses, and to increase their revenue by every means within their power; to limit and reduce the quantity of water supplied for a fixed rate; or if not fixed, to enhance the rates to be paid for every given quantity of water. Upon the principle I have stated of its being a local charge in the one case, it would be a charge regulated according to the property; in the case of a trading company, it must be a charge on the quantity. The New River company, however, did not follow that principle of charge, but looked also to the convenience afforded to the property which was supplied with the water; and the rates which were existing in 1810, were rates assessed, not merely with a view to the quantity of water consumed in that particular district or street, but to the character of the property; and those rates had grown up during a long

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

series of years, mutually acquiesced in by the public and by the companies who had the exclusive supply of the town at that time.

Of what nature were the complaints you represent to have been preferred against the old companies at the formation of the new companies?—I think there were many more complaints than were well founded; that the complaints which were brought forward in the year 1810 were principally excited by the new speculators in waterworks; and that the complainants being collected together for the purpose of giving evidence on the West Middlesex bill of 1810, a colour was given to their representations; for I beg to state, as a fact which is capable of proof before this Committee, that not one of those new companies was promoted by any parochial body within the district which they now supply; and if the Committee will give me leave, I will hand to them copies of letters written by Mr. Sloper, then clerk to the West Middlesex company, to the vestries of St. Mary-le-bone and St. Giles, to show that the parochial bodies were not parties to the institution of the new works.

[A letter, dated Montagu-street, Russell-square, November 24th 1809, signed Robert S. Sloper, addressed to John Jones, Esq. clerk to the Vestry Court-house, St. Mary-le-bone, was read, as follows:]

“ Sir,

“ I AM desired by the board of directors of the West Middlesex waterworks to acknowledge your communication respecting the appointment of Mr. Marshall to be surveyor or supervisor to the company, and to signify that a person shall be forthwith selected, whom it is hoped, may prove agreeable and satisfactory to the parish of Mary-le-bone.

“ I am at the same time directed to signify, that if the gentlemen of the vestry are still apprehensive that the pavements of the parish may be materially injured by the laying down of pipes at this season of the year, the board of directors will order that such work shall be immediately discontinued, hoping that the vestry will not permit the other water companies to proceed with similar works, so as to forestall the market for the supply of water in a part of the parish of Mary-le-bone, where the West Middlesex company are invited to serve, and which they contemplate to do at such reduced rates, and with water of such purity, as will insure the encouragement of the parish at large, to an undertaking which has been carried into effect at so large an expense, and with so much public spirit.”

[Another letter, dated 14th February 1810, signed R. S. Sloper, addressed to the vestry of the parish of St. Giles's, was read, as follows:]

“ I AM desired by the board of directors of the West Middlesex waterworks to inform the vestry of the parish of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields and St. George Bloomsbury, (through you,) that the company have now a bill pending in parliament, for the purpose of enabling them to extend their supply of water to your parish, amongst others particularly enumerated. I am also earnestly to solicit their approbation, and that they would please to concur in petitioning parliament to sanction a measure which will add so materially to the domestic comfort and security of the inhabitants, it being the intention of the West Middlesex company not only to lay down iron pipes throughout the whole of their service, and thereby save to each parish the expense and inconvenience so incessantly occasioned in taking up the pavements on account of the wear and bursting of the wooden pipes, but to give a most ample supply of perfectly settled soft water for domestic purposes, and to make such arrangements with the different fire-offices as shall insure an instantaneous supply of water for the use of the engines wherever fires happen.

“ In consequence of the urgent press of business before parliament, and being conscious (as the directors are,) that a vestry cannot be convened, and a determination come to on this application, for, probably, several days, they have ventured to direct, (in order to save time,) that a petition may be carried about for the signatures of such individuals as may be disposed to sign; a step which, under the circumstances of the case, the board hope will not be considered offensive by the vestry, to whom, as the guardians of the parish at large, the company look up for their important aid; and a blank is left at the head of the petition for the favour of their names, should they be pleased to comply with this application, and which it is anxiously hoped they will. You will of course understand, that no expense of any kind will attach to the parish.”

It is one of the grounds laid down by these companies for their increased rates, that we, (the different parishes,) have been guilty of a breach of faith towards them; that

*Mr.
James Weale.*

(2 March.)

that we invited them to construct those works : I will explain that to the Committee. In the House of Lords, they laid before the Committee petitions which had been presented in 1810, in support of their bill, signed by certain inhabitants of those parishes. Upon those petitions they grounded an allegation, that the parishes had invited and promoted their undertaking ; and that after they had constructed their works, they could not obtain the custom of the inhabitants. Now the fact was, that the West Middlesex company, which had not powers to come into London previously to 1810, were laying down pipes for the supply of a part of the parish of Mary-le-bone. If that supply had been extremely desirable to the parish of Mary-le-bone, it is not to be presumed that the vestry would have interfered and stopped the proceedings of the company in laying down those pipes ; but they did exercise the powers with which they were invested by acts of parliament, to stop the progress of those works in the parish, which gave rise to a correspondence between the vestry and this West Middlesex water company. One of the letters which passed upon that occasion was the letter which has been read to the Committee. In that letter they distinctly state, as an inducement to the vestry of Mary-le-bone, not to proceed in their opposition ; that they contemplated being enabled to supply the inhabitants of Mary-le-bone with water more abundantly, and at reduced rates. I myself, between the years 1800 and 1810, lived in three different parts of that district. I resided in Privy-gardens, in Portland-place, and in the neighbourhood of Manchester-square, the two latter very high situations ; and I never heard of those houses being insufficiently supplied. I never heard of an absolute want of water in either of those three houses.

What companies were you served by in those districts?—The Chelsea and the New River. I believe that in the new part of the parish of Mary-le-bone the supply given for the year or two previously to 1810 was insufficient. Those new buildings are situated upon high ground, and it was understood that the New River company could not, with the then power of their works, adequately supply those buildings ; but the Chelsea company had been for some three or four years previously qualifying themselves to give a sufficient supply to those very parts. As far as the fact came within my own knowledge, and applying the observations generally to the district now supplied by the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies, I should say that the supply in the year 1810 was a supply which occasionally required regard to economy in the use of the water.

Are you alluding to particular parts of the district?—To the districts now supplied by the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies.

Not only in the high places to which you before alluded?—No, generally ; taking the whole of the parishes of Mary-le-bone, St. James and St. George. As to the elevation to which the supply given by the old companies was carried, I can also speak from personal and individual knowledge, that the Chelsea company supplied without extra charge the cistern of a water-closet on the parlour floor in Duke-street, Manchester-square, at the elevation of at least nine feet above the pavement.

The bottom of the cistern or the top?—I should say about the mean ; probably ten feet to the top of the cistern.

Do you happen to know the number of the house?—Yes ; it is a house that belonged to me, No. 32, Duke-street, Manchester-square.

Would you state any particulars you may think material for the information of the Committee concerning the establishment and the proceedings of the new companies?—I would lay out of consideration, in answer to that question, all particulars of their expenditure, or of the prices paid by proprietors for shares, as quite irrelevant to the subject of your inquiry ; but I wish to lay before the Committee a series of papers, showing what their undertakings were, and which can be identified and authenticated if their authenticity be denied by any party. But before I bring those papers forward, I will just shortly advert to the origin of the West Middlesex company. The West Middlesex company was established in 1806, for the supply of the out-parishes of London, and at that time the Chelsea district was protected. The West Middlesex company had not a right to lay pipes within the districts supplied by the Chelsea company ; that establishment was strictly a city speculation (if I may so call it) and it failed : they were disappointed in their expectations of procuring customers in those parishes, after having expended a very considerable sum of money. To render their works productive, they availed themselves of the insufficient supply to the exterior parts of the parish of Mary-le-bone, and began to extend their works into London. Their operations were stopped by the interference of the Mary-le-bone vestry, and the correspondence

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

to which I have alluded in a preceding answer took place. They then found themselves under the necessity of applying to parliament for new powers to authorize them to come into London, and the bill of 1810 was accordingly presented. Upon the evidence taken upon that bill, a scanty and insufficient supply to the new buildings was represented to be a general insufficiency throughout the town, and the advantages offered by the new companies were, an unlimited supply of water to be given to the tops of the highest houses within those districts. The act of 1810 only recites that the works before constructed might be beneficially extended to the parishes in London, and there was an obligation imposed upon the company to lay down certain mains, which were to be kept constantly charged with water for the extinction of fires; but it contains no regulations preventive of combination, nor any regulations as to the amount of the rates, beyond a general provision that the rates shall be reasonable. They were then admitted into competition with the previously existing companies supplying those parishes, and upon that occasion the Chelsea district was also thrown open to the West Middlesex company. Now it is a most material fact to observe, that these works, which were originally constructed for the supply of the out-parishes of London, became inadequate to that supply which the West Middlesex proprietors, in the view they took of their speculation, contemplated would be necessary for the supply of London; and the engines and the principal main which they had laid down were taken up and replaced by engines of larger powers, and mains of greater capacity. As soon as they had brought their works to a certain state of completion, and were enabled to supply a part of the parish of Paddington, and part of the parish of Mary-le-bone, they circulated through those parts the papers which I will now lay before the Committee.

[The following papers were read.]

“ West Middlesex Waterworks, incorporated by Act of Parliament, 46th of Geo. 3.

“ The directors have the satisfaction to announce to the inhabitants of Mary-le-bone and its vicinity, that the company’s works being now established with engines, reservoirs, and a most extensive line of main pipes, they are ready to supply them with water; and they trust that the exertions now making will enable them to extend their supply in the course of the ensuing month to a large portion of the districts adjacent, viz. the parishes of St. Giles and St. George Bloomsbury, (including the Bedford estate,) Somers Town and the parish of St. Pancras generally.

“ In justice to themselves, as well as for the information of the public, it is incumbent on them concisely to state,

“ First—That their supply is derived from the bed of the river Thames, from off a fine gravelly bottom, thirteen miles above London Bridge, pure as it comes from the country, of superior excellence and unlimited in quantity, and that it is received in reservoirs, which, if it had any sediment to deposit, in times of rain or otherwise, would transmit it perfectly clear and bright to their tenants.

“ Secondly—That from the power of their engines, and the matchless elevation of their grand reservoir, they can convey the water to all tenants who desire it into tanks, or other receptacles at the tops of their houses, thereby affording a considerable saving of expense and labour, in providing and working of force pumps for domestic accommodation, and an invaluable security against fire, the ravages of which may in most instances be stopped by such an immediate supply.

“ Thirdly—They are engaged by law to keep their main pipes full, night and day; and these, from their magnitude and efficacy, will afford on the instant so large a body of water to the fire engines, as must insure the safety and establish the security of their tenants, with regard to so dreadful and destructive a calamity.

“ Fourthly—It is scarcely needful to detail the general benefits in point of domestic conveniences, health and comfort, arising from a plentiful supply of pure water; nor that the company is well enabled and disposed to afford the same on terms of the most liberal and reasonable nature.

“ The directors also beg leave to inform the public, that the company’s office is removed from Bridge-street, Blackfriars, to No. 51, Berners-street, Oxford-street, where attendance is given daily (Sundays excepted) from nine o’clock in the morning till six in the afternoon.

“ August 21, 1811.

“ Jonathan Hardy, secretary.”

“ West Middlesex Waterworks Office, 51, Berners-street, Oxford-street,
“ October 16, 1811.

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

“ The directors of the West Middlesex waterworks have apprised the public, that their works are in a state of forwardness to supply the parish of St. Mary-le-bone and its neighbourhood with water of the purest quality, unlimited in quantity, and delivered, if chosen, in the upper stories of the loftiest houses in London; and the encouragement already received, affords them the fairest prospect of success. They have now to state, that in addition to these advantages, they are enabled to supply their tenants at lower rates than those adopted by any existing establishment.

“ In making this spontaneous reduction, it is not the wish of the West Middlesex company to claim any merit at the expense of those who have come before them; the price of every article of consumption naturally regulates itself by a comparison of the supply with the demand; and in the present instance, the one having continued stationary for a series of years, while the other has rapidly advanced, as well by the augmented population of the metropolis, as by habits of increased comfort and cleanliness among every class of consumers, an enhancement of price became the necessary consequence. It is doubtless on this account that parliament has of late thought fit to incorporate so many new water companies; by whose competition, as the supply must of course increase, a corresponding diminution could not fail to take place in the price of the commodity.

“ The West Middlesex company have a pride in forwarding, thus early in their career, the provident designs of the legislature; nor are they withheld from the performance of this duty, though aware of the clamour likely to be raised by those whom their example will compel (and compel them it must) to a proportionate reduction in their demands. They feel confident that a discerning community will at once perceive, in such proposed reduction, the natural effect of a widened competition, and that by holding forth every fair encouragement to the West Middlesex company, the public will enable them to continue in the market; their expulsion from which, by the operation of the unerring principle above adverted to, must infallibly produce, first the re-establishment, and eventually an augmentation of the present prices.

“ As houses, even of the same class, differ materially both in point of size, and the habitual consumption of water, it has been found impracticable to frame any general scale of charges, but the rates will be declared in each particular instance on application at the company's office, as above, where attendance is given daily, (Sundays excepted) from nine in the morning till six in the evening.

“ *Jonathan Hardy*, secretary.

“ Postscript, November 1.—That which was predicted in the above address, which appeared in most of the newspapers, has actually occurred. The different water companies are now offering to reduce their prices. It is sufficiently evident to what cause the reduction is attributable; and the directors of the West Middlesex company rely with increased confidence on the liberal support of the public.”

“ Address to the Occupiers of Houses supplied with Water by the New River Company.

“ The present opposition to the New River company, and the unjust representations of their conduct, have rendered it a duty to make this appeal, and to show their claims upon the public for support.

“ They have served the metropolis with water nearly two centuries, at rates, which have at no time yielded them above six-and-a-quarter per cent. and for many years past not five per cent. on their capital; whether it be estimated by the original cost of their works, by the actual value of those works, and of the company's stock in trade in its present state, or by the prices which the present proprietors have paid for their shares. The property of the company has advanced less beyond its original value than any species of real property since the commencement of their undertaking.

“ The absurd report that their shares (seventy-two in number) originally cost only £.100 each, needs no other refutation than the statement that their water was brought to London through an aqueduct of forty miles in length. The formation of their works in the time of the original projector, Sir Hugh Middleton, cost, according to the best authorities, £.500,000, and they yielded no dividend for twenty years.

“ The New River actually discharges above 214,000 hogsheads of water in every
706. twenty-

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

twenty-four hours into the town ; the prices received for this water, and the average rate of rents for its use, will show the extreme cheapness with which an abundant supply of one of the greatest conveniences of life, has been afforded by the company to the public, and how little they deserve the imputation of abusing the advantage of a market without competition. Comparing the whole quantity supplied in the year at 214,000 hogsheads per day, with the gross annual receipts of the company, the gross price received for their water does not exceed 2s. for each 100 hogsheads. The average rental upon the houses supplied is something less than 27s. per annum, or about 6d. per week for each house ; the most numerous class of private houses is supplied at less than one third of this rate, this depression of the rate in favour of the poorer inhabitants being of course compensated by a rise on the higher class of houses proportioned to their magnitude, and to the greater abundance of the supply.

“ Of these few facts, those which relate to the origin and ancient state of the New River, are vouched by every authentic history of London, and to those concerning its state in modern times, every man at all acquainted with the concerns of the company can bear witness. They will be sufficient, it is hoped, to undeceive those to whom the company has been represented as exercising an oppressive monopoly, and with whom the speculators in new waterworks have claimed credit for the public spirit of their projects, as aimed at the destruction of that monopoly. They may also serve to show on what foundations are rested the hopes of those who look for large returns from the investment of money in those speculations. The vast body of water before stated to be actually supplied by the New River, in each twenty-four hours, is received into the reservoir at Islington, at a natural elevation of eighty-five feet above the level of the Thames ; and from thence it is raised to a further height of thirty-five feet, by powerful machinery. If the rental of the New River company has been hitherto such as to have afforded, with these advantages, a bare interest on its capital, the most sanguine adventurer will hardly look for a better return, where every ton of water must be raised by steam to the height of 120 feet, to bring it on a level with the present power of the New River company. Whether water so raised can be profitably sold at the rate of 2s. for every 100 hogsheads, is matter of no difficult computation for those who are at all acquainted with the powers of steam engines, and the expenses of maintaining and working them.

“ Thus far the directors have thought it due to themselves, and to the public, to state, respecting the condition and conduct of their concern. It remains to give to their numerous tenants the assurance, which they have a right to expect, that whatever be the expense or reduction of fair profit to the company, they shall be supplied as effectually, in every respect, and at as low a price as they can possibly be, by any other water company. It has been hitherto the object of the New River company to regulate their supply with a view to general cheapness and abundance. They have never thought it expedient for themselves, or the public, to raise their water, by a heavy cost of additional machinery, above the height to which the purposes of domestic convenience require that it should be thrown. There is no difficulty in an ostentatious display of the powers of a waterwork, while they are confined to display alone ; but it is one thing to make a *jet d'eau*, and another to supply a great city. If the New River had no other employment, nothing would be easier than to throw its waters over the tops of the highest houses. It is obvious that in the greater part of the town, the natural elevation of eighty-five feet would effect this, without the aid of machinery, upon the principle that water will rise to its level ; but in the practical business of a water company, this principle is subject to many disturbing causes ; indeed, the supply of every house which it takes in its course, is a disturbing cause ; and in proportion as they are numerous, the natural force of the water is dissipated and weakened, and can only be recruited by impulse from additional steam engines and forcing mains. The New River company speak from long experience, when they assert, that such must be the course of things in every waterwork ; and that a small portion of actual employment will oblige their competitors either to retract the premises which they have holden forth as to the height of their supply, or to resort to these means of fulfilling them.

“ To these means they avow that they are themselves compelled to resort by the challenge which has been thrown out to them ; they will occasion, undoubtedly, a heavy expense to the company, even with the vantage ground which they possess : and where the height of eighty-five feet is to be compensated by machinery, the slightest consideration of the subject will show that the produce cannot equal the expense. But, whatever may be their conviction as to the result, they cannot expect

expect the public will take it for granted ; and they admit the necessity of meeting competition, in every respect, of cheapness and convenience : for the purpose of doing this effectually, orders have been some time since given, for erecting the necessary additional machinery, which will be completed and in action in the month of August next.

“ The directors of the New River company trust, that the tenants of the company will honour them with their support, until an opportunity has been given of showing that the resources of the company are abundantly sufficient to furnish and continue to them every advantage which has been holden out by any of its competitors.

“ *J. P. Rowe*, secretary.

“ New River Office, Salisbury-square, Feb. 27, 1812.”

“ To the Public.

“ THE directors of the West Middlesex waterworks company consider themselves called upon to notice an ‘ appeal to the public,’ recently made by the New River company, wherein they complain, that their conduct has been misrepresented. Misrepresentation, or, indeed, any allusion whatever to the conduct of the New River company, the directors of the West Middlesex must positively disavow. In the address, which they some time since submitted to the public, they confined themselves to a simple statement of the accommodation it is in their power to afford ; nor can that statement be construed into an attack on any existing establishment, except by those who consider an attempt to improve on the present mode of supplying the metropolis with water (confessedly of two centuries duration) as an unwarrantable invasion of their rights and privileges.

“ The New River company have not thought fit to practise the same moderation. Impatient of the disturbance already given to their monopoly, and foreseeing its utter extinction, unless the progress of the new companies be speedily arrested, they proceed at once to denounce failure and discomfiture against their opponents ; alleging, that to construct and maintain a system of works on the mechanical principle adequate to the requisite supply, must be attended with an expense which will ruin them in the competition ; and further, that from certain ‘ disturbing causes,’ the practical difficulty of delivering water at the promised elevation will be found insuperable.

“ With regard to the first allegation, a short reference to the amount of the New River capital, and to the annual expenditure entailed upon the very nature of that concern, compared with those of any new establishment, will at once show, that in provoking such an inquiry, the zeal of the New River directors has rather outstripped their discretion.

“ The New River directors do not condescend to specify the amount of the capital on which the company have divided ‘ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$, and for many years past not more than five per cent.’ but estimated in either of two modes suggested by themselves, it must be enormous. £.500,000, it seems, were expended in bringing their water to London, through an aqueduct of forty miles ; and as ‘ the works yielded no dividend for twenty years,’ the real amount of this outlay may be fairly stated at £. 1,500,000. Taking, however, as a more correct mode of computation, the cost of shares to the actual proprietors, or the sums at which they have been rated in bequests and inheritances for the last thirty years, which may be moderately averaged at £.12,000 each, this sum, multiplied by seventy-two, the number of shares, will make a capital to be divided upon of near £.900,000 : but this is not all. On the system of wooden pipes, adopted by the New River company, which require constant repairs and renovation, together with river charges, &c. &c. the annual expenditure incurred by them exceeds £. 50,000 ; so that upwards of £. 104,000 per annum must be levied upon the community, before the proprietors can divide six per cent. on their capital, the lowest rate of profit certainly, upon which any trade can be carried on with advantage. How does the case stand at the present day ? By the progress of the arts during the last two centuries, (from the whole benefit of which, the New River company would willingly exclude the public,) steam engines and other mechanical powers are capable of forcing a level of sufficient elevation to supply the upper stories of every house in London ; and though our ancestors, to whom these things were unknown, were compelled to go forty miles in search of a similar, though not an equal facility, it does not seem very reasonable that the present race should be assessed, in order to make good to their representatives this now superfluous expenditure. About half of the New River capital, taken at £. 900,000,

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

would suffice to construct works adequate to the supply of its actual tenants; while under the system of iron pipes, the same might be administered at a third of its annual expenditure. It follows, that a new company, when in equal service, would be able, on the same scale of profits, to undersell the New River company in that proportion.

“ Thus then it appears, with what little reason the directors of the New River company take credit with the public for the cheap rate at which they have served the metropolis. Cheapness is a relative term: that article has reached its minimum, which being brought to market at the least possible cost, is sold at the lowest profit; but if an unnecessary expense be incurred in bringing it thither, the article is comparatively dear; it matters not how small may be the rate of profit to the dealer.

“ With regard to the second point insisted on, namely, the mechanical difficulties in delivering water at the promised elevations, it may be sufficient for the present to observe, that if the West Middlesex company cannot accomplish what they have undertaken, a little time will prove their inability, and the public will have its remedy at hand. As far, however, as experience has gone, the supply to the upper stories has flowed into the cisterns three times a week, with almost the regularity of the tide; a fact on which they can confidently appeal to their high tenants, situated as they are in scattered parts of their districts: nor can there be any reason to doubt the continuance of what has been so successfully begun, the actual supply to the high services bearing the same proportion to their present tenants as may reasonably be expected on a more extensive scale.

“ The New River company profess that they have hitherto confined their views to abundance and cheapness of supply; they allege that ‘ there is no difficulty in the ostentatious display of the powers of a waterwork, while they are confined to display alone; but it is one thing to make a *jet d’eau*, another to supply a great city;’ and so, forsooth, to increase the comforts of the rich and diminish the labours of the poor is mere ostentation! an abundant and immediate supply at the tops of houses to arrest the progress of fire is nothing but amusement! the trouble of carrying water up stairs in pitchers, or forcing it by pumps, is no inconvenience! After this, however, it might have been expected that the New River company would have allowed these schemes to waste themselves in their visionary projects, and then have quietly resumed the dominion which they have so long and so vexatiously exercised over the community. But no such thing; they conclude by declaring themselves about to undertake the same folly they have ridiculed and reprobated in others; for which purpose, ‘ additional machinery will be completed and in action in the month of August next.’ Such inconsistencies it is sufficient to state; they can require no comment.

“ Thus much the directors of the West Middlesex company have felt it their duty to observe in answer to the unprovoked attacks of the New River directors. It only remains for them to return thanks to the public for the encouragement already shown to their infant undertaking—encouragement which has surpassed the most sanguine expectation,—and to renew with increased confidence the assurance of their ability to supply water in any quantity to the tops of the loftiest houses, incomparably pure in quality, and at rates far inferior to those hitherto demanded by any existing establishment.

“ *Joseph Bailey*, secretary.”

“ West Middlesex Waterworks Office,
51, Berners-street, April 27th 1812.”

The fact which I wish to bring distinctly under the view of the Committee, with reference to those papers, is, that notwithstanding all these advantages were held out to the inhabitants, they procured but a very small proportion of the inhabitants to deal with them; a strong ground of presumption, I submit, that the supply given by the New River, and the old companies was not such as they represented, insufficient and irregular. I would also observe, that it was impossible that the inhabitants, who were disposed to deal with them, should doubt the truth of the statements which were so repeatedly brought under their notice; for that the West Middlesex company had, at the period of the date of the last of these papers, had six years experience as a water company; and in that paper they also advert to the objection which had been started by the New River company, as to their power of affording high service gratuitously and regularly: they state distinctly
that

that, from the experience they had had, they were satisfied they could afford that high service gratuitously, and that unlimited quantity for the low service, at the reduced rates at which they had offered it. These papers I, in common with the rest of the inhabitants, take to be a part of their engagement with the public; and we also apprehend that they are recognized, and distinctly recognized, in the preamble of the act of 1813, which authorized them to raise a further sum of money to enable them more effectually to carry on their works. Then as to the Grand Junction company; the first public proposal which we received from the Grand Junction company was an advertisement published in the newspapers and otherwise circulated; it is dated the 15th of November 1810, and signed by Henry Wright, their solicitor.

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

[It was read, as follows:]

“ GRAND JUNCTION WATERWORKS.

“ By Act 38 Geo. 3, c. 33, the Grand Junction canal company are empowered to make waterworks to supply the parish of Paddington, and parishes and streets adjacent, with water pursuant to this act. Works are now constructing, and reservoirs making, under the direction of Mr. Rennie, the engineer, with powers to effect their purpose far superior to any other in this kingdom, and calculated at once to give to the inhabitants of the parishes and streets to be supplied an abundance of pure and excellent soft water even in the upper stories of their houses or other buildings. This the proprietors will be enabled to do at a comparatively small expense, from the abundance of their sources, from the height of the ground whence the water will be taken being so much above the level of the Thames, and its being so contiguous to the parishes of Paddington, Mary-le-bone, and St. George’s Hanover-square, &c. including all the new streets now making and intended to be made. The grand main at present casting is thirty inches in diameter, and will extend down Oxford-street, conveying a body of water unequalled in the metropolis, and affording an immense advantage in the cases of fire to all the districts through which the pipes will pass. Great attention being necessary in the execution of an undertaking of such magnitude and public importance, the Grand Junction canal company have thought it for the general good that it should be under a distinct and separate management from their other concerns, which are at present sufficient to occupy the attention of any company: they have therefore entered into an agreement with certain gentlemen for the purpose of carrying it into effect, in pursuance of which, and for the more effectual establishment of the undertaking, application will be made to parliament the ensuing session, praying to have the agreement confirmed, and to have the proprietors formed into a distinct company. In the mean time the works are carrying on under the authority and direction of the Grand Junction canal company, by virtue of the act of parliament already made and provided. The fund for carrying the waterworks into execution, is divided into 3,000 shares, of £.50 each; and £.1 per share thereon is already paid into the hands of the treasurer, William Praed, esquire, of Fleet-street. The water in its present state has been analyzed, and found excellent for all culinary and domestic purposes; it is also lighter, and contains less foreign matter than the Thames water; besides which, the Grand Junction canal company are now engaged in making additional reservoirs, and introducing other streams of water, which are of the finest quality, and which will enable them not only to perform their engagement of giving a supply for at least 40,000 houses, but also to meet the demand for water to any extent that may be required. Hence it is obvious that the undertaking will be attended with great public benefit, and the proprietors trust they have reason to feel confident of the liberal support of the public.

“ By order of the Committee of Management for carrying the work into execution, under the authority of the Grand Junction canal company.”

In 1811, the Grand Junction company obtained the act of parliament authorizing them to construct their works: from which it appears that the works were originally intended, and likewise intended by that act, to be constructed for the supply of Paddington. They, however, carried their works into Mary-le-bone, to open a new competition with the New River and Chelsea companies, and with the West Middlesex company; and there is another paper issued from the Grand Junction office, which I shall be anxious to put in to the Committee.

[It was read, as follows:]

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

“ Grand Junction Waterworks Office, 46, Upper Seymour-street.

“ The proprietors of the Grand Junction waterworks have proved the absolute power of their works, the excellence of their water, and the certain success of their plan. On these grounds they solicit support to an undertaking, combining the welfare of the public with the company’s advantage.

“ Their level is ten feet above the highest street in Mary-le-bone, and (what has never before been effected) they give a supply so copious and regular, that the water is always on; many of the new houses served by this company now do without cisterns. This abundant supply of water is always pure in the pipes; it is constantly fresh, because it is always coming in.

“ Their powers from height of situation and largeness of their main, aided by the great force of a steam engine, raise water with ease above the highest house in London, without any interruption of service to the tenants, which has not before been done; and this economical accommodation is felt, not only in small houses, but in laundries, water-closets, nurseries, &c. on upper stories, for which high service no additional charge is made.

“ Ravages of fire are increased by delay and scanty supply; no houses watered by this company can suffer in these respects; their water is never off; their pipes are always full; and a leather hose attached to their plug, gives all the benefit of a fire engine. The water being perfectly clear, would not, in case of fire, tarnish the furniture, as that does, which is now supplied to the fire engines, loaded with the filth of the kennel.

“ The durability of their iron pipes (the only sort used by this company, and which are always proved) relieves them from injuring the streets, because their pipes can never want repair.

“ The annexed analyses show the water to be peculiarly adapted to all domestic purposes. It is drawn from two large filtering reservoirs, situated at Paddington, the main supply to which is derived from the rivers Colne and Brent, and from an immense reservoir of nearly 100 acres, fed by the streams of the vale of Ruislip; and the water being taken at a considerable distance above the basin of the canal at Paddington, is consequently as pure as if it were drawn immediately from those permanent sources.

“ This water is laid on free of expense to the tenants.

“ *W. M. Coe*, chief clerk and secretary.”

“ The analysis I have made of the Grand Junction water is highly favourable to the opinion of its salubrity and excellence, for the important public object which it is intended to fulfil.

(signed) “ *C. R. Aikin*, 4, Broad-street-buildings.”

“ I have analyzed the Grand Junction water, and find it to be most excellent for all domestic purposes, to be also lighter, and contain less foreign matter than the Thames water.

(signed) “ *Frederick Accum*, Compton-street.”

Looking at the description of persons among whom these several proposals were circulated, it was too much to expect that they should withstand the advantages and temptations which were held out to them. Many of them did accordingly quit the old and deal with the new companies; but, as I said before, not to any considerable amount, proportionally to the whole number of inhabitants within the respective districts. They have attempted to show that they were compelled to supply their water at those inadequate rates; but from the papers it appears that the West Middlesex company was the first company that had recourse to that means of getting customers; and when one company had reduced the rates, the other companies were obliged to do it to retain their tenants. Their pipes were driven to an immense distance from their own works. It is within my own knowledge, that the West Middlesex company drove a pipe to the extreme of Somers Town, and in another direction into St. Giles’s. In faith of the assurances held out in these papers also, as to a gratuitous high service, very many of the inhabitants were induced to take down their force-pumps; and many were induced to erect water-closets in their upper stories, who would not have gone to the expense of the machinery of force-pumps to raise the water.

You know this yourself?—I know a great many instances; nevertheless, this kind of competition was persevered in, and very considerable sums were expended by

by the companies in gratuities to agents, such as plumbers and people of that description, to seduce away people from the old companies.

You know this of your own knowledge?—No, from information; but the parties can be called before the Committee, if the facts are denied. I shall state nothing to the Committee of which I have not taken the greatest pains to ascertain the truth. It appears to me that the object of the competition, therefore, as prosecuted by the new companies, was not to afford that abundant supply at a reduced rate permanently, but at every expense to drive out the old companies, and get possession of the market. The Committee will perhaps allow me to state an authority for that statement, which can now be controverted, if I state it incorrectly: I heard at a public meeting a director of the Grand Junction company say, that the object of the establishment of these new works was to crush the old companies.

Who?—Captain Blgrave.

Where was this public meeting?—A public meeting of the householders of Marylebone, in their public building.

When?—Last year.

How far in your opinion have the public purposes for which the new companies were established been since accomplished?—I think as to the enlargement of the competition, which it must be obvious to the Committee, from a view of the acts, was the object of the legislature in creating those new companies, they have wholly failed, and that the mode in which the competition was carried on, as long as it was persevered in, was nearly destructive of all the companies. That was seriously felt by the companies as early as the year 1815, and an arrangement was entered into by the New River company with the West Middlesex company, for the consolidation of their concerns into one company; and upon that arrangement a bill was prepared and submitted to parliament early in the session of 1816, but was afterwards withdrawn. The mischiefs which the public experienced from that competition were of a very important nature, and to a very considerable amount, in the perpetual disturbance of the pavements of the metropolis during the whole period that the competition was carried on. The arrangement which has since taken place among the several water companies for the partition of the town into districts, has left us in a worse situation than we were previously to the establishment of the new companies, as far as competition may be presumed to influence the price of the supply; for before the establishment of the new companies there was a sort of quiescent competition between the companies then established, not a competition of price; but when a representation was made by the inhabitants of a street within the circle of the works of one company, that they were inadequately supplied by the company then supplying them, and that the company so applied to felt an assurance that if they did lay out their capital in extending their works into the complaining street, they would receive a fair remunerating price for the expenditure of capital, and the current expense of a supply of water, the inhabitants were immediately relieved from the grievance of which they had to complain; so that the public derived all the benefit of an active competition: it was a *bonâ fide* competition, having regard only to the fair price of the commodity. No such competition exists at this moment; the combination has left the town subject to the uncontrolled monopoly of the supply, inasmuch as the legislature, in passing the acts of parliament which authorized the erection of these new companies, made no provision against the evil which has resulted from that combination, and consequent partition of the town; and all the evils which have been attributed in theoretical speculation to a monopoly of the supply of any article of general consumption, have followed that combination and partition, to which I have alluded, in a general enhancement of the price usually paid for the commodity, previously to the establishment of the monopoly. Another public injury which has resulted from the competition and subsequent combination is, that the Chelsea company is left with so small a district as to endanger the existence of that company: inasmuch as it must be obvious to the Committee, that waterworks can be profitably carried on in the hands of a trading joint stock company only when it has to supply a large district. The York Buildings company has actually been annihilated; and a competitor has been taken out of the market, which existed before the establishment of these new water companies. This is a short summary of the mischiefs which I apprehend have resulted from the establishment of the new works. On the other hand, I think it cannot be doubted, that not only the new works are constructed upon an improved principle, but that there has been a corresponding improvement in the supply of water given to the inhabitants generally: that the public benefit most materially, both in point of con-

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

venience and in point of expense, by the less frequent occasion for the disturbance of the pavements : and that the execution of these new works upon the improved principle which I have mentioned, and the more certain, and certainly the more abundant supply generally given by these new works, have spurred on and excited the old companies to an improvement of their works, much more quickly than they otherwise probably would. Then again, there is a more certain provision of water for fire, than was found upon the erection of the new works, for which no specific charge is made on the public ; but, on this point, I will here remark that it is the interest not only of these new companies, but of every water company, to keep their mains charged with water at night, or at least to charge their mains with water. When their engines have accomplished the work necessary for the supply of the inhabitants in the course of the day, if they were not to continue at work so as fully to charge the mains, they would have to encounter on the following morning, when they set their engines to work, a very considerable resistance to the passage of the water, and consequently a waste of power for a certain time, in discharging the air from those main pipes : I therefore say, that though it is a legal obligation upon the companies, by their acts of parliament, to keep their mains charged with water, yet it is not attended with any additional expense to them, but on the contrary, would be done under a proper system of management in the ordinary course of the administration of their water. The New River company, I believe, is the only company which is not, by law, required to keep their mains charged with water, but they have invariably from the earliest times done it, and have never got any specific remuneration for that supply, or for delivering it to fires, when that supply was called into action. I think I have now given a fair view of the advantages and disadvantages which have resulted from the establishment of these companies.

Do you think that any permanent public benefit would be produced by the erection of any one or more new establishments of waterworks ?—In answer to that question, I must go into some explanation. If such establishments were formed on the principle of supplying a particular district at its own expense, to the exclusion of all trading companies, there is no doubt that the population of that district, would be materially benefited, as they would receive the water at prime cost. But it is a very different thing to have a choice of the principle on which you would erect a new institution, where no such institution has ever been established, from one where establishments have grown up under the faith of legislative acts, however defective in principle ; all that can then be effected in justice to the two parties, that is, to the public on the one hand, and to the companies on the other, is to endeavour to reconcile and accommodate the adverse interests of the two parties. In this view, therefore, I am of opinion that more trading companies would not be beneficial to the public, but on the contrary prejudicial ; as being likely to renew that competition which has just been put an end to, and which was carried on at the expense of all parties engaged in it. So far from considering that more trading companies would be beneficial, I think that there are already more than are desirable, if cheapness of supply be the object ; but if from the difficulties in the way of regulating a trading monopoly, the monopoly should not be effectually controlled, there is no doubt in my mind that the public would obtain a better and a cheaper supply, under the *bonâ fide* competition of two trading companies, than it would eventually from an uncontrolled monopoly.

Do you believe that the inhabitants of the several parishes, supplied by the West Middlesex and Grand Junction Companies, generally receive a more abundant supply of water now, than previously to the year 1810 ; and if so, to what extent upon the average of houses ?—In answering that question, it is necessary I should advert to the relative quantities which have been stated by the companies in the House of Lords, as the former supply and the present supply. The proportion in which it is stated that the supply has been increased, is from 50 gallons to 250 gallons per diem per house on an average : now I am quite satisfied, from my own personal knowledge, and from a great variety of information which I have collected upon the subject from a great number of persons, of whom I have inquired concerning the fact, that there is some fallacy in the calculation upon which that statement is founded. The supply in 1810, as I have stated in a preceding answer, was generally good ; the answers which I have received from nine tenths of the parties to whom I have applied for information, have been, “ Our cisterns were never empty, we always had water as long as we wanted it ; but whether our cisterns were half full, or a quarter full, we did not know, but we had water.” I would explain myself by supposing that the average ordinary consumption of a house in 1810 was 100 gallons per day, and that it received

received no more than 100 gallons per day from the company supplying it; that would be the kind of supply which I apprehend was given in the year 1810; for, as the use of water is not regularly the same from day to day, it would happen occasionally that there was a scanty supply; but the ordinary consumption being limited to 100 gallons, if the supply be increased to 110 gallons, which is one tenth more, that supply, which before required an occasional regard to economy, would be converted into an abundant supply; and the result of all the information I have collected upon the subject is to satisfy me, whatever may have been the actual quantity delivered by the old companies in the year 1810 to the older parts of the district in question, it is exceeded by the present supply only to the amount of from one tenth to one eighth more than it then was. There can be no doubt that into this district a larger quantity of water is delivered now than there was in 1810, because there is a great increase of buildings since 1810; but that is an advantage to the company supplying it. I think also that it must be obvious to the Committee, as bearing upon the proposition which I have submitted to them, that the increase cannot exceed one eighth; that if the present consumption of a family were reduced by the amount of one eighth, the inconvenience would be felt, and very materially felt. Then again, as to the cisternage capable of receiving the alleged quantity of water; the average cisternage of this district is not capable of receiving a greater supply than from 80 to 90 gallons a day upon the average; supposing the supply to be 80 or 90 gallons a day, that is the utmost extent of the capacity. The calculation is made also upon the assumption that the services are four times a week, and not more frequently.

Mr.
James Weale.

(2 March.)

Which district do you speak of?—The West Middlesex and the Grand Junction.

Lunæ, 5^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. James Weale, Again called in; and Examined.

HAVE you any reasons to offer to the consideration of the Committee, why it would not be just and reasonable to grant to the companies for the future, some addition to the rates of 1810, for a supply of water to be given equal to that now afforded to them?—I have; and, as I think, very strong reasons. Looking at the terms of their contracts, as set forth in their proposals and undertakings, I would say they are not entitled to any addition to the reduced rates, for they perform no more than they voluntarily and spontaneously undertook to perform at those rates. Numerous individuals have been deluded, by their proposals, into expenses far beyond the amount they have gained by the reduction of the rates, in the removal of their force-pumps, cisterns, pipes, &c. which they have since been under the necessity of reinstating; and others have been seduced into the erection of water-closets on the upper stories of their houses, in the faith of receiving a gratuitous high service: and the costs of providing and delivering the water are not greater now than when the companies issued their proposals to serve at these reduced rates. But I believe the public are not unwilling to dispense with a strict observance of the companies proposals and undertakings, and to enter upon a new adjustment of the terms of remuneration, provided security can be given for the continuance of the supply now given. Still I conceive the only safe and fair principle on which such adjustment can be founded, must be with reference to the supply and the rates of 1810, not on collected accounts of income and expenditure, or of profit to be divided on imaginary and fictitious capitals. In this view of the proposition, the grounds laid by the companies for an increased rate may be stated to be, *First*, high service; and for this particular service, I believe that the majority of the tenants availing themselves of it, would consent to pay an extra rate, if the charge be limited to cisterns at an elevation beyond the power of the old works. *Secondly*, increased security against fire: in addition to what I have already stated, in relation to the mains being kept charged with water during the night, I would observe that no reduction in the premiums of insurance has taken place since the establishment of the new waterworks, and that if fires prove less destructive of property now, than twenty or thirty years since, it is almost wholly to be attributed to the less hazardous quality

Mr.
James Weale.

(5 March.)

Mr.
James Weale.

(5 March.)

quality of the buildings since erected. *Thirdly*, increased waste of water; an allegation which I deny to be applicable to this division of the town. *Fourthly*, the ordinary or low service, as increased in quantity and improved in regularity of service; and on this point alone, in my opinion, does the whole question concerning rates depend. If the increase amount only to a fraction of the old supply, as I have endeavoured to show to the Committee, I know not on what equitable principle it can be maintained that the charge should be increased, having regard to the sacrifices which the public have made to enable these companies to construct their works, and to carry on their trade. If the consumption had increased, averagely, within the short period of five years, to three, four or five times its former amount, as has been sometimes alleged, there would be some fair pretence for an increased rate; and the Committee alone can determine how far that allegation ought to be received as correct. Then, on the other hand, we must look to the advantages possessed by the new companies in their improved system of works as compared with the old works, and which improvement it was one of the objects of the legislature to procure for the public in the erection of these corporations. I state it as my opinion, founded on a great variety of information carefully digested, that to perpetual corporations having large districts to supply under the like circumstances, the use of iron mains and pipes will produce a twofold profit; as compared with the profits to be derived from the use of wood pipes, in the course of a period not exceeding sixty years; and after making full allowance for the greater capital required in the one case than in the other. If the public are to be charged for the smallest benefit they can derive from these improvements in a more regular and ample supply of water, I can perceive no advantage resulting to the public, as it was held out there would be, from the construction of the new works. It is also necessary to show to the Committee what the rates of 1810 really were. They were rates assessed by companies which had long been in exclusive possession of the supply; by companies not subject to any control over the amount of their assessment; rates which had been within the five preceding years, increased to their amount in that year, by an addition of from ten to fifteen per cent. on their former amount, to meet the charge of the property tax, and increased prices of labour and materials occasioned by the war; they were rates, even before they were so increased, under which the old companies had not only progressively increased the amount of their real capitals in trade, by successive improvements of their works, but from which they had also derived funds for dividends paid to their respective proprietaries gradually, but progressively increasing in amount through a long course of time terminating in that year. Since the year 1810, the price of labour, and the prices of all kinds of materials used in these works, have been considerably reduced; the property and other taxes have been repealed; and the currency nearly restored to its ancient standard, and certainly improved to an amount, as compared with its value in 1810, of twenty per cent. at the least. To recur then to the rates of 1810, will alone be a grant to them of an additional remuneration of twenty per cent.; and if to that you grant a further addition, you will enhance the price to be paid for the water supplied, far beyond the usual price really paid for that supply in and previously to 1810, at the very moment that the current costs of its provision and delivery are reduced considerably below what their amount was in that year. Looking then to the improvements which have been effected in the mode and amount of the supply; fairly apportioning between the companies and the public a part only of the advantages derived from the improved system of their works; and having regard to the progressive extension of the town, I have no hesitation in submitting to the Committee my unqualified opinion, that in recurring to the rates of 1810, the companies will be most generously and most liberally dealt with on the part of the public, and that to sanction any increase of those rates, would be pregnant with injustice to the community at large, and extremely oppressive on a very great proportion of the inhabitants, who do not participate in the alleged new luxuries of high services, baths, &c.

What particular proceedings of the water companies, arising out of the arrangement for the partition of the town into districts, became the subject of public complaint in the course of the year 1818?—I have already stated that a very large proportion of the inhabitants adhered to and preferred the supply of the old companies throughout the competition. Nevertheless, those inhabitants were suddenly left without a supply of water, or they were transferred from that which they esteemed to be good water to a supply of very indifferent water. The first intimation which the inhabitants received of the old companies having withdrawn from their

their district, was by a printed circular letter, dated the 1st of January 1818, and signed J. P. Rowe, secretary to the New River company.

What do you mean by their being suddenly left without a supply of water?— I mean that the New River company, for instance, ceased to supply its tenants in the district from which it retired either at or soon after Christmas 1817.

Without any previous communication?— Without any previous communication to their tenants.

Do you mean to say the water was taken away without any previous communication to the inhabitants?—I mean to say, that previously to Christmas 1817, when the water ceased to be supplied by the New River company, no notice had been given. The inhabitants were actually without a supply of water, and felt the want of a supply of water before this letter of Mr. Rowe was received.

In point of fact, to your belief, was a transfer of the individuals made without any previous communication to them at all?—I do believe so. I am referring now to the early part of the month of January. This letter is signed by Mr. Rowe, secretary to the New River company, and dated from the New River office, 1st of January 1818.

[It was read.]

The Committee will observe that the letter is dated the 1st of January 1818; it is a printed circular, and was not served upon the respective inhabitants until some days afterwards. Towards the close of the month, the inhabitants so left by the old companies received a circular letter from the West Middlesex waterworks office, dated the 16th of January 1818, and signed by M. K. Knight, secretary.

[It was read.]

Now the fact of the old companies having abandoned their tenants, and the receipt of this letter of Mr. Knight, created a strong feeling of indignation against the companies; and the parties who were suffering from the want of a supply of water, upon making application to the offices of the new companies, were there told that they must pay five shillings for the transfer of their pipes from the mains or pipes belonging to the old companies to the mains or pipes belonging to the new companies. Many persons resisted the demand of five shillings: and so much public discussion of the matter ensued, that the new companies thought fit at last to abandon the demand, and laid on the pipes at their own expense. In consequence of these proceedings, the Mary-le-bone vestry interfered and entered into a correspondence, both with the new and the old companies: and in the course of that correspondence, a letter was received by the Mary-le-bone vestry from Mr. Knight, dated the 19th of February 1818, which I should wish also to be read.

[It was read.]

The assurances contained in the letter which has been just read were not deemed satisfactory by the vestry of Mary-le-bone.

Was any answer given to that letter by the vestry, do you know?—No answer whatever. The assurances contained in the letter were not deemed satisfactory; and having ascertained that the partition of that district of the town had taken place, the vestry came to a resolution to apply to parliament for leave to introduce a bill to empower the vestrymen of Mary-le-bone to construct waterworks for the supply of that parish, or to contract with any existing water company for the supply of the parish with water.

Have you a copy of that resolution?—I have a printed copy of the papers here: the original documents can be produced, if the Committee desire to have the documents themselves.

Have you the resolution?—I am only just adverting to these documents: if you think they are essential to your inquiry, you can call for them from an authentic source, which must be more satisfactory to the Committee, and to me: I have them only in a printed shape. The resolution is dated the 28th of February 1818: "Resolved unanimously, That the several reports and proceedings of this board, and its committees, with the report of Mr. Potter, respecting the application to parliament for better supplying the inhabitants of this parish with water, having been this day taken into mature consideration, that application be made to parliament for carrying the same into execution, and also for empowering this board to enter into contracts with any water companies for the supplying this parish with water, and to empower any such companies to contract with this vestry." On the 2d of May 1818, a further communication was made from the clerk of the West Middlesex company; from which it appeared that the directors of the West Middlesex company

Mr.
James Weale.

(5 March.)

pany had mis-calculated the amount of rental which they would derive from a recurrence to the rates of 1810, and that the rates of 1810 would not, in fact, produce such a gross sum from the district to be supplied with water; as would, in their opinion, be a fair remuneration to them for that supply.

In fact they retracted the declaration of the letter dated the 19th of February? —They retracted it, as I understand, in a verbal declaration that it was written an error.

[It was read.]

The Committee will be pleased to observe, that the companies hold themselves at liberty to recede from that assurance which is held out in the letter of the 19th of February 1818, because no answer was given to it by the Mary-le-bone vestry. Founded on the report of the 2d of May 1818, which has just been read to the Committee, the West Middlesex company issued a circular letter or printed handbill, dated the 11th May 1818, which, I believe, was distributed throughout the parish. It is a paper, intituled, "Case of the West Middlesex Waterworks against the Bill now in Parliament for establishing a Parochial Water Company in St. Mary-le-bone;" and is dated, "Office, 51, Berners-street, 11th May 1818;" and signed "by Order of the Board of Directors, M. K. Knight, Secretary."

[It was read.]

This paper was left at the houses of the inhabitants in the way all papers of this description usually are; and from what I have heard I believe that very few of the inhabitants, comparatively, read it. It was treated as a handbill. The Mary-le-bone Parochial Bill had then been introduced into parliament; but the proceedings on it were soon afterwards suspended, on a suggestion of Mr. Michael Angelo Taylor, that some arrangement might possibly be effected between the parish and the companies during the summer recess. In the mean time the pipes of the companies which had retired from that division of the town were taken up and removed. After Midsummer 1818, the different collectors of the West Middlesex company, in calling for payment of the half-year's rates, which became due at Midsummer 1818, gave receipts, on which this information was printed "The company think it right to intimate to their customers that the advance announced in their printed case, dated May the 11th, 1818, will not be collected till after Christmas next."

What proceedings, in relation to these subjects, took place subsequently to Christmas 1818?—Soon after Christmas 1818, the increased rates were put in charge of the collectors of the West Middlesex company, and the demand for payment of them produced great indignation and a very considerable ferment throughout the whole of that district. The Committee will recollect that the notice upon the receipts last given, stated, that the advance would "not be collected till after Christmas next." Even those who knew that it was intended to increase the rates, were not at all aware that those increased rates were to take place from a period antecedent to the delivery of that notice. The Committee will also observe the equivocal term which is used in that notice, "will not be collected till after Christmas next." I now hold in my hand one of the receipts so given, dated the 21st of December 1818; and I put it to the Committee whether the party so paying could have conceived that the increased rate was to take effect from the preceding Midsummer.

Do you mean to state, that when the rates came to be collected, they were demanded from the Midsummer antecedent to that notice, or only from Midsummer? —From Midsummer 1818, which is antecedent to that notice.

[A receipt was produced, dated July 1st, 1818, without any such notice.]

There was a very considerable resistance to the demand so made. The Mary-le-bone vestry again submitted their bill to parliament, and shortly afterwards Mr. Michael Angelo Taylor presented that bill, which is since very well known as Mr. Taylor's water bill. It passed the House of Commons; and it passed the House of Lords, with an amendment, limiting the increased rates to the rates of 1810. On its return to the House of Commons it was therefore withdrawn. During the whole of the interval, the collectors were requiring the payment of the increased rates, and by various representations did obtain payment from many individuals. At the time the demand was made upon me, (in April 1819) I refused to pay it, and I stated to the collector that if the company thought they were entitled to enforce the payment, I was quite ready to try the question with them. The general dissatisfaction which

which prevailed throughout the parish led to the association of some of the householders, who felt themselves aggrieved by the conduct of the companies; and a public meeting was held for the purpose of raising a fund to defray the expenses which might be incurred in trying the right of the company to withhold a supply of water for a refusal to pay this increased rate, and also to ascertain whether they were entitled to demand any increase of the rates at all. A letter was written to the solicitors for the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies, on behalf of the individuals so associated together, proposing that the matters in dispute should be put into a shape for early trial. That proposal was not accepted. After Michaelmas 1819 the Grand Junction company began to demand payment of increased rates, and they were generally resisted. I would now explain that the principle upon which the increase was charged in the case of the West Middlesex company, was by adding to the rate charged upon the particular house in 1810, five-and-twenty per cent. if situated southward of the New-road; but for houses situated northward of the New-road, a charge was made, having no reference to the rates paid in 1810 for houses which were built in and previously to that year. The Grand Junction company did not follow that rule, but proceeded upon a principle of equalization, so that in many instances the increased rate of the Grand Junction company was, having regard to the rate charged in 1810 upon the particular house, considerably more than twenty-five per cent. and in some few instances certainly less.

What was the principle of equalization; how was that founded?—As far as I have been able to judge from statements which have been laid before me of the rates charged upon particular houses, I should say that no principle whatever was observed; but that it was to exact the largest sum which could be obtained from the party.

Will you state to whom this has been represented by the companies?—It has been stated to me.

By an agent of the company?—By Mr. Coe, clerk to the Grand Junction company, who stated to me that the rates charged in 1810, on particular houses, bore no proportion to the quantity of water or the quality of the house, and that remonstrances having been made at an early period, they were induced to depart from the principle of adding 25 per cent. to the rate charged upon the particular house in 1810, and to equalize the rates, having regard to those two circumstances; but that, upon the whole, they did not receive an additional rate beyond the amount of 25 per cent. upon the aggregate rental of 1810.

They represented that, upon the whole, they had not got a larger gross sum upon the whole amount of the rates in 1810 than 25 per cent?—Yes. In January 1820, the Mary-le-bone vestry offered again to try the questions in dispute, in the shape of an amicable suit between the parties. In March 1820, a similar proposal was made on behalf of the associated householders; and who further offered, through the medium of their solicitor, to give an undertaking, to abide by the decision, and to pay the rates in the mean time. In April 1820, the proposal was again renewed on behalf of the associated householders, through the medium of the Chairman of this Committee; and I should wish particularly that his letter should be read, to show that the householders were willing to give the companies every possible security that they should not be damaged by any delay which might take place in obtaining a judicial decision upon the questions so disputed, the previous proposals having been declined. It is a letter dated the 22d April, 1820, signed W. H. Fremantle, chairman of the general committee of the Anti Water Monopoly Association, and is addressed to Mr. M. K. Knight, clerk of the West Middlesex waterworks.

[It was read.]

A similar letter was sent to the clerk of the Grand Junction company. In answer to that letter, a letter was received from Mr. Knight, dated the 28th April 1820.

[It was read.]

The answer of the Grand Junction company, dated the 2d of May 1820, is signed W. M. Coe, secretary.

[It was read.]

The Committee will observe that this correspondence adverts to certain cases, in which the companies had cut off the pipes for nonpayment of the increased rates; but all those cases were of this description; namely, the parties had once paid the increased rate, and, as they alleged, from a misapprehension of the powers of the company, not willingly. The company had not ventured at that period to cut off the pipes of any individuals who continued to occupy the same premises which they

Mr.
James Weale.

(5 March.)

had occupied during the half year ending Midsummer 1818, and who had throughout the subsequent period refused to pay the increased rates. To those persons, a circular notice was delivered previously to Lady-day 1820, which notice is framed in these terms: it is dated the 11th March 1820, signed M. K. Knight.

[It was read.]

The terms of the circular notice from the Grand Junction company are not precisely the same, but they are to the same effect; it is dated the 1st of June 1820, signed W. M. Coe.

[It was read.]

The Committee will observe that it was one of the objects of the several proposals which were made to the companies, to put the questions in dispute between the parties into a shape for trial, or for receiving the decision of a court of law, to ascertain whether the householders were to be considered as yearly tenants under their existing contracts (if they were contracts); or, whether the companies were under a legal obligation to supply water to the inhabitants respectively resident within the circle of their works, on payment of reasonable rates; and in these notices it is quite obvious, that the companies admit that the parties were yearly tenants, and that they could not enforce the payment of increased rates without a previous notice of six months. About this time the West Middlesex company claimed a further additional rate from the householders who were supplied with the high service, such additional rate to commence from Lady-day 1819. The Grand Junction company's demand for high service commenced from Michaelmas 1818. The increased rates are demanded by the West Middlesex company, for the low service from Midsummer 1818, and for the high service from Lady-day 1819: by the Grand Junction company, for both the low and the high services from Michaelmas 1818.

That was the first time of their charging for high service?—Yes; but it was not until after Michaelmas 1819 that the demand was made for the high service. The West Middlesex company (and I believe the Grand Junction also), did give notice that the high service would be made a matter of distinct charge.

Is that the notice you allude to [handing a paper to the witness]?—This is the same.

[It was read, dated the 19th February 1819.]

The refusal of the companies to accept the propositions which were made to them for the trial of the questions in dispute, induced the inhabitants to present the petitions to parliament towards the close of the sessions 1820, which have led to this inquiry.

Your answers have hitherto referred to the proceedings of the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies alone; do you know whether a similar course of proceeding was followed by the New River and Chelsea companies in the adjacent districts allotted to them?—Yes; the Chelsea first assessed their tenants with an increased rate in the autumn of 1818. I was abroad at that time; but all the papers relating to it have since been put into my hands by the solicitor to the committee of householders appointed in that district. The Chelsea company required payment of an increased rate, amounting to fifty per cent. on the rates in 1810, and to enforce the payment of it, cut off some one or two pipes; a public meeting of the householders was held, and a committee appointed to confer with the Chelsea company. Much correspondence took place between the parties, in which I think it due to the Chelsea company to state, that every information desired by the parties so in correspondence with them was afforded. When Mr. Taylor's bill was in progress in the House of Commons, and it was ascertained that the Committee of that house would not sanction an increase of the rates beyond the amount of twenty-five per cent. upon the rates of 1810, the Chelsea company publicly declared that they would be satisfied with the like increase; and they issued a circular notice to all their tenants, wherein they stated that one half of the increased rate which had been collected at that time, would be returned to the inhabitants, and it has since been returned to them accordingly. The notice is dated the 8th of May 1819, and signed J. G. Lynde, secretary, Chelsea waterworks.

[It was read.]

The New River company have not, I believe, to this hour, (they had not within the last fortnight) increased the rates in the districts which have been abandoned to them; nor have they even re-established the rates of 1810, in the cases of the tenants

tenants who were re-transferred to them, but have been serving them at the reduced rates which were set by the new companies when they seduced them away from the old companies.

State the most material points of the grievances complained of in relation to the existing law on this subject, to which you would wish most particularly to point the attention of the Committee?—The first is, the breach of faith in the violation of their engagements with individuals, as to the reduced rates and high services: the injuries which the old companies have sustained from the unfair manner in which they prosecuted their competition, and the consequent injury to the public in the destruction of the previously existing competition: the amount of the increased rates demanded, generally, in the older parts of the division, as compared with the rates paid in 1810, and the inequality of the assessment of the increased rates, which have been carried to a most enormous and arbitrary amount in numerous instances, particularly on houses built since 1810, or situated northward of the New-road, and as compared with their assessment on the older houses southward of the New-road: the charge made for high service, in numerous instances, where the same cisterns have been supplied in the ordinary service of the old companies, and without extra charge: the extra rates charged on all tradesmen using water in their business, although their consumption be not equal to the ordinary supply: the asserted right of withholding a supply of water at their pleasure; the power, consequent on that assumption of right, of cutting off the supply, and which has been exercised in all cases where the tenants have refused to conform to their terms of agreement, and under various other pretences; and the extortion practised and enforced by the exercise of that power, in regard to the period comprised in their own six months notices. In explanation of the last sentence of my answer, I would state to the Committee, that on the expiration of those notices, the companies refused to receive payment of the sums therein specified and stated to be the rates at which they were then under contract to serve, and told the parties that unless they would pay the increased rates for the whole of the back period, or consent to pay a further increase of rate, which should be equivalent to the difference between the rate then payable and the amount of the increased rate demanded, the water would be cut off. Where the party has refused to consent to those terms, the water has been cut off; and, in some instances, before the water has been again laid on, they have made the party pay that difference between the old and new rate, in the way of a fine, or sign an agreement for the payment of a further increased rate, equivalent to twenty per cent. on the amount of the increased rate, making a total increase of fifty per cent. on the rate of 1810. The next ground of complaint is, that there is no security that an ample supply of water will continue to be given even in the cases of individuals who submit to their terms; and lastly, the expense and difficulties, and almost utter hopelessness, of obtaining any redress at law, however grievous or unjust the matter may be, in consequence of particular clauses contained in the different acts of parliament.

What are the clauses in the existing acts which you represent as interposing peculiar difficulties in the prosecution of proceedings at law against the water companies?—The clauses to which I particularly allude, are clauses which have crept of late years very commonly into acts of parliament of this description.

What act are you referring to now?—The West Middlesex act of the 46th Geo. 3, c. 119, sections 80 and 81, enacting, that a plaintiff shall not recover, unless previous notice of the action be given to the company, and that he shall be subject to double costs, if judgment be given against him.

[They were read.]

The Committee will observe that those clauses require a plaintiff to give notice of the matter of his complaint to the company before instituting any action at law; the practical effect of that provision is, that if there be the slightest variation between the terms of the notice so served upon the company, and the declaration in the action, the plaintiff will most certainly be nonsuited upon proof of that variation; he is not merely nonsuited, but he is also burthened with double costs.

Have you ever been advised by any professional man that you could not proceed to bring an action for cutting off your water, without giving such notice as that?—Undoubtedly I have, by an eminent special pleader; I have had a case before him for some months, for the purpose of drawing a notice. So that an individual has not only to contend against a public company, dealing with a corporate fund, but he is also met with this technical difficulty, and if successfully pleaded against him he has

Mr.
James Weale.

(5 March.)

to pay double costs; whereas in litigation between private parties he would only be subjected to the ordinary taxed costs. In the case of the Grand Junction company, it is treble costs. I consider that at this moment I have a good right of action against the West Middlesex company, even under their own construction of the law, they having cut my water off, after having supplied me beyond Christmas, the term of the current contract alleged in their notice; and if it were not for the clauses in question, I should have instituted that action already; and unless some other means be afforded by a new act of the legislature, even with the risk of double costs on my own head, I will yet try an action on that matter.

You have been advised you cannot, without giving that notice?—Yes, certainly.

What is the name of the lawyer who gave you that advise?—Mr. Littledale, and my own attorney. Mr. Littledale finds a difficulty at this moment in drawing a notice; we have been waiting a decision in the court of King's Bench, to know what the law is, to frame the notice accordingly. I would therefore wish to express my earnest hope to the Committee, that if their inquiries should lead to the adoption of any new legislative measure, provision will be made to afford an easy means of obtaining redress against these companies for any complaints which may be made against them, in regard to an insufficient supply of water, or the demand of an unreasonable rate.

When the companies offer to supply at reduced rates, have you any reason to believe that it was generally understood that the supply was to be afforded at those rates for a short time only, or that the rates were to be reduced permanently?—I have good reason to believe that the general understanding, not only on the part of the inhabitants so supplied at reduced rates, but also on the part of the agents of the companies proposing to supply those inhabitants at reduced rates, from communications which I have had with many of the persons acting as their agents at that period, that the supply was to be given permanently at those reduced rates. I do not mean to say, for all time; that they were never to be varied. I now hold in my hand a document which, I think, will go to show, that such was the understanding of the Grand Junction waterworks company themselves. It is a printed paper which was circulated generally among the more respectable inhabitants of the parishes supplied by them.

[It was read.]

There is no date to that paper, but it refers to the minute of the board of directors of the Grand Junction company, of the 4th of June 1812.

You have stated on a former day, and you have repeated it to-day, that when this competition was begun, and was going on, by far the larger part of the inhabitants adhered to the old companies; you yourself were one of those who adhered to the old companies?—Yes.

You were served by the New River, and continued to be so served?—Yes.

Because you thought the competition was begun and carried on upon an unjust principle, with a view to drive out the old companies, and that the new companies were offering to serve at rates which they could not afford for that purpose?—Yes.

When you state that this adherence to the old companies was general, do you mean that the inhabitants generally adhered to the old companies, consenting to pay the former rates, or that they adhered to them upon the condition of a considerable abatement of their rates?—In answer to that question, it is only possible for me to state what occurred in my own individual case. The new companies, when they first came into those parishes, did not proceed to lay down their pipes regularly through a portion of the district, but they drove their pipes forward into the best streets, to occupy the best part of the different divisions, leaving all the inferior streets unsupplied from their works. It was in those superior situations that the competition first commenced, by the reduction of the rates. It had not reached me at the time when the New River company's collector put into my hands a printed letter (to the best of my recollection, for I have not been able to find it), urging the inhabitants generally not to withdraw their custom from their old friends, the New River company, for that the New River company would be disposed to continue to serve the inhabitants at as low rates as could possibly be afforded by any new company: and at a very short period after that a notice was served, I should rather say, at the time that the collector called for payment of the rates due, he intimated that the rates would be reduced to what they were previously to the last increase in 1806 or 1807; so that, unsolicited, the rates on my house were reduced from 30s. to 24s.; and I think the same thing occurred throughout the district.

Then

Mr.
James Weale.

(5 March.)

Then this adherence was purchased by a sacrifice of twenty per cent?—I cannot say how far the householders would have been proof against the temptations of the new companies, if the old companies had adhered to their old rates; but the reduction of the rates of the old companies being made almost immediately after the new companies were enabled to supply, and were offering to supply at reduced rates, that portion of the inhabitants which I have before stated, did adhere to the old companies.

Do you think there is the least chance in the world, that the inhabitants would have adhered to the old companies, if the old companies had adhered to their old rates?—Not upon a large scale; I do not think it possible that men could have withstood those temptations.

Would you yourself have adhered?—I dare say not.

Your mind was under the impression that the reduction offered by the new companies was an injustice to the old companies, and could not be afforded?—I may have been acting under different feelings from the mass of the inhabitants. For the last twenty years, my attention has been particularly directed to the operations of the trading joint stock companies which have arisen within that period. About twenty years ago, I commenced a literary work upon the Mississippi scheme of Law; and I was a very close observer of all the operations which were carried on by the speculators, who came forward with various projects between the years 1800 and 1810; so that I was more alive to the subject than the great mass of people were: for I saw in the greater part of those schemes the fraudulent principle upon which they were brought forward to the public, and felt assured that the greater part of them would prove to be mere bubbles.

Fraudful you mean to the honest, plain-dealing trader, who had no such projects?—No; I speak as to the public in general. There was no crying want of water in these districts; but the new works originated in a set of city speculators, and the clamour with which the old companies were met in 1810, when that West Middlesex bill was under the consideration of the House of Commons, was mainly excited and instigated by those speculators, so as to give a colour to their representation that there was a want of water.

That was your opinion then, and is now?—Yes; from the circumstances I have mentioned: my inquiries were not particularly directed to water companies.

Do you mean to say that any set of gentlemen could persuade a set of inhabitants they wanted water, when they did not?—No; I have had before me the evidence given in 1810, and in that evidence, I see individuals were collected together from certain quarters of the town to state to the Committee that there was a want of water; I say that they were collected together; and I say the ground upon which I state my conviction of the fact is, that in such a wealthy division of the town as that which comprises the parishes of St. Mary-le-bone, St. George and St. James, if there had been so much inconvenience experienced from the insufficiency of the supply given by the old companies, there can be no doubt that many of the principal proprietors of property in that division of the town, and other wealthy individuals resident there, would have come forward to propose the construction of such works as were afterwards constructed, and to relieve themselves from that inconvenience; but, as you have already heard from one of the witnesses on the part of the companies, the persons who first thought of supplying this want of water in St. George's and St. Mary-le-bone, were persons who were engaged in a speculation of constructing waterworks for Manchester.

Do you think there may not be very considerable inconvenience felt from want of water short of the inconvenience which would instigate men of property having nothing to do with such speculations or trade, to form a junction, raise a great capital, enter into a new business, at that time comparatively unknown, and form waterworks to relieve themselves?—I do not think it at all probable; I do not think, from my knowledge of works of that kind, that there ever was a great undertaking carried into effect or projected, without the parties who have felt the inconvenience, or the want of such an undertaking, first moving in it. I will refer to the docks, and to the canals.

You have stated that you believe this to be a mere speculation something of a younger child of your Mississippi scheme; that it was fraudulent towards the public, and fraudulent to those already engaged in the supply of the town, inasmuch as it held out a hope, for which there was no real foundation, in its being possible that the party should derive an honest profit from the terms on which they offered to sell?—I have a moral conviction of that fact, and I have a moral conviction of this fact,

Mr.
James Weale.

(5 March.)

fact, that after they became perfectly assured that it was morally impossible they should be able to afford the supply they were holding out, they did go on prosecuting their works, and raising fresh funds by new subscriptions; and I would refer to a pamphlet, which was compiled by the then secretary of the Chelsea company (stating facts which must have come home to the understanding of every man who had £.50 engaged in any one of those speculations), to show it was impossible they could ever succeed on the principle on which they were proceeding; nevertheless, and for three years after the letters which formed the subject-matter of the pamphlet had been published, they persevered in still holding forth those promises to the public.

With all these impressions on your mind, did it never occur to you that you were, in effect, to the extent of 6 s. a year assisting them in this fraud, by accepting a tender of reduction that the old companies made, and could not afford to make, in your own case?—I have no objection to answer the question, and I beg to be allowed to answer it: I should say not, certainly; because I do not conceive that the ruin proceeded from the mere reduction of the rates; on the contrary, I think that there was good ground for the public to expect a reduction of the rates. I know that there was a general dissatisfaction prevailing at the increase of the rates a few years before, which I have already stated; and in making that reduction the New River company was only recurring to the rates previously assessed upon the inhabitants. The circumstance, therefore, which bore upon my mind, was not the fact of the new companies offering this unlimited and more commodious supply of water at a reduced rate, but from the manner in which they were acting for the purpose of obtaining customers; their proposals that they would lay down leaden pipes; that they would do a great variety of things which the old companies never would have done, as temptations and inducements to withdraw those tenants from the old companies; and because they were in some instances, I believe I may say in all, giving a gratuitous supply of water for a part of the year. Again, if they could obtain a customer at the end of a street, they would run down a main to the end of the street to obtain the custom of that customer. It was quite obvious that the rental to be obtained from the single house could not afford a profit upon the works laid down for the supply of that house.

When you say you think the public were entitled to a reduction of rate in 1810, are you aware of the increased price of labour in London, within the few years that preceded 1810?—I believe no man is more aware of the fact than I am.

What do you state to be the increase from 1795 or 1800 to 1810?—I should think that the amount of the depreciation in the value of money, between the commencement of the revolutionary war in 1793 and the year 1810, was at least 40 per cent.

Are you aware that labour had risen above 150 per cent?—Yes, in some instances.

Rents continued to be paid in this depreciated money?—They did.

Are you aware that the price of timber had risen from 50 s. a load to £. 5 or £. 6?—You allude to elm timber. I do not carry the price in my mind, but I recollect that there was an increase fully to that extent in oak timber.

Then you must be aware that the expenses of a company so carrying on their concerns, must have been very considerably enhanced during the ten or fifteen years you speak of?—I have no doubt of it: but that the answers which I have given to your questions may not carry an erroneous impression to the mind of the Committee, it is necessary I should state that the public, and I in common with that public, were utterly ignorant of the amount of the profit made by the New River or Chelsea companies. There was a general impression abroad, that those companies, being in possession of the monopoly of the supply, were, even with the rates before they were so increased, realizing immense profits; and the public were not disposed, merely from the circumstance of the increased prices of labour and materials, to concede to the companies an increase of the rates; because it was thought that they might continue to give the same supply for the same rates, though the currency in which those rates were paid was depreciated; that the companies would still derive a very considerable profit from those rates.

You say this impression was general; do you believe that the new companies were not under the same sort of mistake as to the profits of the old companies?—My answer to that question can only go to show this; that if the new companies did not inform themselves of the amount of rates paid within the district which they proposed to supply, and compute how far the rates so paid were likely to afford them

a profit

a profit upon the capital to be embarked in the construction of the works, and the current expense of carrying on their works; it must be quite obvious to the Committee, as it is to me, that the speculation must have been commenced (I am referring to the original proprietors) without any permanent regard to the public benefit, but merely to promote that which I have always looked upon to have been their sole object, speculation in the shares of the companies; that they looked to profit from increasing the market-price of the shares which they possessed, and realizing the premiums which they could obtain upon a transfer of those shares. For, it is an extraordinary fact, that the Grand Junction company, which upon the face of the act of parliament itself appears to have been constituted for the purpose of supplying the parish of Paddington with water, do not even at this moment, though their works are situated in the very centre of that parish, supply only a part of it, and but a very small part of it.

That was the result of the partition?—No: they never had supplied the bishop of London's tenants, which was the origin and object of their appointment. I mean to say this, that the apparent object of their institution was the last object which those companies set about to perform.

You mean to infer, that if their object had been to accommodate the public, they would have supplied those tenants?—Yes: an application has been made on behalf of a tenant of the bishop of London's estate, for a supply of water from the works of the Grand Junction company, and the answer given to that application was, that the company had no mains or pipes laid down in that part of the bishop of London's estate.

Mr. Charles Smith, Called in; and Examined.

WHERE do you live?—No. 211, Piccadilly.

What are you?—A superfine colourman.

Are you one of the petitioners?—I am one of the petitioners, and one of the opposers of the water monopolies.

Is your name affixed to any of the petitions presented on Friday?—No; my case is that of my water having been cut off.

State your case?—I did not know but that I was on the New River company till they came and wanted two guineas instead of 24s.

When did they cut it off?—I think I came and complained to you [a member of the Committee] when they did.

When did they cut off your supply?—As nearly as I can calculate, three weeks ago.

Have you any recollection to a certainty when it was cut off?—No; but I can tell within a few days; above three weeks.

Do you happen to know whether this Committee was sitting at that time?—I do not know.

Was it before or since the 6th of February?—I cannot tell exactly, they came and made the demand after Christmas, and applied two or three times, and since that they have cut it off; but they have been the cause of my sinking a pump. I beg leave to state one thing that bears particularly upon the question before the Committee, and that is in respect to the public's withdrawing from the New River company. I can only say that my own case is a case in point; that I have been a tenant for these last thirty years, as I thought, always of the New River company; that I approve of the New River company's water; that I should not have taken any other water on any terms or conditions; that a notice was served on me and application made to me repeatedly by the other companies; I always refused, saying the New River afforded me a good and proper supply, and I considered, although they had advanced once, I considered it a rational advance and no imposition, and therefore I should certainly not, from my own feelings, and I believe a great many with whom I am acquainted would not have withdrawn, had the New River company continued to supply.

You got an abatement of your rent before they went?—No.

None?—They chose to take it off. I had no abatement, because they went back to the old prices of their own accord.

Mr.
James Wealc.

(5 March.)

Mr.
Charles Smith.

Mercurij, 7^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William John Newton*, Called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
W. J. Newton.

(7 March.)

WHAT is your situation, and where do you reside?—No. 8, Argyle-street ; I am an Artist by profession.

In what line?—Miniature painting.

How long have you resided there?—About six years ; I have lived there since Michaelmas 1814.

State to the Committee what the nature of your complaint is?—I have lived, as I have just stated, in Argyle-street, six years and rather better, during which time I had occupied two houses, No. 34 and No. 8 ; I left No. 34 at Midsummer last ; a person waited upon me from the Grand Junction company about the latter end of the year 1816, or the beginning of 1817, to ask me to take their water from them, offering as an inducement a lower rate.

Do you happen to know who that person was?—No, I cannot inform the Committee the name, but a person stating himself to come from the company ; I refused, by stating that I was very well satisfied with the New River company, and if they did not continue to use me well I would apply to the Grand Junction. Some time afterwards a person waited upon me from the New River company, hoping I would not leave them ; I told him a person had called upon me from the Grand Junction.

Who was that person?—The person whom I usually paid ; I do not know his name ; it was the collector : I stated to him that I was satisfied with the supply of water of the New River, and at the rate also ; that I would not leave them so long as they continued to use me well ; for I neither thought it honourable nor just that such old servants of the public should be turned away without just cause. Foreseeing the probability of a question being put to me to that effect, I thought it advisable to put the receipts in my pocket ; the receipts I paid regularly to the New River company, wherein it will clearly appear, that after I had been so applied to there was no reduction of the rate ; I have brought them with me that they may appear clearly before the Committee. I did not leave the New River company, nor would I take any abatement of the price that had been charged to me heretofore ; I had paid £.2. 10s. a year up to Michaelmas 1818, and this application was made to me about 1816 or 1817. A person waited upon me some time afterwards from the Grand Junction company for payment ; not the same person who came to me before.

Do you recollect the time?—No, not exactly ; it was after Michaelmas 1818. This person from the Grand Junction Canal company informed me that the New River company had left the street ; this was the time they made the application to me for payment, and I hesitated some time to pay them ; at last I paid up to Michaelmas 1818, there being no alternative, at the same rate of £.2. 10s. I paid them three quarters. I paid that, finding there was no alternative, and as no addition to the rate had been made, I thought it was but justice, in short : some time after I received a circular letter from the Grand Junction water company, stating their case with a view to a further demand ; I refused to comply, in consequence of an invitation from my neighbours to resist the demand. Some time afterwards I think it was I received another circular, about the beginning of last year, threatening, that if I did not comply with the additional rate they would cut off the water.

Have you that notice with you?—No, I have not ; but it was read the last time I was here. I removed to my present residence about Midsummer last year ; up to the time of going into the house, and while I was living there, there was an abundant supply of water, and during the time the repairs were going on, but in three or four days afterwards there was a deficiency. I made an application to the Grand Junction office to know the cause of this deficiency, and they informed me that it was in consequence of my refusing to pay up the new rate at the house

I had

I had just left ; that it was in consequence of that they had cut off the supply, without making any previous application to me.

What was the increase they demanded?—I think twenty-five per cent.

Which you had refused to pay?—Yes ; upon the invitation of my neighbours.

Was the demand made upon a receipt?—No ; it was a verbal demand of twenty-five per cent. without any specific sum being mentioned. At this interview, at the Grand Junction office, with Mr. Coe the secretary, suffering as I was, I was naturally very much irritated, and there was an interview which does not redound to the credit of Mr. Coe ; there was some very insulting language used, perhaps I should say it was not very creditable to either, but I was determined I would not in future expose myself to any thing of the like kind, and whatever I chose to say afterwards should be by letter, in consequence of which this correspondence took place.—[The witness here read the correspondence that had taken place between himself and the officers of the Grand Junction water company : and added,]—I have therefore not been supplied with water from this company, nor from any exterior mode, since Midsummer, so that I have been compelled to resort to other means. I have a pump in the house which supplies me with water ; I have fixed a force pump to it, which supplies the upper and lower parts of the house. I have made a large tank, so that I am abundantly supplied with rain water, and I shall not take any water of them at all ; I have rendered myself independent of them ; I am better supplied, and the water is infinitely better than the water I received before. The house I now occupy had been empty eight years, and was fully supplied with water.

Mr. *W. M. Coe*, further Examined.

YOU have heard the statement of facts made by Mr. Newton ; will you be so good as to state what you have to say in answer to them?—The facts are generally true, except as to his receiving no answer to his first three letters, and in answer to those letters there was no written communication but a verbal one, by the collector calling for the payment of the rate, Mr. Newton having stated that he would pay it, although by compulsion.

Had he directions immediately to call?—He had.

What were your directions to the collector?—To call upon Mr. Newton for the increased rate, and upon that the water would be laid on.

You, as the officer of the company, directed the collector to call upon Mr. Newton and inform him that if he paid the additional rate, the water would be immediately laid on?—I did. It is also necessary to state with regard to the reason why the supply of water to this house was first taken off, (No. 8) ; it had been some time empty, and the foreman had received directions to take the water off the house during its being empty, to prevent waste, which is a common practice with the company ; he had neglected so to do ; and when the house was under repair, I inquired whether the water had been taken off ; the foreman upon examining his books found it was not. It was then thought necessary to take the water off, for the purpose of entering into an agreement with the person who should occupy that house, to prevent any future disputes as to the rate that might be required from him, and the water was taken off without the company knowing that Mr. Newton was going to occupy it.

Has not the Grand Junction company refused to restore the supply of water after the termination of the notices, unless the customer submitted to pay the arrears, after the rate insisted on by the company, as the rate in future?—Yes, I admit that, that those rates should be paid.

Arrears running from what time?—From the time the increased rate commenced, Michaelmas 1818, collected at 1819.

When was the notice given?—It has been given not in many instances with regard to the number of persons we supply ; I should think 1,500 were issued. I should say first that a notice was delivered by the Grand Junction company in July and August 1818, that the rise would take place at the subsequent Michaelmas, expecting that persons would make their inquiries as to what that rise would be, and make their agreement for that purpose ; there were very few persons who did apply, and in cases where they had so applied, they were informed what the rise was that would be made after Lady-day 1819 ; it was stated in that notice, that the rise would commence in 1818, and be collected at Lady-day 1819 ; and at Lady-day 1819 the collectors were sent round with their increased rates ; a vast number of persons had paid during that collection ; petitions were presented from

Mr.
W. J. Newton.

(7 March.)

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(7 March.)

Mary-le-bone, and Mr. Taylor's bill was introduced after Lady-day 1819, and we suspended our collection, pursuant to the recommendation of that Committee, till it had gone through the House; after the bill had been thrown out of the House of Lords, we then proceeded with the collection in the same way as we had previously intended, but then there were a number of persons who refused to pay that increased rate, and to those persons who so refused, we issued the second six months notice.

When did you begin to act upon these notices?—After Christmas.

In any case, where you acted upon those notices, have you demanded the increased rate of the party?—Yes; as the ground of the new contract.

Did you demand any arrears of that increase over-reaching this term of the six months notice?—Supposing the party receiving that notice had been assessed at the increased rate at three guineas instead of fifty shillings, we gave him this notice, that we should serve him at fifty shillings till the period named there, in 1818. I will suppose we had made a demand upon that person for £. 3, his old rent being £. 2. 10s. that then he refused to pay it, we issued that notice to him, and at the expiration of that notice we should state what is there stated in the letter, we should take the £. 2. 10s.

Waving your claim to the £. 3?—Yes.

Did you ever, in any instance, say you would not take the 50s. but the £. 3?—During that notice the collectors would not receive it until the notice expired, and then they were desired to take the sum therein stated, 50s. and if the party would not agree with the company for his future supply, to take off his water.

Is this 50s. supposed to be the old rate?—Yes.

The collector was instructed to collect, after the expiration of this notice, nothing more than the old rate?—Yes.

Did you in any case authorize the collector to go further, and not only demand the old rate but the arrears at the increased rate, during the period to which this relates?—He has had no such instruction from our office, but to receive the old rate, and if the party would not enter into an agreement for his further supply, to have the water taken off.

Have you in any instance found that the collectors have received more than the old rate?—They have not demanded it, but they have received it upon an explanation of what the nature of that contract was; by far the greater majority of the company's tenants having paid the rate, vast numbers of them had made inquiry whether the whole body of the tenants would be charged upon the same principle; whether any difference would be made to a person who withheld the payment of his rate because he had been so advised: that being the case, the directors thought it would be fair and just to those who had paid that increased rate, that those who had not paid it should be placed upon the same footing, and therefore they had determined that the grounds of the future contract for their supply should comprehend that which they left unpaid.

Then where the party at No. 9 had paid the increase without objection, and his neighbour at No. 10 had refused to pay, when you came to increase the rate of No. 10, after the expiration of the six months, although the supply would be the same, you would put No. 10 at a higher rate than No. 9?—Yes, at the following year.

Only for one year?—Only for one year.

What No. 10 had refused to pay would have included what No. 9 had consented to pay; the increase you had made would have been with a view to make No. 10 pay the same as No. 9, the consentor, had paid?—Yes.

Then in truth what appeared in the shape of increased rate would have been a demand from the refuser of the arrears which No. 9 had consented to pay?—Yes.

So that it was one and the same thing whether you say we will charge you so much more and call it arrear or an additional rate for the next year amounting to the same sum?—Yes it was.

From what period did the court of directors appoint the new rates?—From Michaelmas 1818.

At what period did the six months notice commence?—That six months notice was given at various periods; there were about 1,500 persons who had not paid the increased rate, and to those 1,500 the notices were issued at different periods, there having been a previous notice given, not the six months notice, but that the rate would be increased at Michaelmas 1818.

The period fixed for the increase of the rate by the directors of the Grand Junction company, was Michaelmas 1818, and those notices you say were given at various times; all subsequent engagements with the tenants included a period covering the lapse of time between the Michaelmas of 1818 and the re-engagement of the tenants with the Grand Junction company?—Yes, it did.

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(7 March.)

Mr. *Matthias Koops Knight*, further Examined.

HAS not the West Middlesex company refused to restore the supply of water, after the termination of the notices, unless the customer submitted to pay the arrears after the rate insisted on by the company as the rate in future?—I concur in a great part of what Mr. Coe has said as to the effect of it; but it is necessary I should explain shortly how the facts really stood, and what were the objects of giving that second notice. The Committee have already had before them the notice dated the 11th May 1818, and also the further notice on the receipts given in the course of the collection from Midsummer 1818 to the following Christmas (which was the current half-year of the increased rates) that the rates would “be collected at the Christmas following,” it being always the custom to suffer six months to elapse before the water rate is called for. At Christmas 1818, the books of the company were delivered to the collectors, and they proceeded to receive the increased rates: at that time the gentleman, who has since written so much upon the subject, had not begun his publications. The company proceeded to collect their rates; the Mary-le-bone vestry, in February, had proceeded with their parochial bill; still the collection went on, and at the end of the half-year, notwithstanding all the proceedings which had taken place between the company and the Mary-le-bone vestry, a very large portion (I think very nearly nine-tenths) had paid the increased rate in the course of the first half-year, so that only £. 3,000 of arrears were left at Midsummer 1819; subsequently, the publications I have just alluded to, appeared; papers were sent into every house in the parish, not only by the committee called the Anti Monopoly Association, but also by the vestry in their collective capacity, papers signed by the vestry clerk by order of the vestry; those papers were various; all of them calculated to excite the greatest discontent, most of them containing misrepresentations of facts, and inclosing papers identifying the vestry to a great extent with the proceedings of the association; I will give this as an instance, that a paper of the association was inclosed in a letter of the vestry clerk, and left at almost every house in the parish. It must at once strike the Committee, that these documents, in which the inhabitants generally were informed that they were paying an enormous rate that could not be legally justified, would make a very great impression in the parish, particularly the poorer class, coming as it did from the vestry of the parish, the select vestry of the parish, composed of noblemen and gentlemen; and it is not to be wondered at that their complaints of the increase began to be heard: complaints then did arise certainly as to the amount of the rate, and that led to a degree of irritation in the public mind; so that for the last two years, the officers of the company have not been in a very enviable situation; it was almost as much as one could do to hear and talk to the people who came there, their violence was so extreme. In the course of the following year a great variety of discussions took place, public meetings were called, and the gentleman who formed the association went from parish to parish to excite that spirit; I believe he was the author of almost all the publications that appeared circulated in St. George’s, St. Pancras, Paddington, Mary-le-bone, and in St. James’s; in all of which, meetings of the inhabitants were called, at coffee-houses and places of that sort, and all the malcontents of the parish would naturally flock to that meeting; those who were dissatisfied would go, and those who were satisfied would not make their appearance. The Committee, I believe, are well aware of what the results of those meetings were, actions were threatened to be brought against the company; we represented to the individuals that we were disposed to show every forbearance, that we did not mean to press unnecessarily upon them for payment, but we wished to give them every means of satisfying themselves as to the fairness of our proceeding; we were constantly in attendance, all our books were open to every body, even to the meanest in the parish, and I, as well as the other officers, were always ready to give any explanation as to the cause of the rise, and to show the necessity for it. I have no hesitation in saying, that in nine cases out of ten, those who sought the information were satisfied with the information they received. I myself, in the course of two years that this has lasted, have seen a vast number of noblemen and gentlemen, and the poorer class of inhabitants, and I think I have the means of

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(7 March.)

speaking from that circumstance a little more accurately of what the feeling of the parish is, than a person who has not been so situated; it has been my duty and my inclination also; and I do most distinctly deny that this is a public grievance, it has been fomented by party, kept up by party, and still maintained by party, for the great bulk of the inhabitants of Mary-le-bone, I will boldly say, are no parties to these proceedings, certainly the respectable part are not; and in order to go a little further into this, I will allude to the sources from whence I have derived my information; I allude to the collectors and other officers of the company: the Committee will at once see, that where so much clamour existed, where so much was at stake for the company, I should be most anxious daily to ascertain how it was proceeding; I therefore every week made it my business particularly to inquire of the collectors as to the general impression upon their minds of the feeling of the parties that they had that week called upon, and until these circulars of the vestry and the association had inundated almost every house, I still insist that there was nothing like an extensive complaint. I will mention another fact, in which I can be controverted if I state an untruth: there has been a subscription, that subscription has been fomented and assisted by the greatest possible activity, a collector of the poor rates of the parish of Mary-le-bone made it his business, I would only charge one, I have him particularly in my mind, I will not say he was instructed, I have no right to state that, but a collector of the poor rates in the parish of Mary-le-bone was a collector of the subscriptions, I know, for I have been told by dozens, I may say scores of individuals called upon, that he has used every means in his power to obtain subscriptions, that he has received subscriptions from all those who would subscribe, down almost to a shilling; from a guinea to a shilling, or any sum they would pay; that individual was also treasurer of the association, and he made it his business, as well as that of collecting the poor rates as parish officer, to poison the minds of every one in his walk against the company, telling them they were fools for paying their rates, that the company had no right to them, that they were acting illegally, that they must reduce them, and statements of the like tendency; I should state further, that he himself was a name given to me as complaining that intimidation and false representation were used on the part of the company, and that the company obtained payment of their rates by those means.

What name was that?—Michael Smith.

Who was it handed to you by?—Mr. Weale. Mr. Smith proceeded in this course for a time, till the committee certainly was composed of more honourable men; this was previous to the meeting at Willis's rooms; previous to that time the committee consisted of men in a more humble sphere of life, all of whom were most active in their own sphere in persuading people not to pay, and collecting sums of the description I have mentioned; in poor streets begging for half-a-crown or a shilling, any thing they could get. As so much has been said of the great popular feeling against the increased rate, I think that subscription will be the best possible test of the feeling of the parish; subscriptions obtained from all those sources of irritation; if there was a general discontent in the parish, surely a great majority of the inhabitants would subscribe to a fund to protect themselves; if it is not so, then I say, that if I had no other fact to stand upon, that there I am upon a rock, and I deny the assertion that it is a public grievance; I think that is all that is necessary to state upon that head. I will go back now to the notice. With regard to the notice, and the immediate proceedings of the company upon those notices, on the 11th of May 1811 a notice was given, as I stated, generally to the inhabitants, that a rise in rates must certainly take place, and stating that the rise should not exceed twenty-five per cent. upon the rate paid in 1810, saving for high services; I will repeat that that was followed in order to prevent mistake, that it should not be considered they were going to collect the advanced rate, but that the current half-year would be suffered to elapse, and that the increased rate would be collected at Christmas; that word, collected, infers that the rate commenced at Midsummer, it being always the case to suffer half a year to become due before it was called for; at Christmas 1818 it was collected, and received to the extent of eight or nine tenths of the inhabitants.

Were the receipts printed for the half year?—They were.

Were they sent immediately?—Yes; I have looked at the books this morning, and I find the collection began the 1st of July.

Was there any idea of reserving them, or were they brought into use directly?—They were the remnants of the preceding half-year. I state this boldly, that a vast majority of those receipts bore that which is called a notice, but which I call

(an

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(7 March.)

an intimation that the rates would be collected at Christmas, to explain what was not specific, and that leads me to the reason for giving this subsequent notice. If the papers which were circulating in the parish are put in, the Committee will see that the company was threatened with a series of law proceedings; it naturally led them to consult their counsel as to how they might be affected by those proceedings; upon which consultation, that notice of the 11th of May was submitted to them. I might here simply mention, that up to that period the custom of all the water companies was merely to give verbal notices in every thing that took place in their concerns; written notices were never expected nor requested; if a person discontinued taking water, it was sufficient for him to say it, merely that he was going to leave that house, and paying up to the end of the current quarter; but this notice having been given, and actions being threatened, that led the company naturally to consider how they stood with regard to the public, what was the nature of the contract between them and the public; and several of the most eminent counsel now at the bar, all concurred in treating it as a personal contract between *A. B.* and the company; that as the supply, according to the act of parliament, was quarterly, half-yearly, or yearly, it was a contract for an annual supply of water; and if we wished to put an end to that contract, or if either party wished to put an end to it, they considered that the courts would hold, in case of an action being brought against the company, it would be necessary for them to show that they had ceased their contract, upon a reasonable notice, clearly and specifically stating that they did not conceive that a six months notice, or three months, or for any specific period, was necessary, but that a notice was necessary in order that the party might be aware that the contract then subsisting should cease at a certain period. The committee, in anticipation of the action held out, said they only waited for a case to bring the action; we considered it certain that it would come; they therefore advised a six months notice to be given, and they also adverted to the notice that had been given; they said it would be very simple of the company to go into court upon a case, and be turned round upon a point of form; it was very possible, though they did not say it would be so, that the notice of the 11th of May, being a paper addressed merely to the inhabitants, that an individual would say that is no notice to me; it is not specific, it is not addressed to me, it only says such a sum shall be given, and therefore in order to be quite safe, not to be turned round upon a point of form, they advised in all those cases which, up to that period, had not paid the increased rate of twenty-five per cent. that a specific notice, addressed to *A. B.* specifying the sum at which he had been charged, should be given, and they recommended that it should not be given for less than six months; that it would show greater moderation, as there were so many complaints: that is the history of the second notice being given. In the case of the West Middlesex company, very few of those notices were required, because the great bulk of the people had paid the increased rate; some were given in March 1820, to discontinue at the following Michaelmas; some other few were given at Midsummer 1820, to discontinue at the following Christmas, and that disposed of all our cases. At Michaelmas 1820, the company sent the collectors round to receive the rates; many had made tenders during that time, some of which were paid, some we thought it better to stand over, but generally speaking, the collectors were told they had much better confine their attention till that notice expired to those who paid readily, but those who refused once or twice, after that notice, agreed to pay the third and fourth time; they said very naturally, my neighbour *A. B.* has not paid you for three or four years, I only owe half a year, why not make him pay before you call upon me for payment. The Committee will see the situation in which the company was placed between friends and foes. The persons who had regularly paid, and were satisfied to pay the increased rate, finding that their neighbours had not paid it at all, called upon the company for an explanation of it. At the Michaelmas of 1820, they therefore proceeded in all those cases that were then remaining; a great many had paid in the interim, and a great number were cut off at Michaelmas, the company receiving up to Michaelmas the old rate of those who insisted upon paying it; but it is fair I should state, that before they did so pay, we told them inasmuch as the great bulk of the inhabitants had paid from Midsummer 1818, we give you the option of either paying the increased rate the same as they had paid for that period, or we decline to make a new contract with you unless you will enter into a contract for the ensuing year to the amount of the increased rate with one fifth addition, conceiving that in the course of five years the difference would be made up to the company, and that

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(7 March.)

that the twentieth part of the inhabitants would, by that means, be placed nearly in the same situation (not quite so good) as the other nineteen; and in doing this I can most unequivocally bear testimony to the honourable intention of the board for adopting that course; whether it was wise or not is another matter, but it was fair dealing.

Could you state the amount in money to which those cases would have extended, where you had to demand this retrospective arrear, in fact?—I can give the Committee an idea of the thing, which I think will be quite sufficient; it is really so inconsiderable, I do not think it would altogether amount to £.100; I believe in all the cases where the parties have signed the agreement, that those cases did not amount to twenty.

Can you furnish the Committee with those cases?—I can furnish the agreements, Mr. Harris was one, of 27 Norton-street. I can state to the Committee that the amount was never taken into consideration, but proceeded upon what they considered fair dealing. I just wish here to state, that up to this moment, a legal decision upon this point has not been given; they have all along considered themselves entitled to the increased rate from Midsummer 1818; but that is not decided yet.

Though you state that the amount of arrear upon this particular point is only about £.100, and inconsiderable, yet in point of fact, upon that principle, you would have made the demand had it amounted to £.1,000?—Yes, certainly.

You consider yourself of course, in the situation of secretary, as the authorized organ of the company you represent?—Doubtless.

And in any official communication you make to the public, they must be bound by it?—I consider so.

Was that letter written by you—[*handing a paper to the witness*]?—I will not call it a letter; it is a garbled extract; that letter is before the Committee; it is the publication of that paper we complain of as the greatest grievance that has been practised towards us.

As a misrepresentation?—Misrepresentation and grievance.

Is this only an extract?—Yes; it stops in the middle of a sentence.

Did that letter distinctly taken with the whole context, state that no advance whatever would take place upon the usual supply of water beyond what the inhabitants paid to the old companies in 1810?—My answer to that will involve a statement. I mean to state, that it was a letter written in the haste of the moment, pressed as the directors were by the Mary-le-bone vestry; they were urged by the most gross representations, not by them collectively, but they were urged by statements, that the water rates were to be increased to £.20 and £.30 a house; the Mary-le-bone vestry were proceeding with the parochial bill, inflaming the parish: with those representations, the company felt their existence struck at, and they naturally were very anxious upon the subject; they had a meeting with the Mary-le-bone vestry upon the 3d of February (that letter is dated the 18th), upon which that vestry was informed that no increase at all was contemplated at present; the words at present seemed to excite a flame, and the company were called upon to say distinctly what it would be; they were told, that until the works were completed, they could not tell; they were then in a very confused state; they had a great many pipes to lay down; the change having just taken place, the attention of the company was naturally directed first to give the town an abundant supply of water, to take every precaution as a security against fire, and to complete their works: although that was not stated, I know what the intention was among all the companies; the intention was, when the old companies retired, that the rates should not be advanced for I believe a period of two years, until those measures I have alluded to had taken place: notwithstanding this representation on the 3d of February, the proceedings were continued; estimates were ordered to be given; a great deal of anxiety and alarm was felt; seeing the vestry was partly composed of nobility and members of parliament, the company could not tell to what extent that opposition might be carried.

[The letter and the extract alluded to were read.]

On the 11th of May, three months after this letter was written, was not there a notice given to the parish of an intention to raise them 25 per cent. on the rates of 1810? As an individual of that parish, seeing that letter, and contrasting it with the subsequent conduct of the companies, am not I entitled to consider that as a public grievance?—That question enables me to go on with what I left off stating. I have stated

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(7 March.)

stated that that letter was written to the Mary-le-bone vestry (from the great pressure which the Mary-le-bone vestry were throwing upon the company, and from the misrepresentation that the rates would be £. 20 and £. 30 per house,) to come to something like a specific statement of what they meant by the words "at present," which had been used at the first meeting; they had turned to the documents in their possession to see what the rates of 1810 were; every thing up to that period had been estimated, but the company considered when they wrote that letter that the rates of 1810 amounted to a considerable sum more than they afterwards turned out to be. I should state, that that letter, about which I have been asked this question, was addressed by me, as the officer of the company, to the vestry of Mary-le-bone, and was never intended for publication; it was never intended to guide the case of *A. B.* and *C. D.* it was a letter of communication from one body to another. On their presenting their parochial bill, Mr. Michael Angelo Taylor suggested, that the repeated invitations of the West Middlesex company to the vestry, to appoint a committee to go into the question to examine what would be a fair rate to be charged, should be acted upon; he considered that more might be settled in two or three discussions of that sort, than in angry altercations; he therefore pressed that upon the gentlemen of the Mary-le-bone vestry when they appeared upon his bill. The company had repeatedly solicited this appointment of a committee. Mr. Taylor suggested, as well as another gentleman upon the committee, that the committee to be appointed (which they had assented to) should not be composed of the gentlemen who had taken a part in and originated this dispute, but that it should be left to unbiassed and impartial men, those who had not taken part either way up to that period, (this was the beginning of April, I think;) up to which period no notice had been taken of that letter; this is a most material thing, that it was not answered in any way, or alluded to in any way. The vestry of Mary-le-bone did then appoint a committee of three gentlemen to meet three gentlemen from the three water companies touching upon their parish, the Grand Junction, the New River and the West Middlesex; from some cause they did not think proper to follow the other part of the recommendation, but they nominated three gentlemen who we had good reason for believing were the beginners of the dispute, and took an active part against the company. The committee met, (I was not present) but I apprehend the letter that has just been read was not alluded to, but they began *de novo*, as I was informed by the gentlemen of the West Middlesex company, with an understanding that nothing that had passed or should pass up to that period should operate to the prejudice of either party if they should not come to an agreement. The first thing that was done was an order to the officers of the companies to ascertain what the rates of 1810 really were; the New River company allowed us access to their books, their officers assisted in the examination, and an accurate account was taken of the rates of 1810; the rates were stated of the same buildings, in some instances it was very difficult to identify the houses, a considerable part of Mary-le-bone being then building and not finished, but still an account was rendered, and to the great surprise and regret of the West Middlesex company, it appeared that the rates of 1810 were much less than they before had reason to believe they were, and therefore they made a report, upon consultation of the Grand Junction and West Middlesex companies to that committee, in writing, which has been given in to this Committee, and has been read, dated the 1st or 2d of May, in which they stated distinctly what would satisfy them, and what rates they were willing to be bound by. I have already said, and I wish to repeat it, that that letter of the 19th of February had never been acted on in any way; it was a private letter from one board to another in the early part of the discussion; the report therefore of the 1st or 2d of May 1818, corrected the error which the committee were then informed they had fallen into, and an account was then rendered as to what would satisfy them. Without any intimation from that committee whether the proposal was acceded to or not, the companies were astonished two or three days afterwards to find that they had introduced their bill before Parliament; that bill was read a first time on the 6th of May, without any assent or dissent to the terms given in by the companies, and proceedings took place upon that bill, it having been understood on both sides that what had taken place, or should take place, should be without prejudice. Upon that bill being read in Parliament, the company then issued to the parish and to the public their case of the 11th of May; till that paper was issued, they did not consider themselves bound in any way; an error had been made unfortunately, and the only way they had of correcting it was by the report of the 11th of May; they considered that in the eyes of

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(7 March.)

all honourable men, it would be ample and sufficient ; they were astonished to find that letter circulated in the way it had been ; that all the correspondence that had taken place previously had been kept out of view, and that that extract, ending particularly at a strong point, should be called a copy of a letter, and my name was put, as signing that letter ending in that manner ; it is before the Committee, and no man looking at that paper would imagine for an instant that there was a single word more than what is there stated.

Was there ever any regret expressed on the part of this company for having made this mistake ?—To that committee I apprehend it was fully explained.

There is nothing in this report of it ?—Up to that period it was considered as if nothing had passed, and therefore they thought it not necessary to advert to this fact.

Am I expecting too much when I say I should expect that the company would not have made this communication, without examining the amount of the rate ; from whence did they derive this calculation ?—From the report of their committee.

Was there, in point of fact, regret expressed by the directors of the West Middlesex company for having made this mistake ?—I was not present, but I take it for granted it was adverted to ; the letter was a very hasty ill-advised thing, and we now know it.

You have stated that it was hardly to be expected that persons of fortune should feel this addition of rate, or that persons of very little money should interfere to redress their wrongs, therefore it fell upon that class of society between the two extremes ?—I will confine my answer to those persons I have seen ; it has been almost invariably those that have been satisfied, upon the explanation given, that the advance was fair.

When you say upon comparison very few remained, do you mean comparison with the rich or otherwise ?—I mean a comparison of the whole population of Paddington, Mary-le-bone and Pancras, that there is only one in forty who has not paid the rate ; the majority of those who complained before, are now satisfied, and go on to pay their rates ; after Mr. Taylor's bill, which limited the company (before they were considered not limited, nor do I consider they are,) Mr. Taylor's bill was brought in to restrain them, and after it was thrown out, they said such a measure seems to be advisable and necessary, we ought not to be at your mercy ; if you will give us an assurance that you mean to abide by that bill, as if it had passed, we are content ; I speak of some who had opposed us before, now quiescent. There is a paper delivered in, which the company, upon representations coming from various sources, sent round to say that they meant to abide by those rates, and that all those persons who would not take the company's assurance, (we had been accused of a breach of faith, and almost every thing that man could be accused of,) that we would give them contracts for terms of years, to bind ourselves mutually to the rate we had charged ; and what is most extraordinary, the board of guardians of the poor of the parish of Mary-le-bone, composed wholly of vestrymen, who had originated and carried on this discussion, were the very first to enter into a contract with us, and it is now subsisting, for the supply of their poorhouse, which is the only way in which they could recognize each other ; that agreement is now subsisting for fourteen years. Lord Hertford has applied, also Lord Robert Seymour, Lord Walsingham, and several gentlemen ; Mr. Pitt, of Wimpole-street, a vestryman, was content to take our representation.

Do you not conceive that by this communication between you and those persons, that their feelings were much more directed to the uncertainty in which they were placed as to the engagement between the company and the public, and the possibility of the company at any future period extending their rates to any amount, than as to their satisfaction with the mode of increase of the rates they had adopted at that moment ?—I think it very probable.

It was rather to secure themselves against any further advance, than to denote satisfaction at the increase ?—Yes.

In point of fact, it is possible that a person may acquiesce in the addition of 25 per cent. but he could not be supposed to acquiesce in case persons had been raised more than that ; do you admit that any persons have been rated more than that ?—Not to my knowledge south of the New-road.

The rates of 1810 were paid by persons north of the New-road ?—To a certain extent.

You say that north of the New Road, persons were requested to pay more than 25 per cent ?—Yes.

That

That an individual who paid the rate of 1810 has been requested to pay an increase above 25 per cent?—Yes, for this reason, that all north of the New-road is a very high service, and we found it necessary upon that, as they were building houses detached and in gardens, requiring a great outlay of capital to supply them, that in order to fix rates for those houses, which would at all pay any thing like interest for the capital so to be expended, the rates must be very considerable, and in proportion to the houses. In some few that had been built in 1810, (say about Bell-street and just across the New-road) the new rate does not exceed 25 per cent. on the rate paid in 1810; and when the bill was before the Committee, Lord Shaftesbury suggested there should be a distinction, and he suggested that the New-road being the natural boundary for the town, should be the line fixed upon, and that all above that should be subject to an additional rate, to meet this difficulty.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(7 March.)

Have you any definite proportion north of the New-road?—No.

Upon what principle have you made that distinction?—The elevation, the expense of supply, and the class of inhabitants.

Has that led to any particular rule?—Not any particular rule; it has already been stated to the Committee, that to fix a rule for rating houses is one of the most difficult things in our business.

The directors of the company, through you, informed their tenants generally, without exception, there would be no rise beyond twenty-five per cent. upon the rates of 1810; they never at that period marked the distinction between north and south of the New-road?—No, they did not.

Then, notwithstanding the assurance of the company not to exceed twenty-five per cent, they did take upon themselves to change, alter or increase this demand?—That arose from Mr. Taylor's bill: when the bill had passed the Commons and was thrown out of the Lords, from that hour did Mr. Taylor desire the company would take the bill for their standard and guide. That bill did make a particular exception. An honourable member on this Committee himself put in a clause limiting the profits of the company to ten per cent. in order to govern their charges north of the New-road.

It not being a legislative measure it amounted only to advice given to you?—Surely.

Have you in any instance southward of the New-road gone beyond that rate?—No, not to my knowledge; north of the New-road by far the greater proportion of houses built since 1810 have been only charged twenty-five per cent; I mean all those immediately abutting on the New-road, such as Upper Baker-street, the rate has been confined to that; but in the Alpha cottages, which is the only part that strikes me where we have come to the new rating, in consequence of the very great expense of iron pipes, (for those cottages are detached in large gardens, with ponds and various means of consuming water which the inhabitants of London have not,) the new rating took place, and a very great increase; a house that had paid two guineas was charged four; and I would mention this one fact of a house north of the New-road, that those houses in point of proportion, where they have no gardens, are now, in my opinion, rated much lower than even houses in Oxford-street: in this way, a house in Oxford-street which paid 30s. is now charged for the basement 37s. and for a water-closet on the upper part of the house, above the second floor, £.2, making £.3. 17s. Now I state that all the water sent to a house at the Alpha cottages, which is perhaps rated from £.3 to £.4, that every drop of that is high service water, served at a greater expense of fuel than a house in Oxford-street, so that that class of our customers who feel themselves aggrieved, are in a better situation than those in Oxford-street who do not feel themselves aggrieved.

South of the New-road do you say the charge in advance is only twenty-five per cent?—Yes.

Daniel Robert Barker, Esq. Called in; and Examined.

WHERE do you reside?—The complaint I have to make is of a house No. 43, York-street, Baker-street.

*D. R. Barker,
Esq.*

Have you any profession?—No, I am living upon my means; the house I am speaking of was built in 1810, it is one of seven houses, which are all, I conceive, to be within one brick in point of size alike; they were originally supplied by the New River company, I believe at 36s. but it might be 40s. each, ordinary service, that is, a cistern on the basement, and a water-closet on the ground floor: this house of mine had a green-house besides: that rate was reduced in consequence

D. R. Barker,
Esq.

(7 March.)

of a circular issued by the West Middlesex company. I bought the house of Lady Murray, or rather I took it in exchange for a house which was served by the New River company, in which direction I had a great many personal friends, and it was a part of our bargain that she should continue with the New River company, by whom I had been plentifully supplied; some of my friends were directors: some time after, Lady Murray informed me she had left the New River company, in consequence of an offer made by the West Middlesex company to serve her more abundantly and at a cheaper rate, in consequence of a circular; in fact Lady Murray had always high service, and the West Middlesex served her this high service, and continued to do so till 1817 or 1818.

It had been higher than what you paid?—I do not know really what it was; I will allow it to be 40*s.*; then after a year had elapsed, and I had no notice of any rise in the water, or being turned over from one company to another, then comes the collector, and says, Sir, I want three guineas from you, for one year's water service; I asked him whether he was a good calculator, and how far that amounted to twenty-five per cent; that I was not disposed to pay more under any consideration whatever; his answer was, he was ordered to receive it from the board, and I must settle it with Mr. Knight, in consequence of which I had many pleasant conversations with Mr. Knight, but never got my rate reduced; that is the fact, as far as that year goes. I then informed Mr. Knight that I should be much obliged to him to know how I was to proceed, as he had been so kind as to give me notice it was to be cut off at Christmas, that I was still in the same disposition I had been in before to resist the overcharge, because I conceived they had not any right to make the demand of any addition, but I should be glad to be introduced to the board, as I was about to let my house; I received an assurance from the board that my water should not be cut off till after Christmas, and the chairman jocosely said to me, that he would give me one day to reconsider the matter, I persisting not to pay the advance. I let my house on the 29th of September, Michaelmas day, this last year, and the water was cut off in October, contrary to their assurance, being made two months previous to the time. I do not mean to say any thing against the company about cutting the water off, because I am ready to acknowledge, from the apology I had, that it was an error. Mr. Knight said he was very willing to replace it. I mention that, merely to state the circumstance in which the company have been extremely negligent through their agent. Mr. Knight had refused to put on the water to my tenant at the old price, or on any other terms than having the arrears paid up for the time I had refused to pay it. I had been at the office and paid up the old rate of 36*s.* in the presence of Mr. Knight, the nine quarters that were in arrear, and had the receipt delivered me by the clerk in the presence of Mr. Knight, and the water is now cut off, and in consequence of that I have dug a well, which answers every purpose for that house. I let it to a lady, who finds the water softer than where she lives at Clapham, and she is satisfied with it. I would wish to add, that I have no animosity whatever against the company.

(Mr. Knight.)—In explanation of what has just been stated, I would draw the attention of the Committee to this fact, that York-street was precisely one of the streets I alluded to as being building in 1810; here is the book made out two years and a half ago. I have got in York-street the rates of ten houses, from one to ten inclusive, which were rated in 1810 in the New River books.

Was this one of them?—No.

Was that house inhabited?—I have every reason to believe it was not; there were a good many houses built in York-street straggling about, and in those streets I have not the means of identifying the houses; in this street no regular survey took place, it was rated by me on the 17th July 1819. The Committee will see from the few rates I have got here of 1810 I have adhered as nearly as possible to twenty-five per cent. upon those rates; they are charged some £.2, some £.2. 10*s.*; this street was a new street, and I went through it *de novo* to put all the houses appearing of the same class upon the same footing, and I did it on the date I have mentioned, from No. 1 to No. 15; I have rated them all at three guineas each for the ordinary service, considering all those houses to be of the same class as nearly as possible. Mr. Barker's house is precisely opposite the first ten; it appeared to me from the exterior view to be a house of the same class as those rated in 1810: twenty-five per cent. upon 50*s.* would be £.3. 2*s.*; that is all I have to say upon that subject; that is precisely the case. I excepted, and I still adhere

adhere to what I have asserted, that in all the houses in that part of the parish that book will show that where the houses could be identified we have adhered to the twenty-five per cent.

(*Mr. Barker.*)—Those houses opposite have three windows in front, the houses on our side of the way are all of them very moderate small houses, so low that you go off the pavement into them; they are small houses with two windows and eighteen feet front.

What does it let for?—From £. 70 to £. 100 a year.

Do you know what the opposite houses let for?—From £. 140 to £. 150. I dined in one of them the other day, and the dining-parlour is about as big as the floor in my house.

(*Mr. Knight.*)—The size and value of the house is mere matter of opinion, I did not go into them, but according to the frontage and the rating in the parish books, I say that Mr. Barker is fairly rated.

Does this column, under the head of rate now paid, relate to the rates as your company found them, without any addition?—Unquestionably as we found them; they are the competition rates.

Jonas Hall Pope, Esq. Called in; and Examined.

YOU are a Surgeon?—Yes.

In what street is the house situated respecting which you have to make a complaint?—Somerset-street, Portman-square. I paid the Grand Junction water company till Midsummer 1819, at the rate of 24s. a year, for a house No. 26, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square; at Midsummer 1819, I took possession of the house in Somerset-street, No. 6.

At what rate?—At the rate of £. 2. 5 s. where I had no greater supply of water, but rather less, for I had a supply in the old house on the first floor. A few weeks after I commenced the new house, a demand was made upon me for three quarters of a year of arrears, for this new house, by the company.

Upon your taking possession?—Yes.

For what, in fact, you suppose ought to have been paid by the preceding tenant?—Yes; and therefore I did not conceive myself justified in paying it; they suffered me to continue in this situation six months, and they then demanded my rate with the arrears; I refused to pay the arrears, and at the end of twelve months, Midsummer 1820, the collector applied for twelve months rate, and an additional three quarters of arrears. The arrears I positively refused, but I offered to pay the year's rate, under a protest that I would not pay it if I was not obliged or had had my water cut off.

You refused to pay £. 2. 5 s. for the year?—Yes, considering it a very great increase from £. 1. 4s. to £. 2. 5 s. from the same company with a less supply of water.

Was it a larger house?—Rather a larger house.

In point of fact, you agreed to pay that increased rate under a protest, but you objected to pay the arrears under any circumstances?—Yes.

What was the arrear?—At the rate of £. 2. 5 s. having paid them £. 1. 4s; on my refusing to pay this, they cut off the pipe directly after Midsummer 1820; it was in the month of July, some correspondence took place, but it was in September they cut it off, and not before, and so it has continued ever since, and I am now without water, and have been these three months.

Have you paid any thing subject to that protest you made?—Not at all; I offered to pay Mr. Coe at the office £. 2. 5 s. a year's rate, but he refused.

Were you aware, when you took this new house, that there were any demands made for arrears?—Not at all; the former tenant, I believe, only made use of the house for receiving letters, there was no family there, and consequently no water was used, the individual I took the house of I have not seen from that time.

Upon taking the house did you make any such inquiry?—When the agreement was made between him and me, the receipts of taxes were produced, and he said nothing more was owing.

Was the receipt for water produced?—No; and I conceive upon that principle they might demand five years rate of me. With respect to refusing the advanced rate, I did it upon the ground of not having any security what might be advanced further.

*D. R. Barker,
Esq.*

(7 March.)

*J. H. Pope,
Esq.*

J. H. Pope,
Esq.

(7 March.)

Did you let your own house where you resided before?—Yes.

Was there any communication between you and the other person about the water rate?—Yes, the receipts were produced.

Why did not you make any inquiry about the water of the preceding tenant?—It was not let till the quarter afterwards.

Was it in consequence of this claim of three quarters having been made upon you that induced you to make that communication to him?—Yes, that induced me to make that provision for his security, lest he should be placed in the same situation.

(*Mr. Coe.*)—This is a case of arrears, and the information I get from the collector is this, that No. 6, Somerset-street, was occupied by a Mr. Carr, who paid the water rate to Michaelmas 1818, and when the collector called for the half-year's rate due at Lady-day 1819, he found Mr. Pope instead of Mr. Carr in the house; the company had no notice of Mr. Carr having left the house, and if he did so at Lady-day, the company could not send for the rate previous to that period, as it was not due; the company could get no information from Mr. Pope where Mr. Carr was to be found, and he was informed that they looked to the occupier of the premises for the payment, unless he could inform the company where Mr. Carr was to be found; Mr. Pope had time allowed for this purpose until the 11th September 1820, and as the company could neither procure payment nor information as to Mr. Carr's residence, the water was ordered to be taken off.

(*Mr. Pope.*)—Mr. Carr did not occupy the house to Michaelmas, but only till Christmas, he had never paid a shilling of rent; I stated to Mr. Coe at the office that my reason for not being able to get the information was, that I did not know where Mr. Carr was, I thought he was gone out of the way; I believe he was either in confinement, or obliged to be out of the way to escape his creditors, so that Mr. Carr did not occupy that house to Michaelmas 1818, nor did he pay the rate, somebody paid the rate up to that time, and probably the collector put his name down.

(*Mr. Coc.*)—After the water was taken off and Mr. Pope laid it on again.

(*Mr. Pope.*)—The water is not on, and I have been without it for four months, hoping I might be brought into the situation I now stand in: I did it solely for the purpose of bringing the company to an arrangement, either to induce them to act according to their own act of parliament, by laying an information against me, or any other steps that act will justify. I would make another observation, to show how the water companies are disposed to annoy and aggravate; I have no party feeling towards the company; but within this last fortnight one of the officers from the Grand Junction waterworks came to my coachman outside the door, (during this time I have been supplied from a stable where they have two or three pumps), the man came up and said, Tell your master I shall soon put a stop to this supply; my young man heard it and came and told me; I went out to him and said, Have you any message to deliver to me, if you have, I shall be very happy to hear it.

Was that the man who had usually collected the rate?—No, the turncock; he said he should very soon put a stop to it by taking their water off.

Their pumps were not supplied by the Grand Junction water?—No, the wells are sunk.

Was the water with which you were supplied by these other parties who assisted you from the well sunk in the land, or tank, or reservoir, or cistern supplied by the Grand Junction water company?—From a well sunk in the land, declared by the party who sent it to me to be so.

Did he repeat the threat to you?—He did, and I told him to make my compliments to the company, and say, that I should be very glad to receive that communication officially.

Veneris, 9^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

[Mr. W. M. Coe delivered in a notice, dated Grand Junction waterworks office, Union-street, Bond-street, 11th August 1818, which was read.]

[Mr. William Anderson, was called in, and stated, in explanation of Mr. Pope's evidence, that he saw Mr. Dickenson this morning, who informed him that Mr. Pope's servant used to come generally every morning for water out of the tank that was supplied by the Grand Junction company, and that he should be very glad when Mr. Pope received his supply from the company, for it was an inconvenience to him, and he did not like to have his pump worn out.]

[Mr. Knight, in reference to the evidence given by Mr. Barker, stated that the houses Nos. 40, 41, 42 and 43, in York-street, were originally laid on to the works of the West Middlesex company a few days previous to Michaelmas 1811; that there is a memorandum in his book which is not very distinct; there is the word ditto written upon the four, but it is upon the line of only one, and therefore he could not say whether all the houses were uninhabited or some only; but from Michaelmas 1811, when those houses first came in charge (confining himself particularly to Mr. Barker's house and the two adjoining houses,) Lady Murray, at No. 43, paid £.2 10s. per annum to Michaelmas 1813; that the West Middlesex company actually received £.5 from that house; that it was then taken from them in the competition by the New River company; that he had seen the New River company's book, and he had also a note in his own book, that on the 27th of September 1813 it was taken from his works and laid on to the works of the New River company at the reduced rate of 36s. per annum. Mr. Barker's house was rated in July 1819 at three guineas; that York-street being a street building (as it will appear by the New River book,) in 1810, the rates of that street could not of course find their way into his book, and that the principle of twenty-five per cent. was not acted upon there, but that it was an entire new rating; that he took the best guides he had, what they paid when they first came into charge and what the neighbouring houses paid in 1810, and to the best of his judgment they were fairly worth 50s. or £.2. 10s.; that therefore he put the better classes of houses at three guineas a year, and the inferior classes at £.2. 16s.]

Mr. James Day, Called in; and Examined.

WHAT is your situation, and where do you reside?—26, Duke-street, Manchester-square, and I am a Hatter.

State distinctly what is the nature of your grievance, whether it arises from over-rating, the diminution of supply, or what are the grounds of your complaint?—From being over-rated.

New state your case?—In 1810 I paid to the New River company £.1. 16s. per year.

How long had you resided at Duke-street at that time, and how long had you paid that amount?—I have been there now twenty-two years; I have entered upon my twenty-second year; after that time I was supplied by the Grand Junction.

That is, in 1811 you were supplied by the Grand Junction?—It was after that period.

When was the first rate you paid the Grand Junction?—I have not the receipt by me; I have only the receipts of the West Middlesex.

What was your charge by them?—£.1. 2s. a year. Some time elapsed, and, without my knowledge, I found that the concern was changed from the Grand Junction to the West Middlesex, which supplied me upon the same terms.

What year was that?—I have left some of the receipts at home, but I have the last receipt of the 30th of September 1820, for nine quarters £.2. 9s. 6d. that is at the rate of £.1. 2s. per year; previous to paying that nine quarters, their demand was—

Up to what period was that receipt?—To March 1820.

706.

That

Mr.
James Day.

(9 March.)

Mr.
James Day.
(9 March.)

That is just all the years 1818 and 1819?—Yes; they received that money, but then they made a demand upon me of £.4 more for 1818 up to 1820, from Midsummer 1818 to Midsummer 1820, which I refused to pay them: in consequence of that, I received a letter from Mr. Knight, as follows:—Mr. Knight's compliments to Mr. Day, requests him to bring down with him his receipt for Midsummer 1810.—I went to Mr. Knight, but found I could have no sort of redress; I produced to him the receipt of 1810, but that seemed to have no sort of avail with Mr. Knight, for he treated the matter as cavalierly as possible; he said he had referred to the New River books, wherein the Midsummer half-year I paid in proportion to the 50 s. a year: however, it was with some difficulty I could find this receipt which I have produced to you: in consequence of my not complying with Mr. Knight's wish, they took my water from me.

When did they take the water from you?—Shortly after I received this letter, within a few days.

What is the date of the letter?—The 25th of last November.

You had resided in 1810 near ten years in that house?—Yes.

Do you recollect having paid at any time at a greater rate than £.1. 16s. a year?—Yes, previous to 1810 I did; but I appealed to the board somewhere near Salisbury-square, and I stated that I considered I paid too much as a shopkeeper, and they reduced it to £.1. 16s.

Do you recollect the time of that appeal?—No, I do not.

Can you fix the time with any precision?—No, I cannot.

What time was the water cut off?—Shortly after I received this letter, which I received in November last.

It was cut off because you refused to pay the £.4.?—Yes, for the two last years, from 1818 to 1820.

With regard to the service that was afforded to you when you paid the £.1. 16s. or the rate of £.2. 5s. what was the nature of it?—There was a water cask in the area, and a cistern in the kitchen.

You had no forced service?—No.

No high service?—No.

What was the height of the water thrown into your house above the pavement?—I should think not above three or four feet from the pavement.

Which would that be, the kitchen one?—That would be the cistern, the cask is below the area rails.

You had nothing above the ground floor served you?—No.

How was this £.4 said to arise?—It was in consequence of the rise which took place from the West Middlesex water company in the year 1818.

It was for the arrear of that advance?—Yes; in consequence of my refusing to pay that, they advanced it to £.3. 14s.; their demand now is £.3. 14s. annually.

Do you include the high service in the £.3. 14s. as well as low?—Yes.

Have you altered your cistern?—Yes, I have now.

What do they charge for that?—Three pounds a year.

Distinct from the ordinary service?—Yes.

(*Mr. Knight.*)—The ordinary service at Midsummer 1810, which is the date I take throughout the whole of the book, appears to be £.2. 10s; the adjoining houses, 26, 28 and 29, were all £.2 in that year; Mr. Day's is about of the same class; if it were not, I should make no alteration, but take it as it stood; it was therefore under the principle that we raised the whole of the parish to £.3. 2s. which was something under the twenty-five per cent. Mr. Day is one of those persons who refused to pay from Midsummer 1818, under the original notice we gave, and therefore he was one of those parties who was served with a six months notice; he must have been served with a six months notice from Midsummer, expiring at Christmas. I apprehend at Christmas Mr. Day was applied to to pay his rate, and he was then told, of course, that the water would be cut off; Mr. Day came to the office, and paid the old rate, according to the notice, of £.1. 2s. a year, which I received; he paid up to Christmas last, at the reduced rate. I told him, before I gave him a receipt, what other course of proceeding would be taken in order to put him on the same footing with his neighbours; that he would have the option either of paying £.3. 2s. a year from Midsummer 1818, or that for the future supply he would be charged £.3. 12s. or £.3. 14s. upon the principle that I explained on Monday.

(*To Mr. Knight.*)—Did you explain to any of your tenants who refused to pay up

Mr.
James Day.

(9 March.)

up arrears, that they would be charged one-fifth of those arrears for five years only?—Certainly not; I do not recollect anything of the sort; I take it for granted I did not. I had several conversations with Mr. Day, and he repeatedly asserted to me that he had paid only 36s. in the year 1810, and I said, that of course would settle the question between us, for that my books stated 50s. and I relied upon the correctness of my own book; it has got my own mark against it of examination, for I compared this book with that book; I examined it myself, and I can vouch for the correctness of it. Mr. Day denied the correctness of my book, and insisted upon the correctness of his statement; then I said to Mr. Day, the receipt will decide the dispute, bring it down; he promised to do so; he failed; and it was one of those ordered to be cut off.

Did he ever produce that receipt to you?—He did, the one now produced; and I immediately pointed out to him, “Mr. Day, this makes my case good; this receipt is up to Christmas 1810, and this to Midsummer-day.”

Did he state to you that he had obtained an abatement between one period and the other?—No, he did not; but still I am correct in my charge; Midsummer-day is the time I have taken in every instance; Mr. Day’s house is the same as his neighbours; I took the rents to Midsummer 1810; Mr. Day states that he appealed, because he was a tradesman; that is no ground for reduction; the New River company in liberality might reduce it, but we did not do it then.

Did he state he had obtained an abatement?—Certainly not, to the best of my recollection.

In point of fact, when you give the tenants the alternative of paying arrears, or of paying some addition for five years, you charged interest and compound interest; is that the case?—No; it is one-fifth on the rate; that would have stood £.3. 10s; the board entered into no calculation as to the precise effect; they did it to satisfy themselves, and other parties, that those persons who had resisted the rate from Midsummer 1818, should not be in a better situation than those who had not.

Upon what principle do you explain that this 12s. superadded is the fifth of the arrear?—It is not the fifth of the arrear, but one-fifth of £.3. 2s; in one word, instead of an advance from Midsummer 1818 of twenty-five per cent. it is equal to an advance from Christmas 1820 of fifty per cent.

(*To Mr. Day.*)—You stated that you paid 50s. for your ordinary service in 1810?—I paid less than that in 1810.

For which you have been asked since, £.3. 2s?—Yes.

Then you have said, since that, that you have had high service?—That is recently.

What do you pay for your high service?—They have charged me £.3 a year.

Exclusive of your other service?—Yes.

(*Mr. Knight.*)—If a tenant was to quit a house in two years, or half a year, or any certain period, and a new tenant came in, and that person had applied, which they naturally would do, (for the collectors show the books to every body,) a new tenant would see the house No. 5 was £.3. 12s. and the house No. 4 was £.3. 2s. and a new tenant would require an explanation; he would be informed; he would make his complaint and be restored to £.3. 2s.; and it was only meant to apply to that individual so long as he was in the house.

Have you had any instances of any such restoration?—No, it is only within these three months.

When it was determined at a board of directors that it should be an optional thing for a tenant to pay up the arrears or to pay a fifth for five years, were you authorized by the directors to state distinctly that option to the tenants of the company?—Certainly.

You were authorized by the directors to make that plain proposition to the tenants of the company with a distinct period of five years?—I do not recollect the precise terms you mention, but it was an understanding.

Have you any minute of that kind on your proceedings?—No, I have not.

Did you give that intimation?—No, certainly; in the case of a change of a tenant within the five years or any other period, certainly that additional fifth would have been taken off that individual.

[*Mr. Coe* stated, that where applications had been made to know whether the increased rate was to continue, he had uniformly stated that the difference was to be paid in the ensuing year only, and that upon the principle of equalization now

Mr.
James Day.

(9 March.)

proceeded upon, he did not see how it was possible that the house of the person in question who had made the application, could be continued at that high rate with reference to other houses.]

Mr. *Seth Smith*, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
Seth Smith.

WHAT is your situation and residence?—11, Davies-street, Berkley-square.

What are you?—A Builder.

What is the nature of your complaint?—It is a complaint of surcharge. Early in 1819 I bought the lease of a house of Mr. Dennison, the corner of Edward-street in Duke-street; the house was very much out of repair, and the water had been cut off; it was off when I took to the house. I applied to the office to have the water put on; they told me there were five quarters rent in arrear, and that they must refuse to put it on till that was paid. I asked what there was to pay, and they said then £. 2. 7s. for the five quarters. I did not consider it too much; I thought it for so large a house very moderate; I thought it very hard I should be obliged to pay it, and I applied to Mr. Dennison, and he said he should have nothing to do with it, he had tendered the money as usual and they refused to take it, and I was obliged to pay the £. 2. 7s. and afterwards the water was immediately laid on, and I was well supplied at the same rate.

You were obliged to pay the arrear of Mr. Dennison before you occupied the house?—Before they would put on the water; I never occupied that house; I bought it on speculation.

[Mr. Coe stated, that Mr. Smith, when he applied at the office, informed him that Mr. Dennison had agreed to pay up all rates and taxes; Mr. Dennison was one of those gentlemen whose rate had been increased, and left the house after repeated applications by the collector for this rate which was unpaid, and then the water was taken off.]

(To Mr. Coe.)—What was the increase?—From 30s. to 38s. a year.

Mr. *Richard Dennison*, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
Richard Dennison.

WHERE do you live?—At No. 10, Upper York-street; I am a Surgeon: I have been a tenant to the house for forty-three years, from the building of it, and the New River company served me till they left me; I was waited upon by a gentleman of the new company, and indeed I attended some of the great proprietors, two of them in my neighbourhood, and they came to prevail upon me to change the New River, but nothing could persuade me to do it; they had served me all along at 24s. a year.

Up to 1806?—Yes, from the year 1777 till 1806; then there was a rise of from 24s. to 30s. by the New River. Mr. Knight came as usual, “Mr. Dennison, I have increased you a little now, you must pay 30s.” “Very well, there it is, it is cheap enough.” By and by he came again, “Well, old neighbour, you have come down to the old price again, are you getting richer?” and he reduced it of his own accord to 24s.; I paid at that rate till the West Middlesex served me; then they left me again, and juggled one among another till I never knew who served me; sometimes I had thick water and sometimes thin, but I never knew who served me. Mr. Barnes, the collector, is in the room now, and he is very unwell, but we always went on extremely civilly; Mr. Barnes called on me and stated the increase.

You say you refused to pay the arrears?—Yes; Mr. Barnes came, “Well Mr. Dennison, will you pay me now?” “No, you know I am so concerned with Mr. Weale (we were the first stirrers up to protect the public from the oppression), and if I was to fetch it in a tea-cup I will not pay you more.”

More than the 24s.?—Yes; and when Mr. Barnes called, I said I am going to leave the house, (which I did at Christmas), you had better take it now, I am going. Ah, says he, you will not go far, I know where to call. I made the offer and he refused it, and I went away, and then Mr. Smith and I had certainly a promise on my part to pay all taxes, but there was something not quite settled about insurance with my attorney and Mr. Smith’s attorney; the increase was from 24s.

They asked you for twenty-five per cent. upon the rate for 1810?—Yes, they asked me £. 1. 18s.

As you have lived so long in the parish, can you speak to the nature of the supply in 1810, generally?—All the time I was in my house, mine is a common sized cistern across one of the areas, about four feet six inches long, and may hold ninety gallons,

gallons, I never knew it empty either in 1810 or in 1777 when I came to the house.

To what height did the New River supply your house?—The house never had a water-closet; in those days they had not those indulgences; our convenience was upon a level with the street; water was upon the ground floor, and therefore it had no connection with the water being served; but when I had a convenience to wash my hands, I tried whether it would rise, and it would always rise to that, which was about four feet above the first floor.

Do you mean the drawing-room floor?—The drawing-room floor.

That must have been from the ground at least fourteen or fifteen feet high?—I suppose mine are ten feet ceilings; I have no step, from the street it is pretty level.

In what year was that?—Twenty years ago, five-and-twenty years ago, it was not at first when I went into the house.

You are an old inhabitant and have paid attention to this part of the subject; do you happen to know of your knowledge whether these increased rates have been paid voluntarily by any one?—I do not know one; I am a very long practitioner as you may see, and I am in the habit of attending very superior people, and in my profession very low ones.

You have been acting a good deal with Mr. Weale?—Yes.

You took the greatest care in going round to the people never to say a word whether they had been compelled to pay?—Yes, I did.

You did not, as a surgeon, feel their pulse on the subject?—I scarce waited for that, I always gave them my advice; and some of the first and best subscriptions I have collected from the highest people; but I understand Mr. Knight has said we got shilling subscriptions to pay it, but they did not happen to be collected by me, I got nothing less than a guinea; but perhaps a large sum of money of a thousand pounds being collected by shillings would show a large majority of people.

You are a very old inhabitant, and you have attended to these proceedings of water companies; do you recollect that notice having been left at your house [*the notice produced by Mr. Coe*]?—I dare say it was, I had a quantity of notices.

You have no doubt it was left at your house?—I have not a doubt but it was; they never neglected calling upon me. Now I have a small complaint to make.

What is the nature of it?—Increase of rent.

To what amount?—The old was £. 3. 2s. the new rate £. 5. 5s.

Do you mean the old rate for 1810, or an abated rate?—I suppose it was in 1810.

What house is it?—Colonel Martin's, No. 8, Stratford-place, served by the Grand Junction; he was out of town, and he wrote and begged I would prevent the water being cut off from the servants, and Mr. Barnes was good enough to promise me it should not, which it has not; he has kept his word; here is the last receipt to Lady-day 1820, six quarters, £. 7. 17s. 6d.

How much of that is for high service?—No high service, there is none in the house.

(*To Mr. Coe.*)—It appears that the arrears that were personally due from Mr. Dennison, were claimed from Mr. Smith, and received from him?—Yes.

Mr. Dennison appearing to be a solvent and responsible person, and living within the parish, and known to be so to your collector?—He had removed out of our district.

It was known where he was?—Yes.

Upon what principle do your company act in respect to arrears; do you in the first instance claim from the occupant of the house, or follow the tenant and seek for recovery from him personally, so long as he is forthcoming?—Our usual course is to apply to the present occupier first.

Suppose the occupier in any instance to say, this is not for my time, Mr. A. B. owes this money, and lives at such a place, and is solvent, should you think it your duty to seek payment from that person before you came upon the occupier?—Undoubtedly.

Are we to understand that in general cases you resort only to the occupier for arrears not in his own time, when you cannot find the person who incurred them?—That is generally the case.

Why, in this case, did you depart from that rule?—Because Mr. Dennison had refused to pay the rent.

You go to the extent of your power with the old occupier before you go to the

Mr.
Richard Dennison.
(7 March.)

new one?—Not in this instance; if Mr. Dennison had occupied in the place we supplied with water, we should have cut the water off of that house.

In point of fact, you consider the house responsible?—Yes.

Looking to the house, have you any limit of time to which you carry back arrears?—Where cases have come before us we have seldom taken, I think, more than a twelvemonth.

That is your general limit?—Yes.

In this instance it is more; did you remit a quarter?—I understood so from the collector.

What was received from Mr. Smith?—Two pounds seventeen shillings and sixpence.

Was that for five quarters, or for four?—It appears by Mr. Smith's statement that £. 2. 7 s. has been received, which is five quarters; but the information that I got from the collector was that an allowance had been made to Mr. Smith, because Mr. Smith had stated that he could not get the whole from Mr. Dennison, although he had promised to pay up all rates and taxes.

Do you not recollect any instance where you have received beyond four quarters?—O, I think it is possible.

What is the general principle on which you claim the arrears from the outgoing tenant?—That we consider the premises liable for the payment of what is due from them.

(Mr. Knight.)—I concur, on the part of the West Middlesex company, subject to a modification, according to circumstances.

(To Mr. Coe.)—Is there any limitation of time as to the liability of the premises beyond which you do not go back?—I do not know that there is, except where cases of appeal have been taken into consideration.

(To Mr. Knight.)—Is that so with you?—Yes.

Mr. John Thorowgood, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
John Thorowgood.

WHERE do you reside?—In Southmolton-street, and am a Plasterer by trade.

What is the nature of your complaint?—The nature of my complaint first begins with the gross deception practised upon me by the company and its agents, with regard to the price at which they would supply me with water; their subsequent advance; their not offering me any agreement, unless I paid up what they were pleased to term money due to them for two years, which I considered I had no right to pay.

What was the first application made to you; at what period?—The last money that I paid to the Chelsea company, was in the year 1814, at Michaelmas; a few weeks previous to that, I believe I had become a tenant to the Grand Junction company; I find from the year 1808 to 1814, I paid £. 1. 6 s. annually; and I would beg to observe, that during twenty years residence in Southmolton-street, I never found any inadequacy of supply from the Chelsea company.

Have your cisterns been altered, enlarged, increased or diminished?—Not so; they were the same when I first became a tenant of the Grand Junction company as before I commenced it; I had had a vast number of applications from their agents, and representations that I should oblige certain persons with whom I was connected in trade, by taking water from them; I resisted it until I was informed by Mr. Purkis that I might as well make a merit of leaving the Chelsea company instead of letting it go till they were obliged to leave the district; I then applied to the Grand Junction, and saw Mr. Bateman Robson, and several other gentlemen; having known Mr. Robson many years, I communicated to him my wish to become a tenant, and to know on what terms they would serve me; he inquired what I paid; I told him; indeed I believe I took a receipt; Mr. Robson said, very good, Mr. Thorowgood, we profess to serve cheaper than the other company, we will serve you for a pound; I observed to him that it was not what I paid was the object, it was certain conveniences which they promised, and the other company could not give me, which induced me to change.

What was the nature of those conveniences?—That the water was always on; that it would rise to any height; that I had an additional safeguard from fire by that means, and also that I should pay more reasonably was a secondary object; I then told him, instead of a pound suppose you make it a guinea; he said, very well; and at a guinea we went on until about two years from last Michaelmas.

Till

Mr.
John Thorowgood.
(9 March.)

Till the year 1817 then?—Until the year 1818; during the year 1818 I was waited on several times by the collector, who demanded an increased rate of me, to the amount of 33s. a year; I told him I was very much surprised at such a demand, I had agreed to be served at a guinea, and I never would pay an increase unless I was compelled so to do: some time afterwards you are aware that the Anti Water Monopoly Association took place, and feeling myself aggrieved, I became a member, and a very active one. I had made this resistance previously, and told the collector I would not pay unless I was compelled, every time he came offering him the old rate. I then received a notice, inviting me to go to the office, where my complaint would be heard.

[The notice was read.]

In consequence of that notice, in company with two of my neighbours, house-keepers in the same street, I went to see the directors, and hear what they had to say; they told me they were empowered by an act of parliament to charge twenty-five per cent. upon the rates of 1810; I replied it was not so, for they took nothing by that pretended act, it was thrown out; and I made my former observation that I should resist the payment till I was compelled; that they had totally failed in all their promises made to me, and I felt myself seriously disappointed and very much injured in consequence thereof, for that I had been at an expense of near twenty pounds in different shapes, in consequence of the promises they had made to me.

What was that expense?—In my sheds; for the supply of my business I had a tank or reservoir of water, which was always filled by the Chelsea company three times a week; from that I had a pump to serve from the tank, and in addition to this, as their water was to come such a great height, I thought I might as well enjoy some of the comforts to be enjoyed, and in a small dressing closet, on the first floor, I put a wash-hand basin.

After you were served by the Grand Junction you added this luxury?—Yes, I did, and I had my water come in very copiously at first; I could draw water at any time of the day. I told them I had taken down the pump, and sold it for old lead; I had filled up my tank, and that very soon after I became a tenant of theirs I had only the water come in about an hour and a half a day instead of being always on.

You were assured by Mr. Robson originally that you should have it always on?—That was my agreement. I should observe, when I made the agreement with the directors, I inquired what security I should have, that when they had driven the other companies out of the street I should not be raised, and the answer of Mr. Robson was, Mr. Thorowgood, if you have any doubts of that description we will give you a lease for any number of years; I said, I have known you many years, and I think your word will answer my purpose as well; we went on complaining; I frequently made complaints personally, never by letter till I received this six months notice, which expired last Michaelmas; a few days before Michaelmas I went to the office with a neighbour, Mr. Wilson, and wished to know in what way they regarded this notice, for I confessed I did not perfectly comprehend it, but if I understood it right, I presumed that they undertook to serve me at the old rate of one guinea a year until Michaelmas 1820; Mr. Coe at that time was out of town, Mr. Robson and Major Blagrove I saw; those gentlemen told me they had not quite made up their mind on the subject, and as Mr. Coe was out of town, if I would take the trouble to look in in a few days I should have some further information; accordingly when Mr. Coe came to town, I again applied at the office, and Mr. Coe said, I understood it correctly, the notice was to that effect, that they were bound to take the old rate until the expiration of this notice; I was then indebted to them for eight quarters.

The notice is Lady-day 1820?—Yes, it is; we then went on for some few days afterwards, but I believe I told Mr. Coe before I left the office, then you may send the collector for the rate when you please, I shall be ready to pay him; and on the 12th of October the collector called with a receipt ready written.

Read that receipt?—“Received, the 12th day of October 1820, of Mr. Thorowgood, the sum of £. 2. 2s. for eight quarters water rent due to the Grand Junction company at Michaelmas 1820;” signed, “Richard Nicholson.”

That was the expiration of your notice?—Yes; I paid this rate, and I then told him my neighbour Mr. Wilson was down at Brighton, and he had commissioned me to pay his rate upon the same terms. “The old rate,” he said; “Yes, and no more, he is served with the same notice.” The collector was a little irritated, and

Mr.
John Thorowgood.
(9 March.)

wrote out the receipt, and forgot to sign his name to it, but I paid him ; as soon as I paid the money, he asked, " Have you made any new agreement with the company ? " " No, I have not ; they have never tendered any agreement to me, or called on me to make one : " " Then, sir, your water will be cut off immediately," was his very short reply ; I observed, upon such information, that it was at his peril to cut off my water, or to deprive me of the supply, as it was likely some further proceedings would be taken on it ; he took no notice, but in half an hour afterwards some men came and withdrew my ferrule of service from the main pipe.

Was this before the expiration of the notice ?—No, it was in October, some days after ; and I really thought myself, as they had entered into another year, that they had a right to serve me to the end of that year ; the same operation was performed on my neighbour Mr. Wilson's pipe also ; I went to the men who were opening the ground, and inquired by whose authority they were so doing ; they told me, by the authority of the Grand Junction company ; I said, I believe you are right, for I know you, I have seen you at the office ; the next morning I again opened the ground, and I employed a plumber, and laid my water on myself, and also my neighbour Wilson's ; and I did it by open day-light, in hopes that some of their agents might observe it, and that they would commence some proceedings ; however, if they knew it, they took no notice of it ; and some short time afterwards I wrote a note to Mr. Coe, and complained that I thought they had visited me with the utmost vengeance, and asked on what terms they would give me a new supply.

Did you mention to him that you had got it ?—No, I did not ; I did not receive any answer to my first application ; I wrote a second, complaining of neglect, to Mr. Coe, in not answering the first application ; Mr. Coe then called on me the next day, or a day or two afterwards, and in justice to Mr. Coe I must say he behaved very politely on the subject ; we had a long conversation, but in the end he failed in convincing me I was not right.

Was Mr. Coe aware of the water being put on again ?—No.

You did not inform him upon that visit ?—Yes ; but afterwards, after a long conversation, I told Mr. Coe it was very apparent I could no more do without water than without bread, and as they were the only persons in the market, I was obliged to take it of them, and therefore I wanted to know the terms. Mr. Coe observed I could not expect to be in a better situation than my neighbours, and I must pay all arrears, (I disclaimed any being due,) which amounted to £.1. 4s ; he called on me on the first of November, at my dwelling house, for the purpose of arranging terms for my future supply of water ; he wished me to give up my receipt, a receipt which I now have here, to Michaelmas, and take a new one for the advanced rate, for the two years past, amounting to £.1. 4s. more than I had paid the collector up to Michaelmas last.

And of course to pay the difference ?—Yes ; on my refusal to give up the receipt he agreed to send the collector for £.1. 4s. and to serve me in future at the rate of £.1. 13s. per year ; then I had this signed by a witness, (for I did not know what use I might make of it,) that I this day paid the collector £.1. 4s. because I could not have a receipt.

And since that you have stood at the rate of £.1. 13s ?—Yes.

And you have the water now ?—Yes ; before Mr. Coe parted from me, he said he would send a man to lay the water on, and I informed Mr. Coe then that I had it. The Committee will permit me to observe on what I have heard in this room. I have heard it stated by the secretaries from the different companies, that very few persons, compared with the mass, resisted this advance. In Southmolton-street the majority resisted, and that, with very few exceptions, they did not pay until they brought their instruments of destruction in a wheelbarrow to their doors. With regard to the quantity, on a former day I heard it named before this Committee, that each house received a considerable quantity of water ; I have taken the trouble to measure six following houses in Albemarle-street, Piccadilly, considering they were houses moderately sized, between very large and very small, and I found the average quantity, supposing they used the whole which their cisterns would contain, and that their cisterns were always emptied, when they were filled they amounted to 137½ gallons each day.

Upon a calculation of how many days service to a house ?—Seven ; that will give you, first, a description of the house, the number of cisterns, the contents of each cistern, the number of days served in each week, the number of gallons served

in

in each week, the average quantity of gallons per day to each house, the yearly water rent (where I could get at it) formerly paid, and that now paid : among these houses I have taken two hotels, whose consumption cannot be considered small.

Mr.
John Thorowgood.

(9 March.)

[The paper was delivered in.]

Dr. *Robert Masters Kerrison*, Called in ; and Examined.

WHAT is your situation ?—No. 12, New Burlington-street.

Are you a physician ?—I am.

Will you be so good as to state, in a very few words, what the nature of your complaint is ?—Between 1808 and 1812 or 1813, I paid two guineas a year to the New River company ; about that time I was solicited by a gentleman, whom I consider a personal friend, Mr. Cockerell, to take the water from the Grand Junction company ; I did so, without any stipulation as to price ; at the expiration of the usual term of half a year, the collector called on me, and I paid £.1 for half a year, and continued from that period either the end of 1812 or 1813 (the books of the company can of course elucidate that point) paying at the rate of £.2 a year until 1819, a period of five or six years.

Dr.
R. M. Kerrison.

Till what period ?—The demand was made at Michaelmas ; it must have been up to Michaelmas 1818 that I paid it.

Do you pay yearly or half-yearly ?—Half-yearly ; but in the month of July 1819, I received a printed notice, which I have in my pocket, that the water rate was increased to six guineas and a half a year ; this was in the last week of July 1819 ; this notice was left in my absence, and I thought some error might have crept into the account, but the next day or the day after, my next door neighbour, occupying No. 11, Mr. Mathias, whose house is like mine in dimensions and form, without coach-house and stables, called on me and asked me whether I had received any notice about the advance of the water rate ; I said, yes I have, and here it is ; what has happened to you ? “ I have received notice also, and they have advanced me to seven guineas from £.2.” I have brought with me the notice that had been left at his house ; and being at home when the collector called, he spoke to the collector, he remonstrated with him on the great increase of charge, and the collector said, Sir, do you consider it too much, or words to that effect ; the collector actually in this notice made a deduction of 5s. 3d. from £.3. 13s. 6d. upon the assessment of Mr. Mathias, leaving him at six guineas and a half from seven guineas. It appears to me, and I think it will appear to you, gentlemen, that there has been some alteration of figures here, of course prior to the time of this being delivered to the tenant Mr. Mathias, because a deduction of 5s. 3d. leaving a sum of £.3. 8s. 3d. will prove the previous sum, if it had been altered, had been altered prior to that time ; it looks as if it had been £.2. 12s. I happen to have one of my old receipts, of November 1818 before, the half-yearly rate of £.2.

Mr. Mathias never paid the seven guineas, because it was reduced to £.6. 16s. 6d ? —Yes ; but I think that deduction was made on leaving my notice, or prior to leaving my notice, so that whether I had been originally at six guineas and a half, and whether Mr. Mathias had been assessed at seven guineas, and that conversation left an impression on the mind of the collector that six guineas and a half had been the sort of thing for me to pay, and figured mine in equally, I do not know. On the receipt of that information, I considered it proper to inquire of the gentleman who requested me to take water from this company, the meaning of this great advance ; I accordingly wrote to Mr. Cockerell, and he replied to me very properly.

He is one of the directors ?—I believe he is interested in the affairs of the company ; he replied to me in the manner a gentleman would be expected to reply, and said in his letter, which I have in my pocket, that the fair interests of the company required an advance of twenty-five per cent. upon the rates of 1810. I immediately replied to him, that I was willing to make an advance of twenty-five per cent. upon the rate of 1810 ; and as that was a rate of two guineas a year, I was desirous it should be an advance upon that rate. Mr. Cockerell wrote to me in answer, that he had referred my letter to the company, and there our correspondence ceased : I heard nothing directly : I had one or two indirect communications from the company, at least I presume they were indirect communications from the company, because they were from personal friends of the directors. I mentioned it to Mr. Chilver, requesting him as he wished to adjust any thing that might be a cause of dispute ; I repeated to him in writing, after having offered in writing to Mr. Cockerell five-and-twenty per cent. advance, my wish to prevent all

Dr.
R. M. Kerrison.
 (9 March.)

future trouble or difficulties, and stated my readiness to advance twenty-five per cent. on the rate of 1810; and by that time I had become acquainted with the proceedings in Parliament in the preceding session, which I was unacquainted with up to that time, and I repeated my offer of twenty-five per cent. advance, and pledged myself to continue that advance, whether the company were or were not legally entitled to make that advance. I heard nothing from Mr. Chilver; this carried me to the end of December: in the interim I had seen by the papers, that there was a general dissatisfaction respecting the water companies, and I then was disposed to wait the result of that public inquiry, but I thought it gentlemanly and proper, to prevent all future misunderstanding of my motives, to write a letter to the directors officially, stating my two previous offers of twenty-five per cent. on the old rate, which I did, and which letter I will hand to the Chairman if he pleases. Previously to that letter, in September 1819, the secretary of the Grand Junction company called on me, and he then assured me that the company was willing to make some abatement of the demand of £.6. 16s. 6d; I said "what is the nature of that abatement?" he said, "Sir, you will be charged £. 3. 15s. for the usual supply, and £. 1. 15s. for high service;" my remark upon that was, that I had been supplied for several years with water in the cistern, that originally I had a forcing-pump, but that in consequence of the water being offered to me at any part of the house my forcing-pump had been suffered to go to decay and had been then removed.

Is there any difference of cisternage between the periods you speak of?—Not any, nor up to this hour.

None from 1810?—None from 1808; the forcing-pump had gone to decay, and as I had been supplied for several years and without any claim for extra charge on account of water rising to the level of the second floor, I did not see how, in fairness, that charge could be assumed now; therefore I resisted the propriety of such a charge after having been supplied for several years with water in that situation without any intimation except the notice respecting the intention of the company to make a charge; the conversation with Mr. Coe ended, I believe, not to our mutual satisfaction; I was not convinced by his arguments of the propriety of such an advance, and Mr. Coe left me. Mr. Coe the secretary conducted himself with the propriety and manners of a gentleman, but failing to convince me on the propriety of the advance, on rising from his chair he said, "very well, sir, then the company will act accordingly;" upon which I replied, "very well, I am prepared for that; good morning to you." I state these words as the only words on my memory bearing on that point; and I beg to state that I have nothing like a feeling of personal disrespect to Mr. Coe. I received a reply from the secretary of the company of September the 29th, merely stating my letter had been received; then, wishing not to get into any error, and there being a year's rate due at Michaelmas 1819, I sent to the collector a tender of the usual year's rate. I had only received notice of the assessment in the fourth quarter of the year, so that I had been incurring a charge of six guineas and a half a year, according to the assessment, for three quarters and above, prior to my knowledge of that advance. I sent a brief note to the collector, with a tender of the money then due at the old rate, £. 2; the collector hesitated to receive it and did not receive it, but sent a civil message stating that the sum not corresponding with the sum in his books, he could not receive it, but would call the next day; he did so, and explained to me that the sum not corresponding with his books he could not receive it; that he was only a servant of the company and could only do his duty. I got a letter of the 19th of October in these words.

[It was read.]

Having received this official reply that my twenty-five per cent. on the rate of 1810, would not be accepted after having been reiterated twice, I then attended a meeting of those who conceived themselves aggrieved, at Willis's rooms, on the 25th of October; there was a meeting advertised for the parish of Mary-le-bone prior to that time, between the period of my sending the letter to the directors and receiving an official answer, but considering that as I had not received an answer it would be rejected, it was proper to abstain from all intercourse with those in opposition to the company till I had their reply; but when I had the reply, and found I was to be assessed at £. 5. 10s. I considered it my duty to resist the demand unless it was legalized; I therefore attended, and stated briefly what I have now said; a few days afterwards I was informed that a very erroneous account of what I had said was put in a public newspaper, the Morning Post; I obtained the Morning Post of the 1st November, and

Dr.

R. M. Kerrison.

(9 March.)

and saw certainly that it was very contrary to my expressions, and very contrary to the real state of the case, as it concerned me; I therefore sent a letter to the editor of the Post, requesting him to contradict, or at least to state what I did say. I received notice in March 1820 that the period of supply would terminate at the next Christmas; I sent the money to the office for two years rates then due, at the old rate; it was not received then, but a message was returned that the secretary would call on me; the secretary called a day or two afterwards, and received the old rate, and gave me a receipt up to Michaelmas last: in my communication to the secretary I had stated my readiness to pay the old rate, and the thing being then *sub judice* no more than the old rate, the collector waited on me and received the rate. In the course of that day three men came into the street, and with the usual implements for removing stones, were taking up the pavement; I called them in to ascertain their intention, in the presence of a carpenter at work in my house, and the man said he came by order of Mr. Baker, the collector, to remove the service of water, and that it was his business to do so upon all defaulters; I showed my receipt to prove that I was at least not a defaulter; and he then said, I will go up to the office, (leaving the men in the street till his return,) for authority to act; he returned; I told him before he went, in the presence of the carpenter, that I was willing to continue paying, that it was contrary to my wish that the supply of water should be taken off, and that I was not a defaulter; a man came and told the carpenter that he had orders to do his duty; the stones were removed, and the service taken off, and I was left without water from the company; I was then thrown upon the necessity of obtaining what I could, which was at considerable expense to dig a well, which I did, and erected a pump, and had plenty of water, but not fit for culinary purposes, but hard water; and I have here an account of the expenses incurred in consequence of cutting off the supply, contrary to my express injunctions; the amount of the bill was £.32. 2s. 3½d. and I am still of course without any supply except that which I obtained from a well, and which, from the wells of my neighbours, must be very precarious, because the wells to the right and left are dry.

What do you now do for water for culinary purposes?—My washing is sent out, and for other purposes I use this water; my servants tell me it uses a great deal of soap, and then answers very inadequately.

You do not borrow of your neighbours?—Not at all.

You are noways connected with the association that was formed?—Yes; on the 25th of October 1819, after receiving the refusal of the company to lower the demands below £.5. 10s. but before that I had had no communication direct or indirect with any one of the members, except with Mr. Mathias my neighbour.

You say the collector informed you that the charge of £.6. 16s. 6d. would be reduced to £.5. 10s.?—Not the collector, the secretary.

The arrears are claimed on £.5. 10s.?—The arrears were asked for, but not insisted on last October.

In point of fact, is the claim made upon you now by the company upon the arrear of £.5. 10s. or £.6. 16s. 6d.?—It has never been stated; I give the company the credit of believing it would be on the minor rate.

A demand in money has been made?—Yes, twice, £.5. 10s. instead of £.2.

(To Mr. Coe.)—How was the first assessment of six guineas and a half made?—Upon an external examination of the house.

Not upon any reference to the rates of 1810?—No; then I afterwards saw Mr. Kerrison's house internally; and the house is much smaller than I had reason to believe from its external appearance.

And the letter you wrote had reference to that more correct knowledge of the house?—Yes.

In your mode of rating this house of Dr. Kerrison you proceeded at once upon the principle of judging what your charge for the supply of such a house should be, without any reference to the rates of 1810?—Yes.

In making this assessment upon this particular house, had you or had you not a general reference to the rates of 1810?—Yes, with regard to other houses.

Your object was to correct disproportions which you considered existed between one house and another?—Yes.

Lunæ, 12^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William Harris*, Called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
William Harris.

(12 March.)

WILL you state your residence and your situation?—Auctioneer and Appraiser, 27, Norton-street, Mary-le-bone.
What rate did you pay up to 1810?—I cannot exactly state; I do not think I ever paid more than 30 s.

[It appeared from the books that the rate in 1810 was 30 s.]

In what year did you change your water from the New River to the West Middlesex company?—In January 1818.

When did they make the rise upon you?—I believe very soon after that.

Do you recollect at what period?—I believe it ran on for two years; and I always resisted the payment of it; I tendered the old rates, but resisted the new ones.

Did you continue to pay the 30 s. after that period?—No; I believe I did not pay any increased rate.

What are you now paying?—£. 1. 4 s.

What does the arrear upon that amount to?—They gave me a notice charging me 37 s; that I objected to; and when I went to Mr. Knight the last time, he told me I must pay 45 s. and they had the day before cut off the water; and he said, if I meant to have the water at all, I must enter into an agreement in writing; I wished to see what the agreement was, and he put it in annually, and I objected to that, because I expected to get redress before that year was out from the honourable House of Commons.

Was this stated to be a fifth added by way of arrear?—It was not stated in any way.

It was not stated it was to last for five years?—No such thing; I never heard of that till I heard it in this room.

Mr. *William Ansted*, Called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
William Ansted.

STATE the grounds of this charge?—It is one of those cases of which you have had other instances of a fifth added. In 1810 Mr. Harris's house was charged 30 s. a year; it was increased to 37 s. a year, and Mr. Harris paid his old rate up to Christmas 1820, and the water was then cut off, and I gave him the option to pay the arrears, or to sign an agreement to pay 45 s. and he preferred signing an agreement for one year only, and I have the agreement here.

[The agreement was read.]

Mr.
William Harris.

(To Mr. *Harris*.)—Will you go to the next case you have to state?—The next is a case of surcharge from £. 1. 1 s. to £. 1. 10 s. for small houses, where I have tenants, in the upper part of Mary-le-bone. I have two houses in that state, Nos. 11 and 12, Newnham-street, and premises in Mary-le-bone-lane under similar circumstances.

What is the amount of charge?—The charge originally was 17 s. I think for the year, and now it is £. 1. 4 s.

What number is that in Mary-le-bone-lane?—35; I have some houses in Crown-street, Soho.

What are the houses?—Nos. 24 and 27; and here is another, No. 57, Dean-street, of the same description; I had to distrain for the rent there, and I did not get enough to pay myself, and they would not put on the water for the new tenant till I had paid up the arrears.

What were the arrears?—Two quarters, for 24 and 27, £. 1 due at Midsummer 1820; in Dean-street, the receipt is dated the 11th of October 1820, received 16 s. 6 d. three quarters rent for water due to the New River company Lady-day 1820: there are two houses of mine, Nos. 3 and 4, Rose-street, Soho, in the same predicament.

This all fell-out in the year 1820?—Yes, that I paid them; the former tenants leases expired at Christmas, and it was for water rent previous to that time.

Do

Do you say, with regard to those houses, that you distrained for your rent?—I did on that one in Dean-street.

How much did you recover of that rent?—Within four or five pounds.

How much rent was due when you distrained, what does the house let for a year?—Fifty guineas.

You lost a tenth of the year's rent?—I do not know exactly.

As to the others in Crown-street, did you get your own rent?—Yes.

Did you ever go before the New River board upon these cases, or appeal to them?—No, never.

[Mr. Rowe, on the part of the New River company, admitted the truth of the statement of Mr. Harris.]

What is the next case?—A case of the Chelsea company; this is a house I let to the Duke of Cambridge, on the south side of Saint James's park, and he uses it for a military depot; I pay all the taxes, and he pays me a certain rent per annum; it is called the Sheepecote.

State the case?—They have raised me from £. 1. 1s. to £. 3. 3s. I wish to give some explanation upon that: when I first made the purchase there were two companies served that situation, the Grand Junction and the Chelsea; the Chelsea being attempting to continue the service, asked me to continue with them; I told them, if they served on the same principle as others, I would; they took at the rate of one guinea per annum until this combination among the companies took place, and then they sent me a letter, which I have here, demanding at the rate of three guineas; there was some alteration made in the premises; there was a cistern in the wash-house, and to accommodate the quarter-master, I converted a building called the stable into a kitchen for his use, and I removed the cistern into this place, and they charge me now two supplies.

You have no cistern in the old place?—No; it is made into a parlour that room.

You say you abided by the Chelsea company; did not you pay two guineas a year before?—Not to my knowledge; I do not recollect; they took a guinea a year for some years.

When did you put up this cistern?—Five or six years ago.

Anciently there was a water butt or cistern?—A cistern, and that cistern I removed from one place to another.

But you have since put up a water butt in the old situation?—There is a water butt put there, and I put it there.

In point of fact, you have two supplies instead of one?—Yes; but it is on the same premises.

Is it the same house or a distinct and separate house?—It is a distinct kitchen.

Was the spot in which you have placed the cistern a part of the house which you took and let originally to the quarter-master-general?—Yes; it was a stable.

It is not a part of the house?—No; it is at a distance from the house.

Was there any supply to that stable originally?—No.

You took no pains to make any communication to the company, that you had taken on this fresh supply of yourself?—No, I did not.

(Mr. Lynde.)—The house that Mr. Harris has taken, paid since the year 1810, two guineas per annum; when he first came into it he applied to the collector to know the rate, he was told two guineas per annum; he said if you will reduce it to one guinea I will continue with you.

Mr. William Knowles, Called in; and Examined.

HOW long have you collected in this district?—Nearly eight years.

When did you first communicate with Mr. Harris?—In the year 1815.

What did you then collect from him for water rate?—Mr. Rock left the premises at Christmas 1814, and he paid me three quarters of a year at Christmas 1814, at the rate of two guineas per annum. Shortly afterwards Mr. Harris called on me, and told me he had purchased the house of Mr. Rock, and that if I would reduce him to a guinea he would stay with the company, and if I would not he would go to the Grand Junction company, who had a few weeks before drove pipes into York-street; I told Mr. Harris I could not possibly reduce the house without consulting with my superior officers; I consulted with Mr. Simpson; Mr. Simpson advised me to mention it to the board; I did so; the board said they would not allow me to make the reduction, but I stated as a reason why I wished the reduction, or why I thought it would be better to comply with it, that to get to Mr. Harris's house, the Grand Junction

Mr.
William Harris.

(12 March.

Mr.
William Knowles.

Mr.
William Knowles.
(12 March.)

Junction company would have to pass through a court containing twelve houses that paid £. 6. 12 s. to the company, twelve small houses; the board then said, settle the business as well as you can. I saw Mr. Harris afterwards, and I did agree with Mr. Harris, my principal motive for agreeing with him, was to keep the pipes out of that court, and where I should have lost twelve houses had I not complied. I have made a draft of the situation on a paper here, which I would hand to the Committee. In 1818, when the alteration took place, Mr. Harris was put upon the old rent of two guineas and raised to three, but in a very short period of time the company agreed to take off five-and-twenty per cent. and it was reduced to £. 2. 13 s. instead of three guineas. Mr. Harris has called upon me frequently and has tendered me a guinea a year, but as I could not take that, I have not taken any thing from Mr. Harris, and he owes at Lady-day three years rent. I went with Mr. Simpson to see that the house was not overrated at the two guineas, and Mr. Simpson measured it, and he found it measured fifty-four feet by eighteen, which was within the rate the company charged at that time; but in going through this we discovered a very neat little cottage on one side of the garden (the house stands in a garden,) and on one side was a small dwelling. Mr. Harris has explained that, by saying he had removed the cistern that was in the scullery to this new building; that Mr. Dwelley who inhabited the house wanted that part where the water used to be conveyed for his own dwelling; he made a parlour of this place; the new building is a totally new service, and the old pipe which used originally to serve the old house in what was called the scullery, is removed into the centre of the building, or some other part, to supply Mr. Dwelley's foreman, whose family live in that part of the house.

You say that the same supply which was afforded to the house, previous to the removal of the cistern, is still supplied?—The same pipe that supplied originally serves now with the addition of this pipe.

And an additional water butt is put up?—Yes; if there are two services there must be two receptacles.

You have stated as a reason for accepting his proposal, that it was in consequence of the plain and palpable injury to you from others driving pipes in that neighbourhood?—Yes.

Therefore if he had made a lower proposal you would have accepted it?—It is very probable I might, after consulting the board.

(Mr. Coc.)—As to the rates of Nos. 11 and 12, Newnham-street, they were 25 s. each in 1810.

Mr. Shirley David Beare, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
S. D. Beare.

YOU are partner with Mr. Hatchett, are not you?—Yes.

Hotel-keepers in Piccadilly?—Yes.

How long have you resided in that house?—Only two years and a half: if Mr. Hatchett had been in town he would have attended the Committee.

How long has Mr. Hatchett resided there?—He and his father and grandfather have had it near a century.

What rent did you pay in 1810?—I have not the receipts for that year; I have the receipts for 1813 and 1814; we were supplied up to Lady-day 1814 by the Chelsea and New River companies.

What did you pay up to Lady-day 1814?—£. 11. 4 s. the two together; two guineas a year to the New River; £. 9. 2 s. to the Chelsea.

When did you change to the Grand Junction company?—From Lady-day to Michaelmas 1814 was the first change; in the early part of 1814 some gentlemen, representing themselves agents of that company, waited on Mr. Hatchett, and begged his house might be supplied by that company instead of the two former companies; those gentlemen promised the supply should be superior, as there would be high services, and the charge would be much lower.

Was this representation made to you?—No, to Mr. Hatchett.

Not in your presence?—No; Mr. Hatchett is very ill in the country, and he has given me these particulars, but he will verify them at any time: those gentlemen proposed not only a superior supply, but that they would give it for £. 6 per annum.

The whole?—The whole house, high and low service; the house has not been increased in size since they stated that the supply should be from the main, which was always to be charged with water; and Mr. Hatchett was told by them that he might confidently do away with many cisterns which were then necessary as reservoirs from the two former companies; and as a further inducement, Mr. Hatchett informs

Mr.
S. D. Beare.

(12 March.)

informs me that they said, that if he would not then consent to take the water, that he must soon, as the two companies would not have it in their power, or would not serve him any length of time longer.

Is that a statement given to you by Mr. Hatchett himself?—Yes; the water from the Grand Junction company was laid on in the early part of 1814, at £.6 per annum. I have the receipt for the first two quarters.

Is Mr. Hatchett in town?—He is at Brighton. I have receipts as far back as 1813, up to the last payment but one that was made to the Grand Junction company; our plumber is in court who worked in the house for twelve or fourteen years, he can speak to many questions I cannot answer; many cisterns were destroyed, a large tank and a force pump; the supply I understood was very good from the Grand Junction company at first; it was not necessary to have large reservoirs in the house; this good supply was discontinued about the latter end of the year 1818. The water about this time, we can prove by some old servants in the house, who will speak to the fact, came in only three or four times a week, and then only for a few hours of a morning, and frequently left off coming in before the small cisterns which were left were filled, consequently the supply was very inadequate to the consumption of water requisite for the house, and great expense and serious inconvenience was occasioned thereby; instead of coming in every day, and at all times, as I am informed, it only came in three or four times a week, for an hour in the morning; new cisterns were erected, three or four water-closets were destroyed, on account of the scanty supply of water, the drains in almost every part of the house were stopped, and new ones were made on a larger scale, in order that the soil might be carried off with less water, because they became stopped, and it was of serious consequence to the house; and to prevent any waste of this water, the closets were altered to the self-acting principle, in order that a limited quantity of water might be discharged, instead of any waste which otherwise might have taken place; the discharge at each time was reduced one half, so that the consumption of water was lessened as we found the supply was lessened. The last payment for the water was up to Michaelmas 1818, at the rate of £.6 per annum, and no notice was given at this time of any intended advance; twelve months and more passed on without any collector calling for the usual rate, and Mr. Hatchett sent to the office some time in the year 1820 to inquire what was due, wishing to settle up to the twelvemonth that was due at Michaelmas, and they then informed him that there would be an advance, and the person who was sent there to pay offered the money, and it was refused; that it could not be taken, as there was to be an advance, and the gentleman could not then determine what that advance would be. The two years were nearly expired from Michaelmas 1818 when the demand was made from the company upon Mr. Hatchett for the sum of twenty-five guineas per annum for water from Michaelmas 1818, instead of £.6, at which they promised to serve, with a considerably less supply of water, consequently there was nearly fifty guineas due at the time, and I found it was to be continued at that rate.

It was demanded from Michaelmas 1818?—Yes.

No notice had been given to you of an advance?—No.

It was in consequence of Mr. Hatchett's application that he found out the advance?—Yes; I believe Mr. Hatchett never received any printed notice, I am confident I never did. Mr. Hatchett, when he was waited upon by these gentlemen from the company, told them he considered it a very exorbitant rate, and he offered to pay some gentleman from the company, not what they demanded for the past time, but he said he would pay them double or treble if they were not sufficiently paid, but he would not submit to pay them such an extravagant rate; I believe he offered them £.20 a year as an advanced rate; he informed me so; I was not present. I can answer for it we should not have objected to pay double or treble, but we did not think it was fair to charge us so far back as 1818. In consequence of this proceeding of the company, we commenced sinking a well in December, at a very considerable expense; the well is now 240 feet deep, and £.130 has been paid for digging and boring. The chief pipe was cut off in February last, in consequence of not paying the former rates.

Was it in consequence of that you began sinking the well?—Expecting they would cut it off.

You had commenced the well previously?—Yes, in December.

State if you can the extent of your expenses that have been incurred, first by the removal of all your cisterns and your reservoirs for supplying in 1810, and subsequently to this company's supply, and exclusive of the well?—Near £.400,

706. H h exclusive

Mr.
S. D. Beart.

(12 March.)

exclusive of the well ; by alterations of water-closets, by destroying cisterns which were valuable, including bricklayers work, in making new drains, of between £. 30 and £. 40 ; the drains were never stopped while the house was well supplied.

You consider these expenses would not have been incurred had the change of the companies not taken place?—Yes, I am estimating the expense on those grounds.

What do you state the expense of sinking the well now?—Sinking the well and fixing the pump, together I think I may estimate at nearly £. 200.

And what is the supply of water?—The supply of water will be quite sufficient for all purposes of the house, we confidently expect.

You expect to supply your house without any recourse to the companies at all?—We hope to do so, and our neighbours if they want a little spring water.

Has the house been increased since 1814?—Certainly not.

There have been no additional premises added to the White Horse Cellar?—No.

Have you found water at the depth of 240 feet?—We have water, but we have not the main spring, we could bore it at a day's notice, and men are now at work on the well and have been at it for four months ; we have a land spring, but we cannot depend upon it as being sufficient for the supply of the house.

Is your well dug down to 240 feet, or is it by digging and boring?—Digging and boring.

Are not water-closets at the hotels constantly out of order in consequence of the mismanagement of people who use them?—Ours are not.

Do you mean to say it depends on the water company whether they are out of order or not?—Ours are seldom out of order, they are put to rights in a few minutes if they are.

Does it depend on the water company whether they are in or out of order, or upon the persons who use them?—It depends upon the water company if the supply is not good.

Mr. Joseph Simphin, Called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
Joseph Simphin.

YOU heard the evidence given by Mr. Beare?—Yes, and I confirm it ; and we do not use so much water in that house as we did in 1812, not by a considerable deal ; there are three water-closets less, and we have less water ; the supply is now not sufficient. Mr. Anderson came after the supply of water was not sufficient, and recommended to Mr. Hatchett to erect a cistern, the expense of which would be £. 200, and the alteration in the pipes, which would increase Mr. Hatchett's expense more than £. 500.

Did Mr. Hatchett do that?—He did not ; he sent for Mr. Anderson who recommended this, but of the two evils they chose to sink a well and supply themselves ; and the water-closets now do not take half the quantity of water, and no person can use more than a certain quantity ; and if twenty people go in, we know what they take to half a pint.

(Mr. Anderson.)—If the Committee will allow me, I will explain as far as the service goes. When Mr. Hatchett's house was first laid on to the company, we generally kept the water on in all the services nearly night and day ; the consequence was, that Mr. Hatchett found great benefit from such a service as was then given by the company ; and I believe two very small cisterns supplied all the water-closets that were then necessary. In the alteration that took place with the companies, the supply was then reduced very much in the services, and Mr. Hatchett's cisterns became inadequate for the supply of his water-closets ; there have been several complaints made to me, and I always recommended additional cisterns ; instead of their getting additional cisterns, they got additional water butts, I think four or five additional water butts, placing them side by side, and these were put instead of the very extraordinary expense of £. 400 that has been named ; these were the chief expenses that seem to be attached for the want of a supply of water at Mr. Hatchett's ; the plumber, Mr. Simphin, called and stated, that notwithstanding the additional butts, that they were then at times without water, and the plumber proposed that we should lay it upon the main pipe, which was done accordingly ; and with the exception of perhaps once or twice up to last September, from the time that it was laid upon the main, I do not recollect any complaints having been made from Mr. Hatchett's.

When was it laid on the main?—About two years ago.

The main gave a perpetual supply, of course?—It was not perpetual, because once or twice in the course of the day, for an hour or two, it was shut off ; but we had one screw of the main on to give it almost perpetual. I have stated already,

*Mr.
Joseph Simplin.*

(12 March.)

already, that I heard no complaint up to last September, when the increased rate was demanded; and Mr. Coe and myself waited upon Mr. Hatchett, and he stated then a number of grievances about the supply of water, which referred chiefly to the first supply that was given him in 1814, namely, that he had put up additional cisterns, which cisterns I described as nothing more than the butts, that expense was very trifling; but the main point Mr. Hatchett went to was, as to the price; it was stated to him at that time that the Pulteney Hotel in Piccadilly had paid £.25 a year, and it was then (Mr. Hatchett taking it for granted that that was to be his rate) he stated that he had no objections to paying double what he had paid to the company, namely, twice six pounds, about twelve pounds, or something of that; Mr. Coe and myself stated to him then, that it was impossible to supply such a demand of water as that of Mr. Hatchett's for such a sum; he said he would give no more, and he was determined he would sink a well. The observation that we made then was, that in order that you shall not be put to any inconvenience, we will keep the water on till you sink a well, provided you do it in some reasonable time; he stated that he should set to work immediately, and when the year expired his water was then not cut off, and we expected of course that the well had been sunk, and the water was taken off last February.

Did you wait for notice that his well was sunk before it was cut off?—No, because we confined him to a period to do it; he said he could do it in a month or so; the offer was made liberally to him, provided he could state some time.

Did you point out the necessity of such a large cisternage as would cost the expense of £.200?—By no means; I deny it; the cistern that I pointed out would not have been more than £.20 expense.

In effect, what cisternage did you point out?—That was the only one.

You pointed out a particular cistern?—Yes.

In the house then?—In the house then.

Necessary to be put up in the house?—From the complaint.

Which, in your judgment, would cost £.20?—I am sure it would not have cost more; we took the size of a cistern.

What was the size of the cistern?—It would have held six or seven hundred gallons of water.

Do you mean to say you could construct a cistern to hold six or seven hundred gallons of water for £.20?—Thereabouts.

How much of the expense of £.400 do you state to be attributable to the water companies?—I have stated six water butts; I know of nothing else.

Do you think it is owing to any misconduct of the water companies that those sewers have gone to decay, or been silted up?—I consider the companies not answerable for that, because they would always have had water if they had cisterns.

After the cisternage was destroyed, and the water put on the main, at times the water was off the mains, does that account for their being at times badly supplied?—No.

If they had no cisternage, and the water was on the main, how could they have a supply?—When the supply was bad it was on the service.

You say they could not have wanted water from the time they were put on the main?—Certainly not; I would consider it their fault and not mine.

Do you consider the £.12 an adequate sum for the water with which you are now supplying them?—I consider not.

What do you think would be a fair charge in proportion with other people?—If you will give me leave, I will state my reasons: I think it was one of the waiters of the hotel, who had been set to watch the quantity of water that was used, and he stated that after having ascertained for a number of days, he took the average quantity of the water-closets at two hundred falls a day, and about eight gallons per fall for each day; the whole of this, whatever the quantity may be, is high service only; I considered, and an observation was made to Mr. Hatchett at the same time, that taking the whole of his houses that were turned into the hotel, which were four, I think, and taking them at the ordinary price of other houses, would warrant nearly the rent that we were then asking: every person who knows the White Horse Cellar must know that it is a house of very great consumption of water.

When you say that the number of houses would nearly warrant the rent, you mean if they were private houses and not public houses?—Yes.

Was there in fact any increase or enlargement of cisterns or closets after the first agreement?—There was the increase of the water butts.

Mr.
Joseph Simpkin.

(12 March.

After the first agreement there was no other increase of water-closets or cisterns than those water butts you have mentioned?—No.

Is it within your knowledge that the increase of water butts was exactly in proportion to the deduction of cisterns?—I never knew what the cisterns were.

You state that the proprietor of the Pultney Hotel paid £.25, has he ever made any remonstrance to that?—It was paid to the old companies at that rate.

To the Chelsea?—I believe it was.

Have you had any complaint of that rent?—Not that I know of.

When the waiter stated to you there was eight gallons a fall, did he tell you upon what principle he calculated it?—No; the quantity of water used in the water-closet in an hotel it is almost impossible to get at, except by gauging it in the cistern.

How long would it require to hold up the plug to put off 1,600 gallons?—It might be let off very soon, in a very few seconds.

Do you know of any private houses that pay as large a sum as is demanded of Mr. Hatchett?—I believe the Duke of Wellington pays us that sum, and the Marquis of Stafford paid as much in 1810 as we charge to Mr. Hatchett.

Do you know any thing of any representations made to Mr. Hatchett to induce him to be served by the Grand Junction company originally?—None that I know of.

Did you serve him all the time he asked for making his well before you withdrew the water?—Considerably beyond it.

You kept faith with him on that subject?—I did.

You went with Mr. Coe to Mr. Hatchett on this subject?—Yes.

Mr. Hatchett entered into the case, and made representations to you?—He did.

Did he say any thing about this being a departure from your engagement?—There was a general observation that the company had not fulfilled their engagement as to the water being always on.

Did he state any thing to you as if the company had originally engaged at a fixed price with him, and had now departed from it?—I think that was generally stated by him, but the particulars I do not recollect.

(*To Mr. Simpkin.*)—Was there any additional number of water-closets set up in the house after you were supplied with the new companies?—There are three less water-closets now than there were in 1812.

Were there any new water-closets erected between 1814 and 1820?—There were two water-closets destroyed during that time.

And none erected?—None erected after 1814.

Were any of the water-closets in the White Horse Cellar supplied with a forcing pump previous to the Grand Junction supplying the house?—All, except two.

And where were those that were supplied without a forcing pump situated?—On the first floor, where they are now.

The water-closets above the first floor were obliged to be supplied by the forcing pump?—Yes.

(*To Mr. Beare.*)—Have you within the last twelve months repeatedly applied to the office, complaining of a deficiency in the supply of water?—Yes.

Was it before September last?—Before September last.

(*Mr. Anderson.*)—With regard to the complaints, I do not know of any complaints having been made at the office, excepting when the plumber complained of a want of water when the pipe was on the service; when it was laid on the main, I have no recollection of any complaint, with this exception, that the plumber called to say that there was still a want of water in one particular part of the hotel, I think it was the bar, and it was then that I proposed the cistern, and which the plumber knows very well himself that the supply could not be secured without this additional cistern, and which cistern never was put up to my knowledge.

(*Mr. Coe.*)—I beg to state, that when I last saw Mr. Beare at the hotel, he made a similar complaint; I observed to him that I did not see how it was possible that could occur, when his pipe was on the main; his answer was, I will take you to the cook in the kitchen to prove this is the case, I went with him to the head of the stairs and met her, and he asked her, “Have not we been often without water,” and she said, “No, I think it has been as good as it could be.”

(*To Mr. Anderson.*)—Do you think it possible that this hotel being on the main they could have wanted water at any time when that main was running?—Certainly not.

Was

Was that main generally running except about an hour a day?—I can hardly state to an hour, particularly, but my orders were to keep that main charged as far as would supply Mr. Hatchett, nearly night and day.

How far did you keep it charged?—As near that as possible.

What exception?—When a change of service took place.

What time did that take place?—Perhaps an hour or two a day.

Not more than that?—I think not.

Can you give any reason why his house being on the main they might have felt a want of water?—The drawing of water below in various places, and the very great consumption of water below, and that from one pipe, will frequently prevent the water from reaching the upper cisterns.

But in point of fact that drawing could not go on continuously for an hour?—It depends entirely upon the consumption.

Do you think you can safely state the water was on twenty hours a day at Mr. Hatchett's?—Yes, I think I can; when the complaint was made of the want of water, I ordered that the cock of the main should be opened one screw, in order to give a supply to Mr. Hatchett; you will observe that the main for high service is not charged above twelve hours in the day.

How high, when it is charged for low service in such a house as that, will it go?—I do not think it would reach the height of those butts which I named; they were situated, I think, about sixteen or seventeen feet above the street, the top of the butts.

Then the effect of being on the main was only to give him a supply of twelve hours a day for the upper part of his house?—Yes; there never being any deficiency in the lower part.

If there had been a proper cisternage, would Mr. Hatchett have ever experienced any want of supply of water?—Certainly not.

Were the butts in addition to the cisterns a proper substitute for cisterns?—I should think not.

Was the deficiency of supply to be ascribed to the company, or to the deficiency of cisternage?—I should certainly consider to the deficiency of cisternage.

(*Mr. Simplin.*)—The butts are situated to serve the water-closets on the first floor, and from twelve o'clock on Friday to nine o'clock on Monday morning no water came into those butts.

Was that so week after week?—I can bring proof that it was so for twelve or eighteen months; and with respect to those water-closets being without supply, the Chelsea water company used to supply those very water-closets, where a deficiency has been from this company.

(*To Mr. Anderson.*)—You have heard what has been stated by Mr. Simplin, that from twelve o'clock on Friday till nine o'clock on Monday morning no water came into those water butts?—He is alluding to what took place originally, and then I directed the screw to be turned.

Apply that to the last two years?—Since the complaint has been made.

Is that more than a year ago?—Yes, I should consider so.

Do you think since that time that can have been the case?—I have heard no complaints.

(*To Mr. Simplin.*)—Do you confine yourself to the period of the last year and a half?—To the last year and a half, till the water was cut off; every Monday morning I go down to see what is wanting, and to see no water goes to waste, and I noticed those butts were generally out; we had the water four times a week in the butts, but from Friday to Monday we had none, and then we were deficient, and then Mr. Anderson recommended this cistern which was to hold two thousand gallons, and it was to be supported by iron columns through the kitchen, and I leave to any gentleman whether that can be erected for £. 20.

(*To Mr. Anderson.*)—Do you apprehend that from the means you took the house would have been supplied?—No doubt of it.

Supposing the turncock had obeyed your orders would it have been supplied during those times?—I have no doubt of it.

Can you ascertain any reason for Mr. Hatchett not being served?—No, only in the turncock leaving some side supplies open.

If that had been done which you ordered would they have been supplied?—I have no doubt of it.

(*To Mr. Simplin.*)—After the pipes were opened wider did you complain?—

706.

I i

I went

*Mr.
Joseph Simplin.*

(12 March.)

Mr.
Joseph Simpkin.

(12 March.)

I went up to the engine-house to Mr. Anderson eighteen months since, I have gone to the turncock, living very contiguous, and requested he would turn the water on.

The last time you went to Mr. Anderson was eighteen months ago?—Yes.

Can you state what Mr. Anderson said to you?—Mr. Anderson came down to Mr. Hatchett's, and we had a conversation with him and Mr. Coe, and Mr. Anderson recommended this cistern to supply the whole house.

What size was the cistern?—About ten feet long, eight feet wide and four feet deep.

Did Mr. Anderson at that time tell you that he would open any screw of the main, or any thing of that kind?—No, never; I contradict it.

Then what did Mr. Hatchett say to this recommendation?—He said he would discover it; and with respect to the well, with respect to Mr. Anderson or Mr. Coe saying, in my hearing, they would keep the water on till the well was sunk, it never was.

This defect continued week after week after that representation?—Yes.

Did you ever represent it to Mr. Anderson?—No, only to the turncock to turn the water on.

Have you frequently mentioned it to the turncock?—Three or four times since that period.

(*To Mr. Anderson.*)—Have you any rule or regulation to explain the systematic want of supply from Friday to Monday?—No, we had our engine working every day, Sunday excepted.

Then you cannot account for it?—No, I cannot.

(*Mr. Beare.*)—Complaints have been made to the company from time to time by letters, which can be produced if they have been filed.

(*Mr. Coe.*)—Whenever a complaint comes to the office it is entered in a book, and the turncock gives his account of it; and if it is repeated, Mr. Anderson looks into it.

Mr. John Richardson, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
John Richardson.

WHERE do you reside?—In Tichborne-street.

What are you?—I am a mourning coach master.

What is the nature of your case?—An extra charge; it is a charge from £.3 to ten guineas. I entered upon my premises in July 1801, and was served with the water of the New River company to my entire satisfaction, and my consumption of water at that time was considerably more than it has been of late years. Two agents from the Grand Junction company waited on me in the year 1813, and inquired if I was well supplied with water; I replied I was; they then inquired the price I might pay the New River company for such supply; I told them that I formerly used to pay £.7 per annum, but of late years they had raised me to £.8 per annum; after making some inquiry of me into the consumption, they said the charge was an imposition; I told them I never troubled myself about these sort of matters, I always considered myself charged equally with my neighbours; they said they served the stables a little higher up, in the same street, which had a greater demand for water, at £.3 per annum, and should be very happy to serve me upon those terms. I did not desire better water or a better supply; I had no complaint to make upon that point, I had a large tank, with a ball-cock that prevented any waste of water, and therefore turning it on for a longer time would be of no benefit to me; I agreed however to take their water.

At that reduced rate?—At £.3; they said it was high time there should be competition to put an end to the monopoly of the New River company, and the benefit the town would derive from their coming in ought to induce them to encourage their undertaking. After being supplied a very short time by the Grand Junction, my family complained that the water was very dirty, and were much dissatisfied with it; they produced me a mug which had been filled with the water over-night, and there was a very heavy sediment at the bottom, so much so, that we were set against it for domestic purposes, and determined to have the New River water again; I went to the New River company's collector for that purpose, who as soon as he saw me said, Mr. Richardson, I am sorry you should have discontinued our supply of water, as I never heard any complaint from you; I told him the terms I was supplied upon by the Grand Junction company, and I also remarked that the New River company, having the public so completely in their power, ought not to have put such high prices on the public as to induce any other

company

company to underwork them; this was general conversation; but I went for the purpose of having it put on at all events; I explained to him the nature of my consumption, and that the horses were the greater part of their time from home on long journies, and he said if I would come to their board and explain those circumstances he had no doubt they would reduce my charge of £.8, as under all the bearings of the case, he thought I had been charged too much, but it was my own fault, as it was not to be expected they should know my business; he said they should be very happy to serve the premises again; I said, if they would remunerate the Grand Junction for the expense they had been at in placing the water on my premises I would return to them, otherwise I should think I had been treating them very unhandsome; they agreed, and I was again supplied with water from the New River company.

At what rate?—At the £. 3, until the coalition took place in the year 1818; I had not the Grand Junction company's water on my premises, except for a week, or a short time, and paid them no rates. In 1818 I was transferred back to the Grand Junction company, without any previous notice being given me, or first obtaining my consent. At Michaelmas 1819 a demand was made on me for ten guineas, for four quarters rates due at Michaelmas 1819; I refused to pay it, as I thought it was too much for those parties who had told me in the year 1813 that I was imposed on by the New River company, to turn round on me, and in the year 1819 charge me ten guineas. In the March following I was served with a notice at six months, to say if I would not consent to pay the ten guineas per annum, I should be deprived of my water. At Michaelmas 1820, I called at their office and paid the reduced rate, and about the 9th of November following, they cut my pipe off, and I have been without ever since, which is four months. I have had two or three interviews with Mr. Coe, and stated to him, that I should be willing to pay, provided my water was put on again, any rate they may be legally entitled to, as may be decided by Parliament hereafter, or otherwise they would be kind enough to place me where they found me, as I did not send for them, and I was very well supplied by the New River company.

Did not the Grand Junction company incur a considerable expense in laying down a pipe in the upper part of your yard?—Yes; I did not like to go back unless the New River company made them a remuneration; I thought it very unfair without remunerating them their expense.

Did the New River remunerate the Grand Junction?—They told me to leave it to them, it should all be put to rights, and I should hear no more of it.

(*Mr. Coe.*)—Upon Mr. Richardson's refusal to pay the rate which was demanded of him, and wishing his premises to be inspected, I waited upon him for that purpose in November, shortly after the water was cut off, or just previous to it; and from the explanation that I received from Mr. Richardson, and the calculation I made as to the number of stalls and coach-houses which he had, I stated that his rate appeared to be overcharged at the former calculation, and the company would reduce it to eight guineas; Mr. Richardson, however, refused to pay this. I did not know at the time that Mr. Richardson had paid £. 8 in 1810.

Upon what ground did you make up your calculation of rate which you did charge him?—When we first began to rate stables on the new rate, we took them at four shillings a stall, and I made inquiry subsequent to that, (finding many persons had objected to the rate of four shillings a stall,) as to what the Chelsea company used to charge; and I was informed by their engineer that they had charged three shillings a stall, and that they had put the twenty-five per cent. on that; and since that we have calculated at three shillings, and five-and-twenty per cent. making 3s. 9d; and I think Mr. Richardson's calculation was made on that.

Upon taking the number of stalls actually on his premises, did you reduce it according to your rule?—Yes.

And that reduced rate turned out eight guineas?—Yes.

At the time that you proposed to reduce this to eight guineas, did you also forego the arrear of what turned out to be in your latter apprehension an overcharge?—I forget whether that became the subject of conversation or not; but I am sure if it had been we should have told him that we expected the arrears.

If you told him ten guineas was too high, would you then have followed the arrears of the ten guineas?—No.

But the arrears would have followed the reduction of the principal?—Certainly.

You would have expected the arrears of the eight guineas?—Yes.

Mr.
John Richardson.

(To Mr. Richardson.)—From the moment they reduced the amount from ten to eight guineas, you did not expect they would insist on the arrears of the ten?—Certainly not.

(12 March.)

Mr. Michael Smith, Called in; and Examined.

Mr.
Michael Smith.

WHERE do you reside?—No. 17, Gloucester-place, New-road.

What is your situation?—Collector of the parochial rates for Mary-le-bone.

What is the nature of your complaint?—I went to that house at Midsummer 1818, and after Christmas the collector called upon me for half a year's rates, amounting to £. 1. 2s. 6d.; I refused to pay that rate, being more than had been paid before; then he called upon me two or three times, and I still refused him; I then one day met the collector in Gloucester-street, and he accosted me in the street; Now, says he, you may as well pay me, because, says he, we shall beat you (it was then pending in Parliament, I believe.) Well, says I, Wilcock, we will beat you; I had then taken a little active part, but not much; I did not like to be accosted on the highway for the sum of £. 1. 2s. 6d. and I said, Come into Mr. Henshaw's and I will pay you; so we went in, and I said, Now Wilcock, I am a collector, and I have a brother feeling for you, and I will pay you. When he went in I said, Wilcock I will pay you, but remember, with a protest of this kind, if it does not pass Parliament you shall refund; he did not say he would, but he gave me one of his smiles, which he very often does.

Which collectors understand between each other?—Yes; I made an observation about a physician at the time, but that has nothing to do with it; he never refunded it; collectors never do when they can hold it; I did not mind the money much, but being a servant of the parish, I had these delivered from the vestry, wishing I would circulate six or seven hundred of them in my division.

[The witness delivered in a paper, which was read.]

You were directed by the vestry, as their servant, to deliver them?—Yes; but previous to that I had paid my rate, and therefore perhaps I did not take so active a part, except from a sense of duty as a parish officer, and much more so as a housekeeper.

It was subsequent to the payment of your rate that you circulated that paper?—Yes.

When did you distribute that?—A few days after the date of it, and before I had done, I had another to distribute, which I believe was not from the vestry, therefore it is not necessary perhaps to produce it.

Who was it from?—I cannot state; it came in a bundle, but I do not know from whence.

You received this to distribute?—Yes.

How did it come to your hands?—I really cannot say who sent it.

[Another notice was read.]

Do you know whether this came from the vestry or not?—I do not know.

Do you know that it did not come from the vestry?—No, I do not.

What happened after this, you had paid this increased rate?—I had paid it, and I went about, and I could not go on with my collection without saying, here is a fine business to come about now! a fine per centage on the water! well, says I, I have paid mine.

Did you circulate that second paper?—I did, but not so numerous as the other.

You paid your rate?—Yes.

You took an active part in resisting the demand of the water companies?—Yes.

In the course of your collection have you reason to think that the generality of the public whom you were collecting from, for your parochial rates, paid these demands willingly or unwillingly?—Unwillingly, undoubtedly; I will venture to say not two in a hundred paid without grumbling; my friend Mr. Knight called on me on the 25th of March, (I was lying on the sofa, not very well,) and he told me I had better pay it; I tendered the old rate, and it was not received, and on the 27th of March Mr. Knight came with his men, and they cut me off; I was without water till the 10th of July; I then went into the country to dine, and Mrs. Smith, who had felt a little inconvenience from want of water, went and paid the rate, and Mr. Knight said Mr. Smith has taken an active part, I do not complain; as to getting contributions, I do not think I need, nor am I competent to go into so large a field as Mr. Knight did.

(Mr.

(*Mr. Knight.*)—Mr. Smith has stated that the collector called upon him after Christmas 1818, and demanded the rate, and afterwards called upon him two or three times, and he refused to pay the rate, but afterwards he met him in the street and they had some conversation, they then went to Mr. Henshaw's shop and paid the rate. I have simply to remark, that the collector told me that the first time he went his round (the collection commenced only on the first of March), the collector left his notice paper for £. 1. 2s. 6d. the half year's rate, he only called that once on Mr. Smith; in collecting in the neighbourhood he went to Mr. Henshaw's shop in the course of his first round, he saw Mr. Smith in the shop, Mr. Smith actually paid him the £. 1. 2s. 6d. without his even asking him for it, and the collector stated to me that Mr. Smith made this observation, that he thought the company ought to be paid.

Is this more than a twenty-five per cent. case?—No, it is not; Mr. Smith paid the £. 1. 2s. 6d. on the 23d of April. Mr. Smith some time afterwards, when he was instructed so to do by the vestry, was extremely active in going round from house to house, and I do not blame him; but with regard to this paper I wish to say one word about that; there were various papers in Mary-le-bone, the walls were covered with them, and this caution was put on all the walls, with the words, "It is false," very large, namely, that the parish were going for a parochial bill; I have very little doubt it was a paper of vestrymen. Mr. Smith and others, after Midsummer, when that bill was in the House, were most active in stimulating the public against the companies, as I have got a paper here to show.

Mr. John Bullock, Called in; and Examined.

WHAT is your situation?—19, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square.

What are you?—I am a grocer.

Your's was an increased rate, was it?—Yes it was.

By what company?—By the Grand Junction; I paid it once; the first time was under a personal threat from Mr. Coe, and the second time was in consequence of this letter.

What was the increase?—They demanded from 24s. to 38s.

What was the rate in 1810?—Thirty shillings.

What is the reason given in the letter?—

[The letter was read, dated April 28, 1820.]

*Mr.
Michael Smith.*
(12 March.)

*Mr.
John Bullock.*

Mercurij, 14^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. James Weale, again called in; and Examined.

I HAVE stated in my evidence that the demand of the increased rates came on the inhabitants by surprise; that the Grand Junction company had not given any notice. In saying they had given no notice, I did not mean to say they had not given an intimation of their intention, but they had not given regular notices to the inhabitants. Upon a subsequent day Mr. Coe delivered in that printed notice, to show that notices had been served upon the inhabitants generally. The fact to which I wish to call the attention of the Committee is this, that the increased rates of the Grand Junction company have been demanded from Michaelmas 1818, and that on the 11th of June 1818, nine months after that time, Mr. Coe in his evidence on oath before the Committee of the House of Lords, stated, that they had not up to that hour increased the rates, and if the Committee will give me leave, I will read the passages upon that very point, nothing can be stronger.

[An extract from the evidence of Mr. Coe, in p. 101 of the Committee's copy of the Minutes of the Committee of the House of Lords, was read.]

(*To Mr. Coe.*)—Have you heard your evidence before the House of Lords read?—Yes; I conceive that evidence to go to this, that we had not raised the rate, not that we had not an intention to raise it, because I think the evidence shows we had given notice to that effect, and we were just on the point of collection

*Mr.
James Weale.*
(14 March.)

Mr.
James Weale,
(14 March.)

when we went into the House of Commons, and I think a charge was brought against us by Mr. Sumner, that we had employed additional collectors to get in the rate, we were in such a hurry, and it was suggested it would be better to wait till that Committee had gone through the inquiry, and we not only waited through the inquiry of that Committee, but till the bill was thrown out in the House of Lords.

(*Mr Knight.*)—I wish simply to add to my evidence of Monday, in explanation of Mr. Day's case, No. 26, Manchester-square, who produced a receipt, purporting to be for half a year's water rate up to Christmas 1810, at the rate of 36*s.* a year, that Mr. Day actually paid the New River company at the rate of 50*s.* a year up to Midsummer 1810; that on the 4th of May 1811, after the West Middlesex pipes had been brought into his neighbourhood, he went to the New River company, as appears from this book, and on that date, namely the 4th of May 1811, obtained a reduction of his rate from 50*s.* to 36*s.*

Mr. John Thomas Hope, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
J. T. Hope.

WHAT are you?—I am a resident in the parish of Mary-le-bone, and a member of the vestry.

What is the nature of your case?—I have been an inhabitant of No. 37, Upper Seymour-street, which is situated on the highest ground in Mary-le-bone, twenty-seven years, and part of my family several years before that, during which period I have been supplied with water to a cistern below the ground, and another to a water-closet in the yard, and never was short of water, except in frost: and as I am informed, when I make those observations, I shall be open to any contradictions persons present may be able to give me, as I am informed I was served with water three times a week. I could not have received more for domestic purposes than ten hogsheads and a half per week whilst in town, even if the cistern was always emptied before it came on again, and was filled each time, as it will only hold 190 gallons, and about seventy gallons for the water-closet, and with that cistern I could not have consumed more than the quantity I first stated.

Was the water-closet cistern as large as the other?—No.

You had about 260 gallons together?—Yes, thereabouts; for that supply I paid 40*s.* per annum to the New River company. My coach-house was supplied by the Chelsea company at 14*s.* per annum, and my stables by the same company at 20*s.* per annum, and I never recollect that they were short of water, except in frost; and I believe I may say as much of all my neighbours round about, that I never heard of any want of water, except in frost, on the highest ground, where there was greater difficulty to serve than in any other. About 1812 or 1813, I was solicited by a person calling himself an agent of the West Middlesex company, to take water of them, and about 1814 or 1815 of the Grand Junction company: from the first I was offered an abatement of more than ten per cent. from the latter but ten per cent. which I was told had been the usual deduction, and I was to have all the advantages held out in this card, [*producing a card,*] which had been left inclosed in a cover a day or two previously; I refused both, because I was very well supplied, and preferred to my own mind the New River water to that of either of the other companies, particularly to that of the Grand Junction company, which at that time was not well spoken of, and I was fully satisfied of the explanation I had previously received by the circular address of the New River company of February 27, 1812; this paper was given to me by Mr. Nott, the collector, and it satisfied my mind, particularly from one or two passages, which I want to point out to the Committee; the only object that I have in view is, to lay the whole matter before the Committee, that they may in their wisdom devise such means as they think will prevent the recurrence of such things in future. One reason I was satisfied was from the circumstance of a declaration of theirs, that the average rental upon the houses supplied is something less than 27*s.* per annum; that, in all the average of the different matters I compared, seemed to correspond very well; and also from the circumstance that they mentioned, that in general the charge did not exceed 2*s.* for each hundred hogsheads; and from another observation of theirs, that whenever the company felt themselves bound to do it, they admitted the necessity of meeting competition in every respect of cheapness and convenience.

Stating at the same time that they should do so under great disadvantage of price?—Yes, I believe so; I was satisfied, especially as their average charge of 27*s.* per annum so nearly corresponded with that of the Chelsea charge of 28*s.* per annum,

Mr.
J. T. Hope.

(14 March.)

as had been shown to a Committee of the House of Commons, and as the average charge on my three tenements was under both those averages. I considered also that the West Middlesex company was acting under a delusion, or attempting to impose upon the public, in pretending to supply so many parishes for the small sum of £. 30,000 which was the first grant they received from Parliament; then there is a proviso at the end of that act, that they should be able to ask for a larger sum: I mention this, to call the attention of the Committee to those points which probably they might not have been aware of before. The result has proved so; they have been obliged to get more money. The next time I paid rent to the New River company, they deducted, unasked, ten per cent; the Chelsea company continued their old charge. At Christmas 1817, when I arrived in town, I learned that the Chelsea company had cut off the supply of water to my coach-house and stables from about the Michaelmas preceding, and reduced the tenants who lodged above them to the necessity of going about begging for water wherever they could get it. The 21st December 1817, was the last day the New River water was served to my house. On the 18th of January 1818, which was twenty-eight days after the last coming in of the water, I received this notice from the New River company, and I wish to point out a particular passage in it, stating that they had stopped the water since Christmas last, and also stating their reasons for so doing. The Chelsea company never gave me any notice, nor sent me any apology. A particular passage struck me, with respect to this circular of the New River company: "and they can truly say, with reference to their own concern, the unreasonable reduction of water rates, and the increased difficulty of collecting those reduced rates;" from which I argue, if there was a difficulty in collecting the reduced rates, how much more difficulty there must be in collecting the increased rates. On the 21st of January 1818, I received this circular from the West Middlesex water company, dated the 16th January 1818, requesting to supply me with water, but as I knew that a general discontent prevailed throughout the parish, and complaints had been made to the vestry of Mary-le-bone of the conduct of all the companies, who, to satisfy the complainants and themselves, intended to inquire into the affair, I determined to wait the result of that inquiry, hoping the legislature would shortly interfere in behalf of the inhabitants at the west end of the town, who suffered several weeks the privation of water; but when I found there were no hopes of that, on or about the 21st of June I desired my plumber to apply to the West Middlesex company for water; I mention this circumstance, to show that different changes in their own system had taken place; he brought me word that the West Middlesex company, to whom he had paid 5s. for laying on the water, had returned it again, telling him, that since the circular of the West Middlesex company, it had been settled that the Grand Junction company was to supply my house, showing that even after the period that this commutation, if I may so call it, had taken place, their plans were not arranged, otherwise it never could have been in the contemplation of the West Middlesex company to send to me, to offer to supply me, and that he had paid 10s. to that company for laying on the water to both house and offices: my tenant also, whom I gave leave to apply for water, paid 5s. which he afterwards received back; my 10s. were never received back; I have understood that I might have applied for it since, but I did not know till twelve months after, when my bill came in, that it had been charged, and the matter was still going on, and I did not trouble myself about it; I have been supplied since Midsummer 1818 at the same price the old companies charged, which I considered tantamount to a new agreement, and binding on them for a similar supply as formerly, for they could not supply me more abundantly, however capable they might be of doing so, as long as the water was not suffered to run to waste, and I had no occasion for the further increase of it: I paid them once, at the same rate as I paid the other companies, at the reduced rate. My rate was reduced from 40s. to 36s. I had a receipt which I considered as tantamount to a new agreement; I was not aware of the possibility of any change being made.

Who served your coach-house?—The Grand Junction served them all.

For 36s?—No; the house for 36s. and the other places as I had been charged by the old company. In January 1820, the Grand Junction collector called to demand £. 2. 10s. for a year's water rent to Michaelmas 1819, instead of £. 1. 16s. last paid for the house, and £. 2. 2s. instead of £. 1. 14s. last paid for the coach-house and stables, and that without any previous notice of an intention so to do, which is twenty-five per cent. on the rate of 1810. Now I must beg leave here to make an observation as to what has passed, if any of the Committee will

Mr.
J. T. Hope.

(14 March.)

look at what the West Middlesex company call a notice; in the first instance it is a general notice "that we shall demand a higher rate," but there is no time specified when that advance is to take place; that notice is dated May 11th 1818, which they stated was their notice of an advance; but with respect to the Grand Junction company's notice, I was out of town at the time they say it was delivered, but I think from that punctuality I have seen in my servants, that if it had been delivered, I must have seen it; and I never heard of that notice until such time as it was produced in this room, and therefore I say, as far as concerns myself, I had no legal notice which they pretend to say as a yearly tenant I was entitled to. I asked the collector the reason for such charge; he replied he could give none, and was not instructed to give any: I tendered the old rent, and said that as I had no notice of such a demand being intended, and as he could give no reason for the increased demand, I should refuse it until I was satisfied of the company's right to make it; and I then sent the money to the office by an attorney, and required an explanation, who informed me they refused both, they refused to take the money which I tendered to them, and to give an explanation. On March the 10th 1820, I received this notice, that I might repair to the Grand Junction office for their explanation and to renew my contract, on pain of having a supply of water discontinued altogether. I make this remark now, to show that if they were aware that a regular notice had been served to me before, I apprehend there would have been no occasion to give me the second notice, but here is a regular notice for an advance. On May the 29th, as nothing was yet done for the relief of the public, I went to the Grand Junction office and saw Mr. Coe; I asked what new agreement, according to his notice sent to me, it was expected should be entered into between me and the Grand Junction company for a continuation of the supply of water to my house and premises, as formerly furnished by the New River company, and since by his company on the like terms; he said, I had already been served with notice of the rents they should expect of me in future; Will you not take any thing less? said I; Why, no; for if we abate you any thing, the like will be expected by others. I asked him on what grounds they demanded such addition of rents; to which he replied, they could not afford to do it for less, and that I knew so as well as he did. Do you mean to say, I asked, by not being able to afford it, that the amount of the rent as you found it in that district, when you undertook to supply it, is not sufficient to enable you to carry on the works, and to pay all the salaries of the officers, and the whole expenses of the establishment? Oh no, replied he, they are enough for that; but if the proprietors do not get something more, to enable them to share a satisfactory dividend, they would not be content. Then, said I, you merely want to raise the rents in order to increase the dividends of the proprietors? Certainly, said he, for if they could not obtain something more they would sell their shares, and if they could not sell them they might be induced to sell their works to realize what they could, and that I had better buy them. I told him he had answered me very fairly, but under that explanation I saw no reason for the increased demand made on me.

You did not propose to buy in upon that occasion?—No; I knew it was a losing concern; I had every reason to think it was, from the nature of the speculation. I wish to observe that I had no wish to intrude myself on the Committee, had it not been for many circumstances stated by the secretary of the West Middlesex company, which I thought would be taken as admitted, if not explained. Without enumerating all the different circumstances Mr. Knight has stated, I will merely refer to the parts I wish to explain, and I think I shall be able to satisfy the Committee as to many points which did appear to me to want explanation before. What I wish to explain is such matters as came within my own knowledge of the several variations in the water companies demands on the inhabitants of the districts which they supply, and particularly with regard to Mary-le-bone. In order that the Committee may be aware of the whole proceeding, I beg leave to state, in the first instance, (I have given you before the average charge per house of the Chelsea and New River companies,) I wish now to state, that the rate of the New River company, as it existed in 1810, was a rise of about ten per cent. three or four or five years prior thereto; I mention this to show that whatever advance was made it was an advance upon an advance, the rates being first advanced in 1806, and this rise was the cause of complaint, and not the insufficiency of water, except in new and remote parts of the town at that time supplied, and that the average charge of the New River company even in 1812 was, as I said before, 27*s.* per annum. The first assurance I ever heard of serving
the

the public at reduced rates was in the letter of Mr. Sloper to the vestry of Mary-le-bone, dated November the 24th 1809; and following up that system, I heard continually of persons going about with cards and hand-bills, styling themselves agents of the companies, and soliciting custom at reduced rates, and engaging to lay on water free of expense. It was said in the course of the examination before this Committee, that the vestry supported the bill to Parliament; the observation that I made was, that I could produce an extract from the minutes, which I now do; Mr. Greenwell the clerk is not well, and cannot attend, and therefore I brought it; it is signed by him; Mr. Greenwell at that time was not clerk of the vestry, but he is in possession of the minutes.

[An extract from the minutes of the vestry of Mary-le-bone, dated the 4th of November 1809, was read.]

Are there not many parts of Mary-le-bone much higher and more difficult to serve than Seymour-street?—Certainly, to the north.

Are you connected with the Anti Water Monopoly Association?—I have been from the beginning.

(*Mr. Lynde.*)—I wish to correct some part of Mr. Hope's statement with regard to the Chelsea company; he says, that they never gave him any notice of leaving the district; and he meant to infer, that the Chelsea company did not give notice to any of their tenants; we certainly served no written or printed notice; we thought it better to give directions to the collectors to call and make an apology, and see the master of the house if they could; here the collector says he saw Mr. Hope's servant and gave him notice, and subsequently he saw Mr. Hope himself, and gave him notice of it; and the collector of the other district will state with him, that they called at every house, and they reported to the board that they had so done.

(*Mr. Hope.*)—I was not in town at the time the collector called, nor until Christmas, about three months after it was cut off.

Mr. James Birch Sharpe. Called in; and Examined.

WHERE is your residence?—At Hoxton.

What is your situation?—Private gentleman.

Are you in any way connected with any of the companies?—I am not, nor was I at any time, either with the old companies, the new companies, or the institution of any company; and I beg leave to add, that I do not appear here for any individual, but for myself. I must observe, that I have not paid so much attention to the extent of the grievances which the public have to complain of at the east end of the town, equal with those at the west end, nor examined much into their nature, but considered more the cause of those grievances, which are in the want of a proper regulation, or rather in the irregular manner in which the laws for the institution of those water companies for the supply of water to the metropolis have been passed; if other regulations were adopted, and that which is now simply a private resolution of a company, became a matter of public notoriety or a public matter, many of the grievances would be entirely put an end to. To show the extent of district to which my observations apply, I would wish to have read the preamble of the act of parliament which instituted the East London water-works company; and I beg leave to state, that the district is of considerable importance, inasmuch as it contains a greater number of houses, and consequently I think I may infer a greater number of inhabitants, than the cities of London and Westminster conjointly, together with the liberties of Westminster and the districts without the walls of the city. The preamble of the act will also show the necessary engagements; and I will beg leave merely to say, that after the preamble states the districts to which their works are to extend, it states that those districts are insufficiently supplied with water, and that therefore it would be beneficial for them. The first grievance of which I have to complain, and which will apply to my own case in particular, is, that the proprietors of property are under the necessity of paying the rent or water charge contracted by their tenant. I speak principally to principles, and I will give one case in each company to show it is applicable to the New River and East London company; but I consider this unjust in principle, that *A. B.* should be obliged to pay a debt for *C. D.* to which *A. B.* is not a party, and I think there is danger in this, because it gives opportunity for a malicious tenant to annoy his landlord. There is another point to which I wish to call the attention of the Committee, which is of importance, that the companies will allow the landlords

Mr.
J. T. Hope.

(14 March.)

Mr.
J. B. Sharpe.

Mr.
J. B. Sharpe.
(14 March.)

to contract with them for the supply of certain houses; the companies first choose what class of houses they will allow you to contract for, (and of course I thought I was only answerable for the houses for which I had compounded,) but after they have made their election, if any arrears accrue, no matter from what cause, whether it be from the removal of a tenant or from the neglect of the collector, you are compelled to pay, without any fixed rule as to time, to circumstances, to the amount or otherwise; and this is particularly hard, since the proprietors are unable to ascertain the debt, have no knowledge of the existence of that debt until it is actually demanded of them, and therefore they are unable in any way to provide against it: as a proof of what I have stated, I will bring you a demand made upon me by the New River company; this is a demand for arrears of ten quarters water charge, up to Midsummer 1815, that is to say, from Christmas 1812 to Midsummer 1815; I wish to show the principle; I am not making a complaint that it is unfair or unjust, but I complain of it, because the public are not apprized of it that it is a private rule of the companies; but if it was a law, the landlord would be able to make provision for it, for he is placed in this situation if arrears occur and the water is cut off; the new tenant will not agree to take the house unless the water is laid on; the burthen necessarily falls on the landlord, and he cannot redress himself; had he known it previously, he would say the rent is £. 30, the water charge is 30s. and you are to pay that to me; if that could be instituted, the grievance would be removed, and the landlords would be able to recover this; now they have no power; the individual is gone, the landlord is compelled to pay the demand, and he cannot enforce it from the old tenant because it is only due to the company; now in this sum of ten quarters, one of my complaints is made out, that is, that those arrears may arise from the conduct of the collector. In this case the tenant was a very bad tenant, and rent to the amount of £. 40 was given up to him quietly that he might quit the house.

What was the term for which he owed that £. 40?—I do not recollect; he paid £. 30 or £. 35 per year; now if the man was a bad character, it was a great neglect in the collector to allow such arrears, and therefore I suppose he should have cut off the water at the expiration of a single year; and thus, without reference to time, as I have stated, the landlord was compelled to pay the expense.

You complain that there should be a want of a public regulation which should enable persons to know whether the premises were likely to be charged or not?—Certainly, that we do not know it till the charge is made upon us, that it is a private rule, and not a public law: but I beg leave to say, that as the case now stands, we have no security, whether that rule shall last a year or not, and that is one principle of the complaint which I bring before the Committee; the same rule applies to the East London company, and if they will admit it, it will save me the trouble of bringing proof of it: I am not anxious to bring any charge against the company, but only to speak to the effects.

[Mr. Pickering admitted the case was so.]

As I am a proprietor of several houses, unfortunately of an inferior class, I should not myself object to any law that might be passed in order to fix the property with the water charge; and to prove that I am somewhat sincere in my assertion, I offered to farm or compound with the New River company for the whole of my houses, which was refused; the reply was, that it was too great a concern, and therefore I am not one of the landlords who would refuse an offer made to them, as has been stated, because, I conceive, if the Committee were to recommend such a law, a power would be given to landlords to recover, as they have in cases of insurance, by distress, or as they have, where an agreement to that effect is made, to recover the land-tax, which is a charge upon the freeholder; and perhaps I may be allowed also to state, that if such were to be the case, that the price charged for the water would be a little less than at present. But as a landlord also, I wish to make an observation as to what I consider a charge against landlords in general. In the evidence of Mr. Steevens, the engineer of the East London company, he stated that the landlords charged their tenants a higher price than they paid the company; this is true; I do so; for if the company receive a benefit by making an allowance to the proprietor of 25 per cent. because he compounds, it is on the same principle right that the landlord should make a tenant pay the full amount; and therefore I do not consider that that is selling water at a profit, providing that proportion is observed. The other grievance which I have to complain of is important; I allude to the combination between the New River and the East London companies; that is admitted; but it is a greater grievance at our end of the town than at this, because it is already in evidence before you, that it would take a considerable time before the

Mr.
J. B. Sharpe.

(14 March.)

the water of one company could be thrown into the pipes of the other, in case of fire, and in case of the defects of the works of one company; and upon another principle too is it of greater consequence to us than it appears to be with respect to the inhabitants of this end of the town, that as there is at present but one dealer in water, or one company, we are under the necessity of paying the price, whatever it may be, or submit to the deprivation; but there is a clause, I understand, in the articles of agreement before you, that if one company should refuse to serve the inhabitants, the other company would be compelled, under their articles of agreement, to do so; but I do not see how it could possibly apply, when it would take so great a time to change their pipes; because, on the partition, seven weeks were consumed on the alteration, and for seven weeks consequently my house was scarcely during that time supplied a single day with water; and the other grievances with respect to this combination are, that the prices are exorbitant. To save the time of the Committee, I have brought before them receipts; the first receipt is a rise of a little more than fifty per cent; and I will state it now, without fear of contradiction, that with respect to the East London company, they rose throughout the whole of their district, I believe fifty per cent. very nearly as a general rule, and in many cases to some hundreds per cent. This is a case of a Mr. Green, in Margaret-street, Hackney-fields, a rise from 16s. to 25s.

In what year was the 16s?—1815, with the same company; this was up to Michaelmas 1815; a charge of 8s. for two quarters, in October 1819; up to Christmas 1817 the charge was 12s. 6d. for two quarters; Nos. 78 and 79, Margaret-street, are in the same situation. I do not mean to anticipate any defence that may be set up, but I wish to state one fact, that both of those are charged alike; but when the advance took place, it might be stated that the charge was justifiable, as one of them was a laundress, but in the other case it was not so, the houses were of the same size.

Do you know these houses yourself?—I will state at once, I have brought forward the receipts in order to save a good deal of useless gossip, which the Committee must otherwise attend to, and I have brought the persons in general to whom the receipts were made out, because it is clear an old laundress or washerwoman could give no satisfactory evidence to the Committee. I know the houses very well, they consist of four rooms and the wash-house, commonly called five rooms by the company.

(Mr. Pickering.)—Those houses came within our scale of rating.

(Mr. Sharpe.)—It is also within my knowledge that that part of the district was all rated at the same rate.

What was it before?—The New River company never went into that street at all.

What supplied it at 16s.?—It is a new street, and it was rated at that by the East London.

When was it built?—Ten or twelve or fifteen years ago.

The East London company first charged 16s. and then raised it to 25s?—Yes.

Were the New River company's pipes near there?—I do not think they are, because you have fields to cross from Kingsland crescent to Margaret-street.

(To Mr. Pickering.)—It does not appear that any competition existed in this quarter, or was near this quarter, at that or any former time?—Not that I know of.

Then the Committee do not understand for what reason you suddenly raised this rate in so large a proportion as from 16s. to 25s?—My answer to that is, that upon a revision of the district we found that many of the streets and houses in the districts had been rated considerably too low in proportion to others, and the first step was to bring those houses which we considered had been so underrated on an equality with the rest; then at Christmas 1817 a general rise took place of something under five-and-twenty per cent. upon the whole; but I beg leave to add to that, that the additional rates put upon the houses in the way of equalizing them, and also that addition upon the whole afterwards, I believe does not exceed five-and-twenty per cent. on the gross.

Then the case of this particular house was a case that included the raising up of a rate that was formerly too low, to a level, and also the addition of twenty-five per cent?—Certainly.

Can you explain to the Committee what was the occasion of that original low rate?—In many instances, to my knowledge, it was imposition practised on the company by those

Mr.
J. B. Sharpe.

(14 March.)

those who applied for water, in describing the premises which they wished to be supplied as of a less dimension than they really were.

Is it usual for no surveyor to see what the premises are; do you always take the tenant's own representation?—I am sorry to say in the early times of new water-work companies that was not the case, they did not take that pains, and by subsequent revisions of the district, they found they were imposed on in that respect.

Could you by inquiry ascertain the reason of the low rating of this special case?—I can make the inquiry of the collector certainly, but the house appears to be a house of five rooms; I dare say we shall be able to find the reason why the rise was made, as it was general.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I must now bring another case of a rise of fifty per cent. to which the reason given in the other case will not apply; this is a house in the occupation of Mr. John Butler, No. 6, in John's-terrace, Hackney-road. By the receipts it appears that Mr. Butler paid in the year 1818, immediately previous to the rise, three guineas per annum for three houses in that street; the three guineas for three houses was paid on the 23d of February 1818, up to the Christmas previous, which was Christmas 1817, and then on the 20th day of February 1821, which was the only receipt, I believe, which could be found for two houses, £.3 were paid for two houses; those houses contain eight rooms at the least, and are very good, substantial, handsome houses, and I believe let for between £.50 and £.70 a year.

[Mr. Pickering admitted the rates were so raised.]

(*To Mr. Sharpe.*)—What would be the probable rental of the houses in Margaret-street?—The rent of the houses in Margaret-street I take to be £.24 a year.

And the others you call £.50 or £.70?—Between £.50 and £.70. In a house of £.24 a year, it is probable that the landlord pays all the parochial rates and taxes, which is my case: I let such houses for £.20 a year for the tenant to pay all taxes, and in the other case £.24 a year, and pay taxes myself.

(*Mr. Pickering.*)—I believe those houses in John's-terrace were very near the New River service.

(*To Mr. Steevens.*)—Do you believe the rate of a guinea to have been below the fair rate the company could afford?—I consider so; it is not more than half the value those houses ought to pay.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I will now call the Committee's attention to another case; the correct situation of this house I can hardly state, and therefore if the information I have given to the solicitor is incorrect, it is the fault of the collector's bad writing; the name is Bell, in Castle-street, Spitalfields; it is a very poor neighbourhood indeed; it appears for this house 18s. was paid for three quarters rate up to Christmas 1817, and for half a year or two quarters rate to Midsummer 1818, it was £.1; that is from 24s. to 40s. a year.

Do you know this house?—Here are the receipts; I know nothing of the premises whatever, and I think the gentleman who can state the premises, will make a good defence if he can.

(*Mr. Pickering.*)—This is a large public-house, known by the sign of the Feathers; it is a large house of the kind; it has a good deal of garden ground; three families as lodgers, weavers and so on; and it was raised at Christmas 1817 from 24s. to 40s.

Was it a large public-house, with garden and skittle ground, when it paid £.1.4s?—Yes; and at that time ought to have been rated at 32s. the equalization would have made it amount to that.

When you say the equalization, do you mean with other public-houses?—Yes, exactly, to bring this house to what other public-houses in the neighbourhood paid.

If you had made no general rise at all of twenty-five per cent. what would you have considered this house ought to have paid?—Thirty-two shillings.

According to the rate which other public-houses similarly situated in the neighbourhood paid before the general rise?—Certainly; the generality of them paid 36s.

Have you any means of telling us other public-houses in that neighbourhood that did pay 32s?—The books will show it: in Shadwell, I believe, it will be found they generally paid 36s. this was one of the houses supplied by the New River company before 1815.

It appears that you made an equalization, as you call it, at Christmas 1817, was that

that a diminution in some cases, and an increase in others, or was it a general increase?—In some cases it was a decrease, but in general it was an increase.

Upon the whole of your rental was it an increase?—Upon the whole, certainly.

That equalization was previous to the addition you put afterwards?—Yes, certainly, I understand so; the equalization was only where the houses had been under-rated.

After you had made the revision which you speak of, you made an equalization again?—No, certainly not; it was a per-centage on the whole.

When you say under-rated, you mean comparatively with the neighbourhood?—Yes, comparatively with houses of that description; we found in some cases they were over-rated, and in those cases we made a reduction.

You prepared your rental by some proceeding, which you may call an equalization if you please, previous to adding the twenty-five per cent?—Yes.

By the preparation of your rental, did you increase it or decrease it, or make it the same as it was before?—Upon the whole it was an increase; in some instances it was lowered, but in a great many instances it was raised.

Did you in those changes that you made previous to the twenty-five per cent. being put on generally, take great numbers of houses and refer them to a few which were rated higher, raising them to that level; or was it that you took the smaller number of houses and referred them to a general level that was higher?—Taking the lower number and referring them to the general level of the greater.

Can you give a comparative view of the rise?—I think we can; in many parts of the district, what the company gained in rental, both in equalization and subsequent rise, did not amount to twenty-five per cent.

In point of fact, in this special instance in Margaret-street it was more than twenty-five per cent?—Perhaps it might be, and some a great deal less.

Where it appears to be more it is a special case?—Yes.

But upon the gross it was twenty-five per cent?—Yes.

You say there were some houses reduced, were they many?—I cannot tell that out of 32,000 houses.

Were there many do you think?—They bore no proportion certainly to those that were raised.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I would wish also to show another case, of a different description of houses, to establish the fact which I have asserted, that it was generally fifty per cent. and I would bring various parts of the town for that purpose; a house in the possession of Mr. Hackblock, in Holywell-street, Shoreditch, paid in the year 1811 to the New River company one guinea per annum.

Were you chairman of a general committee who made a report which is in this pamphlet [*handing a pamphlet to the witness*]?—I was, and I can only say this, that the committee is now I believe extinct, and I am the only active member of it.

Veneris, 16^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. J. B. Sharpe, again called in.

BEFORE I proceed with my evidence, I should wish to explain, with permission, some facts which I think are of importance. I am sorry that from circumstances that I could not control, some little confusion took place in my evidence at the commencement, and I hope the Committee will excuse it. I omitted to state, that in the charge of the ten quarters arrears that I was compelled to pay by the New River company, I appealed against the charge, and then I stated all the circumstances of the case, such as I have stated to this Committee; the man being a bad tenant, and the neglect of the collector (without meaning any personal blame to the collector,) I could get no redress whatever; and I was informed by one of the gentlemen who constituted the New River board, that they never gave themselves any trouble to collect arrears becoming due by any tenant, because they knew if the tenant did not pay the proprietor must. I wish also to state, that on the 30th May 1820, I was compelled to pay, before the water was laid on, 15 s. for half a year's water rate, which had been outstanding one year and three quarters. I wish also to

706.

M m

correct

Mr.
J. B. Sharpe.

(14 March.)

Mr.
J. B. Sharpe.

(16 March.)

Mr:
J. B. Sharpe.

(16 March.)

correct a statement that I made on the last day, with respect to the probable value, or at least my estimate of the value of certain houses in Margaret-street, Hackney-fields, and also with respect to the rental of certain houses in John's-terrace, Hackney-road. I think I stated that those houses in Margaret-street generally let at £. 20 per annum if the landlord paid the taxes and the water rate. I made it my business yesterday to inquire of several houses of that description which were to let, and at No. 31 and No. 60, in that street, both being houses of four rooms and a wash-house each, the parties required a rent of £. 16 only, and if the landlord paid all the taxes with the water, it was to be £. 20 a year; the water is 25s. per annum for those houses. I also wish to state, that I inquired of some houses rather larger than I expected to find in that street, being houses of six rooms and a wash-house, and the rent demanded was £. 20 per annum, the tenant to pay all taxes, and £. 25 per annum, the landlord to pay all taxes: they are, properly speaking, fourth rate houses, but they possess six rooms and a wash-house; the water rent of those houses was 28s. per annum. It was stated by the clerk of the company, that they considered all houses of four rooms and a wash-house as five roomed houses, and charged them at 5s. a room. I considered at the time the defence was made that there was no correct rule as to equalization of water charges, or of putting twenty-five per cent. on that equalization; the equalization and the twenty-five per cent. if they did exist separately in fact, or in the minds of the companies, was put on the tenants at one and the same time, and in the case of the six roomed houses that rule was not followed up, since it was 28s. instead of 30s. I would wish also to state, that in the defence of the charge of 40s. for the public-house in Castle-street, it was stated that it was a house of resort, many persons going to it; now if that were the case, it might be a just charge: but surely in the instances that I shall now mention to you, the Royal Oak in this Margaret-street, and the Antelope, these are in the fields, without any neighbourhood, and the houses are thinly placed around them, having very little custom, and the charges are the same, 40s. per annum; they are but six rooms each house.

Can you state the time precisely when it was that you were before the board; what year, and what time of the year?—I can pretty nearly; and I should imagine it was somewhere about November or December, in the year 1816.

With regard to your more modern case of 1820, what was your tenant's name in that case?—Austen.

Had you recovered your own rent?—I believe there were no arrears; I purchased the general lease of that property for the remaining term; and this house was untenanted at the time I took possession.

Then you have lost no rent by it?—No.

And you know of no rent being lost?—No, I know of no rent being lost; he was a very respectable man.

You did not bring that case before the board?—No.

Had this man run away?—No, he was a respectable man; he held possession of the house a considerable time after he left it.

Do you know where he was afterwards?—He removed into Ivy-street, within two minutes walk of his former residence.

Did you tell the collector where he was living?—At that time, when I had to pay, he was dead; he died before the water was laid on, and consequently previously to the time of my knowledge of the debt. This is the only case which has occurred to me in which more than a twelvemonth's arrear has been demanded or received by the New River company.

Mr. John Paul Rowe, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
John Paul Rowe.

YOU are Secretary to the New River company?—Yes.

Do you know what is the rule that the company act upon, with respect to demanding arrears from the landlord, or persons occupying premises, when they are not paid by the person who lived in them at the time the water was furnished?—Never knew to go back more than one year.

How long have you known that rule to be acted upon?—It is within these two or three years I believe, not longer.

You do not bear it in your recollection out of what circumstances it arose that such a rule of limitation came to be adopted?—No.

Within that time of a twelvemonth the company exercise their own discretion?—Yes.

You have no recollection of Mr. Sharpe's being present in the year 1816?—I do not recollect it; I am inclined to think I was out of town at that time.

Since

Since you have been secretary, at any time have you understood that the company acts upon any such principle, as giving themselves no trouble to look after the tenants, because they are sure the landlords may be called upon to pay the rent?—The instructions are to look to the tenants where they can possibly find them, in the first instance.

Has that been constantly so since your recollection?—I believe I may say constantly so; that those are the constant instructions to the collectors.

Is any resort had to the landlord where the tenant can be found and is in solvent circumstances?—If that has been the case, it has been against the orders of the board; I am not aware of any case that has occurred of that nature.

(*To Mr. Sharpe.*)—At what period, after the house in Queen's-row was unoccupied, was application made for the water rent?—No application was made to me whatever; the water was refused to be put on, on my applying for a supply, unless those arrears were paid.

How long before the water was put on was it claimed?—The water was laid on at Lady-day 1820.

How long before that had you applied?—I should suppose immediately previous to Lady-day; there was no necessity to have the water laid on until I let the house, for it remained in my possession three quarters of a year before I got a tenant.

Had the water been off during all that time?—It had.

Do you know when the water was taken off?—I do not.

Mr. William Treacher, called in; and Examined.

YOU are a Collector to the New River company?—Yes.

Do you know the house No. 147 in Queen's-row, occupied by Mr. Austen?—
I do.

What time was the water taken off?—Soon after Midsummer 1818.

The house was empty after Mr. Austen left it?—Yes, it was.

Did you apply for any arrears?—I inquired in the neighbourhood where Mr. Austen was gone to, and could gain no information.

When you say soon after Midsummer 1818, are you sure it was cut off before Michaelmas 1818?—Yes.

You could not find where Mr. Austen was gone?—No, not till Mr. Sharpe paid it.

What did Mr. Sharpe tell you?—He inquired what was due on the house, and I told him 15s. and he said he would be responsible for it, and then the water was put on.

Did he inform you where Mr. Austen was then?—He was dead at that time.

You did not know what became of Mr. Austen after he left the house?—No.

You had inquired for him, and could not ascertain?—No.

What do you understand your duty to be previous to making a claim on the house?—To follow the tenant, if he can be found; if not, to acquaint the landlord with what is due on the house, and then if he pays it the water is restored; but not until that, unless the case comes before the New River board.

And in this instance you followed that course?—Yes.

What is your restriction with regard to the time back at which you are to claim arrears?—A year, not beyond; nor do we suffer it to go on more than a year.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—With respect to John's-terrace, I stated the houses were let at from £.50 to £.70 a year; it is a fact that one of them did let at £.65 a year, but in consequence of the general reduction, I suppose they are now let at £.45 a year only. I would wish to call the attention of the Committee to Margaret-street again, before I continue Mr. Hackblock's case; it appears that there is a six roomed house in Margaret-street, in possession of a baker, that was raised to 28s. and subsequently, in the year 1820, to 36s. a year, upon the principle, as I understand, that he is a baker.

What is the number?—I have not the number.

What is the name?—Mr. Richardson; it is a baker's; and I understand that the addition is in consequence of the trade, which forms one of the complaints I submit to this Committee.

(*Mr. Pickering.*)—In referring to the scale of rates, there is a note referring to the trades of butchers and bakers, five-and-twenty per cent. extra.

Does a baker consume a considerable additional quantity of water?—So I understand; I am informed by one of our collectors who is in the room, who was once in the trade, that it is from twelve to fourteen gallons per sack of flour.

Mr.
John Paul Rowe.
(16 March.)

Mr.
William Treacher.

Mr.
William Treacher.
 (16 March.)

(*To Mr. Mylne.*)—Do the New River company make any difference in the rate with respect to bakers?—They do, in consequence of the convenience afforded to them generally in a night supply, and from drawing it immediately from the pipes in the street, for they have always a cock in the lower part, and draw from the pipe, and not from the cistern; in most cases, where the collectors have not been enabled to fix their rates, they have been referred to me, and I have generally regulated the rate in proportion to the convenience afforded to the individual, and not merely the quantity of water.

They are generally on the main, are they not?—From wanting cold water, and a night supply, they are generally on the main.

Does this remark apply to trades in general?—Some trades, certainly.

Do not bakers also consume a considerable quantity of water in their trade?—Not much; they do some, but not a great deal; convenience of a tenant is to be met by an outlay of capital on the part of the company, in all cases; and it continually occurs, that an individual applies for a supply one pair or two pair of stairs high, where the company cannot supply it by ordinary means; not merely for high service, but in particular trades, distillers particularly; I have generally estimated what the outlay of capital would be, and from that have calculated what the rent ought to be, giving them the option of taking it or not; if he has found sinking a well a cheaper thing, the tenant has done it; but if, on the other hand, the company are called upon to expend a capital, the rental has been fixed accordingly. I will give one instance: Henry Meux's brewery applied for a supply from the New River company, to know at what price it would be done; I went there; they had a well, a very good one, and pumped the water by a steam engine; I looked over their account, and they showed me what it cost them to pump the water, the surface of the water being eighty feet below the ground; this was a competition price; I offered to take them at the expense of the coals which it cost them, by which they would save the wear and tear of the machinery, and they have remained at that rate ever since, for four years; in that case, the company had sufficient capital expended in pipes in the streets.

You do not state that as a profitable transaction?—It aids the general revenue, but it is not in proportion.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I merely state this case, because it has been considered by the parties paying as a grievance; and by making this statement, I consider I afford a fair opportunity for the justification of the companies. With respect to Mr. Hackblock, a currier in Shoreditch, in fact a retail leather-seller, he paid, in the year 1811, to the New River company, two guineas.

What is the size of the house?—It is an eight or ten roomed house, worth at least £. 70 a year, at the lowest estimation, in Shoreditch; and in the year 1820 it paid three guineas, which is an advance of fifty cent. and not twenty-five.

(*Mr. Pickering.*)—Mr. Hackblock's house is a house of ten rooms in the front of Holywell-street; the house is supplied upon the main, the water always on; Mr. Hackblock is a currier, and keeps a great number of men on his premises; his premises are very large, and he has been rated a guinea more than he formerly paid to the New River, namely three guineas.

With regard to the water being on the main, is that at your option, or did he apply for it?—No, that is at our option; there are several houses in Shoreditch which it has not been convenient to put on the service.

Could you serve Mr. Hackblock from the service?—Yes.

It is at your option to take it from the main or a special service?—Yes; but if he is on the main, three guineas is a reasonable sum, in consideration of the largeness of the house, and the addition of the manufactory.

Would you think him entitled to any diminution if he was put on the service?—No, certainly not; Mr. Hackblock has never complained to our board, nor have I heard anything of it till within these few days.

(*Mr. Stevens.*)—At the time Mr. Hackblock was laid on, there was not a service in the street, in consequence he was put on the main; and inasmuch as there was not a service, he was put on at the service price, otherwise he ought to have paid the double price.

You do not make a man pay the double price where you have no service to serve him?—Most assuredly we do not.

Do you invariably charge a double rate when he is on the main?—That is the rule; they have a variety of advantages which answer their purposes; in that case,

Mr.
William Treacher.

(16 March.)

case, a vessel of 100 gallons will serve a man who otherwise must have a vessel of 2,000.

This man could not have been supplied but from the East London, could he?—He was originally supplied from the New River.

After the division, he could only be supplied by the East London?—He could not.

You could only supply him from the main?—Previously to the service being put on he was served from the main.

He is still on the main?—Yes.

When the division took place, Mr. Hackblock had no means of being supplied but from the East London?—No.

They could only supply him from the main?—I believe the service was laid previous to that exchange, but Mr. Hackblock has never been put on it.

When the division took place had the East London the means of serving him but from the main?—I am not sure.

Was any option given to Mr. Hackblock whether he would have it from the main or the service?—I do not know whether there was to Mr. Hackblock, but there was to others.

If he had not had it from the main he could have had no water at all?—Yes, we had a service there.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—In continuation I wish to state, in proof of what I have before asserted, that the rise has been generally 50 per cent. and in those cases which I shall enumerate to you collectively it is within a small fraction certainly of it. I beg leave to observe that I have called simply upon these individuals because I know them, I have not selected them from any other motive, from any information I previously possessed; I have stated Mr. Smith, a wine cooper in Shoreditch, Mr. Hill, a chemist in Shoreditch, Mr. Airey, grocer in Shoreditch, Mr. Rigby, an ironmonger in Shoreditch, Mr. Hems, a cheesemonger in Shoreditch, were all raised from 21 s. per annum to 30 s. per annum; those houses, taking them altogether, may be nearly of equal rentals, but some of them are considerably larger than the others; for instance, Mr. Rigby's, the ironmonger's, is a large house, and contains at least fourteen rooms, besides extensive premises. I wish to state also, a rise which certainly struck the individual, and must strike every one as enormous, the case of Mr. Allison, a tripe merchant in Shoreditch, for two houses in the street, originally charged 42 s. per annum for both the houses, and then raised to 147 s. per annum, which is seven guineas; I have surveyed this gentleman's premises, and he has two pumps in constant operation.

Of hard water?—From wells; he was originally charged eight guineas, but upon appeal they reduced him one guinea, to the present price, seven guineas; five guineas he would consider a very fair price to pay; he certainly uses a great quantity of water in his trade, but the rise was so enormous, and so sudden, he appealed.

Was it from the New River he was charged at two guineas?—No, by the East London water company, in both cases.

(*Mr. Pickering.*)—These houses in Holywell-street, Shoreditch, are eight roomed houses, with shops in a front situation in High-street, Shoreditch, a very public street, and it was when 21 s. was the competition price.

What had been the original price?—By the New River company it appears that Mr. Hill was originally 30 s. to the New River, which is what we have raised it to; No. 36, Mr. Rigby, 26 s.; No. 234, Hems, an ironmonger, stands in the name of Raymond, a victualler, 30 s.; the next is 170, Shepherd, a colour-maker, £. 1. 4 s.; 161, Walters, £. 1. 8 s. In the case of Mr. Allison, that is a case that came under the knowledge of our engineer, and he will explain it.

(*Mr. Stevens.*)—Mr. Allison is on the main; when Mr. Allison was originally rated for the two houses, I believe they were rated as private houses; Mr. Allison understood there was to be an advance upon them, and I believe had applied to the board; I was directed to make a survey of Mr. Allison's houses, and I think Mr. Allison admitted that they had been rated as private houses, or as private consumers, without any consideration to his trade; I went very minutely into it, and as Mr. Sharpe states, there were two pumps which were not fit for certain purposes; he stated if I would state a price he would abide by it; I stated the price, and he said do you know that is twice or thrice what I am paying? I said I am perfectly satisfied, and I think it so.

This was the seven guineas?—This was the seven guineas; this was after some

Mr.
William Treacher.
(16 March.)

sum had been stated, which I do not know; Mr. Allison said, let my premises be surveyed, and I will pay what is deemed a fair rate.

Who ordered you to go upon the survey?—The court of directors, upon Mr. Allison's application; he then expressed his perfect satisfaction: his father was by, and said, good God! do you consent to this advance? and he said he was quite satisfied. He is consuming as much as would supply ten ordinary houses; and I believe Mr. Allison is as well satisfied with the supply as with the rate.

(*To Mr. Sharpe.*)—Have you had any communication with Mr. Allison?—I saw him yesterday, and he said he considered it too much; he thought five guineas a fair price, but he must be satisfied.

(*Mr. Steevens.*)—Mr. Allison said, do you know this is three times as much as I have paid? He is not only a pork butcher, but a hog slaughter-man, consuming a great deal of water; and he is a tripe boiler, boiling for fifty other shops perhaps: the quantity of water is very large indeed.

Is there any service there?—There is a service directly opposite, but the service would not answer for the back which he has, though holding a hundred gallons, would not be sufficient for him; this is not an ordinary sized pipe; I believe it is an inch and a quarter pipe.

(*Mr. Robert Simpson.*)—I was the person who solicited Mr. Allison to take the water of the East London waterworks company; and I conceived from looking at the front of the houses that they were private houses; I took them at anything he would give us; I took them at a guinea a house: after some time had elapsed, it was nine guineas: the neighbourhood mentioned the quantity of water he was using, and paying no more than they were, and he was raised to eight or nine guineas; after the engineer had surveyed the premises, I was passing, and as I was the person on whose account he came to the company, he called me in, and told me he thought he was raised too much; I went over the premises with him, and certainly his quantity of water was immense, particularly in the tripe shop, in boiling and washing. I said, what will satisfy you? if we reduce it to seven, will you be content? Perfectly so. I said, I will mention it to the board, and if I can prevail upon them, it shall be done at seven. I mentioned it to the board, and they reduced it to seven guineas. I called on Mr. Allison in my way home, and told him so, and no tenant in the district seemed more content; and so I have seen him almost every day, and from that hour to this I never heard him make the least complaint whatever of his water, or that he was charged too high.

(*Mr. Steevens.*)—He has stables and houses besides.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—The next case is Mr. Foulger, a chemist, at No. 133, Ratcliffe-highway; the rise is from 28s. to 50s; a chemist of the ordinary size of those in Shoreditch, without any additional consumption.

A wholesale chemist?—He is a working chemist; he has a laboratory. I wish to make an observation here, that Mr. Hill, in Shoreditch, lives in a similar sized house, and is only charged 30s; he has also a laboratory; he is a working chemist also; Mr. Knight in Norton Falgate, who has a large business as a chemist, is only charged 30s. I have a reason for stating Mr. Knight not being raised, he is situated where a competition could take place, and therefore he is protected by that, but with respect to the other, I do not conceive that a laboratory will make a rise in one house and not in another, except for special reasons.

(*Mr. Pickering.*)—If Mr. Hill has a laboratory in Shoreditch we know nothing of it. Mr. Hill always paid 30s.

What is the reason of Mr. Hill being raised from 21s. to 30s?—

(*Mr. Rowe.*)—Mr. Hill paid 30s. to the New River in 1810.

(*Mr. Pickering.*)—That in Ratcliffe-highway ought not to be put in comparison of this, which has a use for water which we knew nothing of.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I merely ask, if one chemist with a similar practice to the other is charged 50s. why was the other charged 30s?

(*Mr. Steevens.*)—Foulger is a working chemist and a little distiller; for chemists in a large way have a still or two, or three, (I cannot speak to the number, but take it at two;) it is well known to every one, and particularly to Mr. Sharpe, who is a good chemist, that chemists use a great deal of water; indeed I heard a distiller say, if you turned all you pumped up to the worm tub it would not be too much; it is the case with all chemists, where the water falls in and out of the worm tub, and in the case of distillers, where the water flows in as it does to a worm tub and out again, without having been received in any regular back, it is difficult to say the quantity they are consuming; and under those circumstances I have no hesitation in

in saying, that all distillers and chemists, or any other person using a still are under-rated.

Was he a distiller when charged 28s.—I dare say he was, though we had not been told of it.

Mr. *Robert Wright*, Called in ; and Examined.

YOU are collector of Ratcliffe-highway?—Yes; previous to the rise, the houses in Ratcliffe-highway was from 28s. to 30s.

Did that include trades?—Without trades.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I am sorry I had not the opportunity of giving this case to Mr. Pickering, but he will speak to it hereafter. I know that Mr. Foulger is not a distiller. Great chemists distil a little, by their own evidence; I do not think this is a fair charge; the impression upon my mind, as one of the public, was, that those charges which I have now enumerated were exorbitant, and we thought it much more so, comparing it with a letter, which I beg leave to read to the Committee, it is signed T. N. Pickering, chief clerk and secretary, dated East London waterworks office, December 1st 1817, immediately preceding the rise.

[It was read, as follows:]

“ East London Water Works.

“ The court of directors respectfully inform the several tenants of the company, that in consequence of the large sums which have heretofore been laid out, and the great expenditure now taking place in the construction of an additional engine, mains, and other important works, a moderate advance will necessarily be made in the water rates from and after Christmas next, to be payable at Midsummer 1818.

“ By order of the court of directors,

“ *T. N. Pickering*, chief clerk and secretary.

“ East London Waterworks office, Dec. 1, 1817.”

I beg leave, in connection with some evidence that was given, to state that these charges also struck me as exorbitant, because it appears before this Committee that there are thirty-two thousand tenants of this company, averaging somewhat more than 22s. a house, which will make £. 32,000 at the least per annum, giving at the rate of five per cent. a capital of £. 640,000; comparing that capital with the amount they were authorized to lay out by their act, I considered I had great cause to complain, because £. 32,000 per annum was too large an interest for the amount mentioned in that act.

Do you imagine that they divided all that £. 32,000?—Certainly not; I conceived there were current expenses; but if you deduct the £. 11,000, current expenses, that is too great an interest for the money raised by their act.

What is your idea of a proper and reasonable interest?—I would give an idea if I had proper data to go upon.

You must have some notion of what is a fit interest for them to have?—I should say, that for money sunk, in all cases seven per cent. is always allowed.

What should you consider in your own business a fair interest?—I have no business. As a consequence of this combination, I have to complain that I now cannot have high service without an extra charge, because I have been changed from the East London to the New River, the New River do make a charge for high service, the East London do not make a charge for high service, and therefore I complain that if I require high service I must pay an extra charge for it; the East London will throw the water over the highest house in Shoreditch, I have seen it myself, and they make no charge for high service at all.

What is this house in which you have been transferred to the New River company?—A house situated in Myrtle-street, Hoxton; it is a large house, one story high: under the present regulations, I complain that there is no security that the price this year shall not be doubled, or charged at any extent the next year.

Do you pay any thing for high service now?—No, not at all; I was under the necessity of reducing a cistern, which before contained rain water from the top of my house, to six or seven feet lower than its original height, in consequence of this change.

The water from the East London reached that cistern, and the New River does not?—Yes; and the New River supplied me at the height it now is, which is six or seven feet above the pavement of the street; they told me at the time, (for I was six or seven weeks without water,) that they soon would be able to supply me to the original height that I required. My father was under the necessity of putting up

Mr.
William Treacher.

(16 March.)

Mr.
Robert Wright.

Mr.
Robert Wright.
(16 March.)

this large cistern to receive the rain water, and of sinking two wells, in consequence of the New River company refusing to supply Myrtle-street, which is my father's property, which he let out on building leases, unless my father would go to the expense of laying down the wooden services to each house.

Of what period are you speaking now?—I suppose at least twenty years ago; but at that time the mains ran at the end of the street; my father thought it was too great a demand, and therefore sunk the wells as the less expense, and put this tank up.

There were very few houses built at that time?—This was at a time when all the houses were built, except six, I think; there are fifty houses in the street at least; application was made when only a few houses were built, and it was not reasonable to suppose the company would supply it, and they were under the necessity of laying down a large leaden service from Hoxton Town to a house, No. 5, in this street.

Who laid that down?—My father.

About twenty years ago?—Thereabouts; it is within my perfect recollection; that was one of the causes alleged before a Committee of this House, as a reason upon which the bill for the establishment of the East London company was passed; that was the alleged complaint in 1807.

Alleged by your father?—By my father and others in a similar situation.

Your father brought it forward?—Yes, my father attended here several days.

Your father was pretty active in promoting that object at the time?—My father was very active in promoting the institution of the East London company; this tank was put up in consequence of the refusal of the company to supply us, except upon the terms I have mentioned, and it was afterwards taken down, because the New River could not supply at that height at the time the change took place from the East London to the New River.

When the whole street was finished, you say application was made to the New River to serve that street?—Yes.

That they had pipes at the end of the street?—Yes.

And that they refused to drive service-pipes up the street?—Yes.

(To Mr. Mylne.)—Was the New River company's declining to serve those new buildings to avoid the outlay of capital, or on account of deficiency of supply of water at their head?—Entirely to avoid the outlay of capital, the increase was so great, that even calling on the builders to lay down new pipes did not meet the necessity of the case, and a rise took place in 1806.

Do you mean to say, that when the company were applied to to lay down a main into a street of thirty or forty houses, the company did not think it worth their while for that increased tenantry to lay down and serve that street?—They found that to be the case generally.

Do you mean to say, that it was found generally that the old rates would not pay the expense of laying down the additional pipes?—Yes.

The increase of the town was so great at that period that you had not a capital adequate to it?—No; it would have materially reduced their dividends.

Whatever your inclination was, your capital was not equal to the demand?—No.

Are the Committee to understand you thus, that the company declined to lay on the water in new streets at the old rates unless the builders would be at the expense of laying down new pipes?—Yes.

And they did not venture to take the tenants at an increased rate?—No; that was pushed for two or three years; then I believe it was modified to a part of the expense, the builder to pay half the expense; and the rates were increased, and the charge ultimately abandoned.

In point of fact, supposing that a street had been built, and that the builders of that street had agreed to lay down pipes at their own expense, the company would never have had the same claim to an increased rate on those streets as if they had laid down pipes at their own expense?—No; the moment they had taken possession of the street they considered they had the same claim to an increased rate as on other streets.

Admitting that the builders had, with a view of obtaining a supply, laid down the main pipes, that street would have a stronger claim against additional rate, than a street laid down by the company?—It is perhaps seven years before a new street begins to pay well, and the capital, while in wood, is half expended, they seldom lasting above fourteen years.

The

The expense of renovation and repair was always to be on the company?—Always after they took possession of the pipes.

That was a very material item while wood was in use, was not it?—Yes; the company did the work, and charged them prime cost; they might do it themselves, if they chose; but they never could do it so cheap. With respect to the high supply, I wish to state the manner in which the company think themselves bound to supply. I stated before that the company did not consider that there was any engagement to serve above the ground floor, above the level of the pavement, or to a cistern standing on the ground in the yard behind; there are many thousand instances where they serve higher, but in no instance whatever previous to 1810, (if an individual, who had a cistern up stairs, applied to the committee and stated they had a deficient supply), have the company expended a shilling to improve that supply; the answer given to the person has been, where is your cistern? In the first story. How long have you been deficient? Two or three months. If you choose to take the hazard of such a supply, it is very well; but if you put your cistern on the basement, we will give you any supply you require. In driving mains to Mary-le-bone, you cannot proportion your main to the size of your district; you take it larger in the first case, and as the houses increase, the supply gets weaker and weaker, and persons have been obliged to lower their cisterns; in thousands of instances, where the butts in the back yards did not get a supply, the people were told they must sink their butts in the ground.

Though the Meuxes had a well upon their premises, (if the Committee understand you right,) they thought it more convenient and cheap to take a supply from the New River company than to have it supplied from their own well?—Yes; the same thing has occurred at another brewhouse in Liquorpond-street.

And in any other place?—I do not recollect just now.

You say the company did not engage to serve above the basement story in 1810; at that period did the general service of the company rise into cisterns above the ground floor of the district?—In a great many instances it did; if the people have the ball-cocks on regularly, it will make a difference of ten feet in the service.

And the company made no difference in the charge for serving a cistern of that kind?—No.

You say it was entirely a matter of chance whether a man got it or not, he had no right to claim it?—Certainly not.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I complain also, that under the present regulation the companies themselves decide all disputes that may arise between the tenants and themselves, a regulation that I think in my humble opinion requires correction, and to which I trust the attention of the Committee will hereafter be called; perhaps if I were to proceed in the way I first arranged, I should be considered tedious by the Committee; I would merely recommend to the attention of the Committee the act which constituted the East London waterworks company; at the commencement, on the 8th of August 1807, I think it will there be found that all the complaints which had before been made of the other companies apply also to this act, and I consider the 35th clause was intended to be more binding than it is, when it is stated that the prices shall be according to mutual agreement; I therefore submit, from the evidence there is nothing like mutual agreement, when a circular is sent round, and you are compelled to pay that demand or lose the supply altogether. I think also it is a matter of some importance to the freehold, and I am surprised it has been overlooked by the legislature, that the companies should have the power to distrain, as in the case of a landlord, for a dispute may possibly arise, when the landlord and the company may enter together, who shall have the prior claim; it is out of the power of private individuals to litigate points with corporate bodies: the reason I have mentioned the circumstance is this, that in case of a distress by the king for assessed taxes and a freeholder at the same time, whoever comes in first takes his whole demand if he can get it, and the other must take what is left if there is any left. I wish to state these words of Mr. Justice Best, as conveying completely my feelings, that great public benefits are held out as inducements to the legislature to sanction these undertakings; and, when their sanction is obtained, is it to be permitted to those persons to say they will do only what is beneficial to themselves, and disregard the interest of the public?

At the meeting at which you were chairman was there any offer made on the part of the company to meet a committee on each side to adjust and arrange the differences?—As to the particular circumstances of that meeting I cannot pretend

*Mr.
Robert Wright.*

(16 March.)

Mr.
Robert Wright.

(16 March.)

to detail them ; but if any information is necessary, the gentlemen of the East London company are competent to give it.

Are you informed of that fact?—I have no recollection of any such proposal at the public meeting.

Was there subsequently a proposal made that there should be a deputation on each side, with a view to adjust and compromise all disputes?—Yes ; and I objected to private compromise, because it was a public matter.

You refused all compromise?—A compromise of some sort was offered, but no terms were mentioned ; it was after the meeting was over, in a committee who called the public meeting, and I objected to it upon principle.

The proposal was made to you, you having been chairman?—It is possible it might. I have no objection to abide, either here or elsewhere, on what I stated on that meeting ; I am ready to enter into any explanation that may be required of me.

Should not you have considered you took a great responsibility on yourself in deciding for the public?—We could not dispose of the public rights, and we considered they were involved in the question.

After this, had not you a second public meeting, at which you were chairman again?—There was a second meeting.

You admitted that a house that had a supply of water was bettered by all the circumstances, by having a leaden pipe attached to it, but in no other way was it benefited?—I stated it was bettered in the same way that a house was bettered by having a baker's shop within five minutes walk of it, instead of having to go five miles for it ; relatively it is better ; I admit, that to a certain extent it is better, on the same principle as I have stated as to a baker's shop within five minutes walk or five miles.

Have you found a facility in the company to receive complaints in the way of appeal?—After the first appeal I made, I do not know.

Of course, as chairman of that meeting you wished to preserve order ; but were you able to preserve order to such an extent as that those who attended on the part of the companies were able to have or to obtain a hearing at that period?—I think the defenders of the company had a very fair hearing, as far as it was possible to keep silence where there was a great public feeling. At the time the meeting was called the public were suffering from the rise of prices, and all the consequences which I have stated from the combination, and therefore of course they were considerably irritated ; but if the minutes of that meeting are brought forward, I am sure that nothing will appear in any observations I made at that meeting that could at all tend to irritate the feelings, or prevent that harmony of the meeting which ought to subsist.

But there was considerable tumult at that meeting?—There was tumult, but not disturbance.

Mr. James Davis, Called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
James Davis.

ARE you one of the proprietors of the East London waterworks?—I am the chairman of the directors of the East London waterworks.

State what you wish to lay before the Committee?—I wish to state particularly as to the meeting at the City of London Tavern (I was there, and Mr. Sharpe was in the chair,) on the 30th of October 1818, and I addressed the meeting after Mr. Sharpe had opened the business, with a view to conciliate, as much as possible, the clamour which had been excited against the companies. I addressed them at considerable length, and was very much interrupted in the course of my address, but I concluded by saying that there was no circumstance of any kind which I was aware of, which related to a supply of water, but what was perfectly fair, and just, and right ; but if there were any exceptions to that observation, we were willing and ready at all times to receive the complaints of the parties, and to give every possible explanation and redress that could be required ; and so strongly impressed was I with that consideration, that though the meeting appeared to be held for the purpose of exciting as much attention as possible, yet I could not reconcile myself to leave the room, without at least endeavouring that that which I had proposed should be submitted to the meeting ; and a gentleman of the name of Young proposed at that meeting that there should be a committee appointed by this meeting, and that all differences, of whatever nature or kind they were, should be submitted to the directors of the East London waterworks ; and I pledged myself as a member of the court, that they should be taken into serious consideration, and, as much as possible, redressed.

redressed. This was proposed by Mr. Sharpe as a question by way of amendment upon the resolution, which was brought forward by some individuals that were there, and upon the amendment being put, it was negatived. Of course when I found there was an end of every thing like that which I promised myself would be the effect of good order, and every thing pleasant and agreeable, I left the room: it was proposed by way of amendment, and seconded and negatived by fifty to one, I suppose; the proposition was made while Mr. Sharpe was in the chair, and submitted to the full meeting, and therefore why he should say it was submitted afterwards, I cannot account for.

Your proposal was to compromise and adjust every thing in dispute?—Certainly.

Was it to enter into a discussion of the whole matter, and explain the grounds on which you acted?—No; only any individual cases of complaint.

The whole must be made up of individual cases; suppose individual cases amounted to the whole, would you have gone into the whole if it had been consented to?—No doubt about it.

You would not have allowed your right to raise an increased rate to be entered into?—Yes, I would; the fact is this, there was nothing but individual cases presented to the meeting.

(*Mr. Sharpe.*)—I stated that I had no recollection of any such proposition at the public meeting; the evidence of the gentleman has shown, at least, if it did take place, the part I acted was a fair part.

And it has also shown that you must have forgotten that?—I did; it was stated specifically at a private meeting on the same evening, or at a subsequent meeting of the committee appointed; it was made there a distinct proposition by one or two members, and I opposed it with as much authority as I could, and I opposed it on principle.

Lunæ, 19^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. William Matthew Coe, called in; and Examined.

THE general answer to the case of Sir Harry Englefield is, that it was a case of equalization, and it was upon the same principle that it was lowered, and after an internal inspection of the house it was reduced, and not the high service taken off.

(*To Mr. Coe.*)—The rise was from three guineas to six, why was that?—We raised this house from three to five guineas on the principle of equalization which we adopted; the one guinea was for the high service, distinctly stated for the high service, and so it was explained to Sir Harry Englefield. Sir Harry Englefield subsequently waited on the directors, and he was informed that it was upon that principle of equalization that the rate was charged on his house, and we instanced several houses to Sir Harry Englefield where the rates had been lowered upon the same principle; that was stated to Sir Harry.

Mr. William Hart, called in; and Examined.

NOW what conversation had you with Sir Harry Englefield?—I first called on Sir Harry's butler for the rates.

At what time was that?—Before I saw Sir Harry; the butler said Sir Harry had objected to the payment of the rates overcharged; I asked if he would let me see the house, and I looked round the house, and saw the situation of the water-closet of the house; the house looks larger externally than it does internally, therefore I said I will represent it to the board. I looked to the situation of the water-closet; we had conceived that it was higher, but I found that it was a little below the ground floor.

It was below the ground floor?—About a step lower, in the back yard; I then told the butler that I should make the representation to the board, and I did so, and the situation the water-closet was in, and the size of the house; and under all those circumstances the board lowered Sir Harry one guinea; then I called on Sir Harry afterwards, and informed him what had been done; that his house was large

*Mr.
James Davis.*

(16 March.)

Mr. W. M. Coe.

(19 March.)

*Mr.
William Hart.*

Mr.
William Hart.

(19 March.)

externally, though it was not so large internally, and the water-closet being a little below the ground floor, we had taken all those circumstances into consideration, and under those circumstances we had lowered him one guinea. That was the conversation between Sir Harry and me; Sir Harry, in reply to that, said that there was a suit in the court of King's Bench, and whenever that was settled he would pay the next day.

Did Sir Harry state that the board must have known that fact before?—I do not recollect; it was under all the circumstances that the rates were lowered, and not upon the principle of the high service. This house certainly does appear larger externally than it does internally.

(*Mr. Coe.*)—Mr. Hart was given to understand decidedly that the high service was not reduced, because it would have gone to take high service from every person in the same situation.

Do you consider that Sir Harry Englefield at that reduction is lower than other houses?—I represented it so to the chairman, and he said, it is not worth squabbling about a few shillings.

You have stated a variety of cases where persons have refused to pay the increased demand, and you have cut off the supply of water; now in this instance you have not; why did you deal partially with him?—It has been at his particular request that it should not until this inquiry was gone into.

(*The Witness.*)—I will state one circumstance with respect to Sir Harry; there certainly ought not—the commissioners ought not to have made a particular distinction in this case, but I had the pleasure of knowing Sir Harry Englefield a few years ago, and I believe that I originally solicited him to take his water from our water company. He was perfectly aware that we could cut off his water, but he said, “It will inconvenience me if you take it off,” and so said the butler; and certainly under those circumstances it was waived, and under the circumstance of his being in an ill state of health; and his own servant the butler, who is here, said, “I hope you will not deprive us of the water, as it will be a very great inconvenience.”

John Gibson, Butler to Sir Harry Englefield, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
John Gibson.

YOU have heard what has been stated by Mr. Hart, and you have heard that letter of Sir Harry Englefield's read?—He stated almost every word of what he has stated, that the gentlemen had taken it off entirely on the ground, finding that the water-closet was on the ground floor, and they thought it was higher; that is the short and long of the story. He repeated those words over to me two or three times, that it was in consequence of its being on the ground floor. The water used to come in regularly Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, and afterwards the days were changed; I know it because I used to hear it when I was sitting in my room.

“ Sir,

Tilney-street, 14th March 1821.

“ Being one of those who first concurred in the propriety and necessity of forming an association of householders, in the parishes supplied with water by the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies, for the purpose of raising a fund to defray the expenses of legal proceedings, to ascertain whether those companies be really invested with the extraordinary and oppressive powers claimed by them, of refusing to afford a supply of water on other than such terms as they shall choose to prescribe to the inhabitants, and also of an application to Parliament for a remedy of the grievances now felt in relation to the supply of water to the metropolis; and having, from a sense of public duty, been actively engaged, since the formation of the association in October 1819, in promoting its objects, and in investigating the grounds on which the companies respectively claim to be entitled to the payment of increased water rates, commencing at different periods in that year; I have been very desirous of attending on the Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed to inquire into these matters, for the purpose of giving evidence thereon, but the continued ill state of my health prevents me from leaving my chamber; and I have therefore thought it advisable to state, in writing, a few of the points which I am anxious to bring under the notice of the Committee, and which I would otherwise have hoped to be permitted to state in person.

“ As the origin and objects of the association I have mentioned, are most fully and correctly set forth in the report of the proceedings at its first public meeting, I inclose a printed copy of that paper soon after its circulation; public meetings of the aggrieved householders were held in the several parishes of St. James Westminster, St. George Hanover-square, St. Mary-le-bone, Pancras and Paddington, which

which were numerously attended, and at which similar resolutions were passed and subscriptions entered into. In December 1819 I drew up a statement, relative to the proceedings of the companies, which I caused to be printed and circulated among the inhabitant householders, wherein I stated the results of the inquiries I had been making, and advised the parishioners, generally, to join the association. Having taken much pains to inform myself on the subject, by personal investigation, I have good grounds to believe that all the facts therein stated are strictly true, and as they comprise the principal matters of grievance, which are still felt, I have also inclosed a copy of that paper.

“ Finding that the companies declined to afford the aggrieved householders an opportunity of procuring a legal decision on the doubtful right they had set up, previously to a general exercise of those assumed rights (a course of proceeding which I do not recollect to have been adopted on any similar occasion by any other public body or corporation whatever,) and being served with a notice from the Grand Junction company that I should be subjected, in common with numerous other individuals, to the inconveniences resulting from the deprivation of the accustomed supply of water at Michaelmas last, (a period of the year when the courts of law would not be sitting, and consequently no immediate appeal could be made to them,) unless I previously submitted to the new terms on which they proposed to continue that supply, I wrote to their secretary a letter, of which the following is a copy :—

“ ‘ Sir,

Tilney-street, 23d March 1821.

“ ‘ I have received your letter of the 4th instant, wherein you state, ‘ that the court of directors of the Grand Junction waterworks company understanding that I refuse to pay the rate charged by them for a supply of water to my premises, from a belief that it is exorbitant, have directed you to assure me that it is fair and moderate,’ and further, ‘ that the expenses which the company have incurred in providing water for the districts which they supply, have so far exceeded their original calculation as to render it impossible for them to continue the service of water to my premises at the rate I have hitherto paid, viz. £. 3. 3 s. per annum, and that the company give me that timely notice, that at Michaelmas next, being the expiration of the current year for which I am now supplied, it is not their intention to renew the present contract under which I have been supplied, and that at and from the said Michaelmas next they will discontinue the supply of water to my premises altogether, unless a new agreement shall be made between me and the company.’

“ ‘ As I do not clearly understand the terms and object of this communication, I desire that you will recall the attention of the court of directors to the circumstances connected with the supply of these premises with water ; namely, that I had been for many years supplied by the Chelsea waterworks company, as abundantly and commodiously, and on as moderate terms as I desired ; that on the establishment of the Grand Junction waterworks, I was induced, at the earnest solicitation of persons interested in those works, to relinquish the supply of the Chelsea company, and to permit the Grand Junction company to serve the premises with their water : that finding the quality of the water to be very inferior to that with which I had been supplied from the Thames, I entered into a parole agreement after the lapse of a certain period, with the officers of the Chelsea company, for a renewal of the service of water from their works, subject to an annual payment of three guineas ; that pursuant to that agreement, I was supplied by the Chelsea company with as much water as I require for my domestic consumption, delivered by one service pipe, partly into two cisterns on the basement, and partly into a cistern placed over a water-closet constructed on the parlour floor, until about or soon after Christmas 1817 ; when I was informed that, in consequence of some arrangement (to which I was in no respect a party) among the several water companies, the Grand Junction water company had been left in the exclusive possession of the supply of this quarter of the parish of St. George Hanover-square, and that my premises would be for the future supplied by that company ; that a demand having been made on me, at a subsequent period, by the collector of the Grand Junction company, for payment of rent due for the water which had been supplied to me by the company (as was alleged by the said collector) from the time the Chelsea company had ceased to afford the supply, computed after the rate of three guineas per annum, which I had agreed to pay as abovementioned, I complied with the demand, and paid the rent so claimed ; that soon after Michaelmas last (1819) application was made to me in like manner, by a collector of the Grand Junction company, for payment of water rent then

Mr.
John Gibson.

(19 March.)

Mr.
John Gibson.

(19 March.)

due for my premises, computed from Michaelmas 1818, at the rate of six instead of three guineas per annum previously paid, it being at the same time explained to me, that the said yearly rate of £. 6. 6s. was assessed as follows; viz. £. 5. 5s. for the water delivered into the cisterns on the basement, and termed the low service, and £. 1. 1s. for the supply of the water-closet, under the denomination of high service, both services being then and still supplied by means of one pipe only communicating with the main in the street; and that, considering these charges to be very unfair and exorbitant, I have declined to pay for the water supplied, any sum exceeding the amount of the rent due computed after the rate of three guineas per annum, hitherto paid by me.

“ I have further to state to you, for the information of the Grand Junction waterworks company, that understanding there are now no other means of procuring a sufficient supply of water to these premises than from their works, in consequence of the arrangement entered into by the several water companies, I shall be subjected to very considerable loss and inconvenience if the present supply be suddenly discontinued, and that I am therefore anxious to be forthwith informed, with reference to the contents of your letter, of the date, nature and particulars of ‘ the contract under which I am now supplied, and the current year of which will expire at Michaelmas next;’ and likewise, of the nature and terms of the new agreement proposed to be made between me and the company, as the only means of avoiding a discontinuance of the supply of water to my premises altogether at the ensuing Michaelmas, in order that I may determine whether I shall accede to such proposal.

“ ‘ I shall be much obliged by your laying this letter before the court of directors at their next meeting, with a request that they will cause answers to the inquiries I have made to be communicated to me with as little delay as possible.

‘ I am, &c.

‘ To Mr. W. M. Coe, (signed) ‘ H. C. Englefield.’
Chief Clerk to the Grand Junction Waterworks Company.’

“ About a month after the date of the above letter, Mr. Coe called and told me that the directors had considered it, and had directed him personally to inform me that the lowest charge for the supply would be six guineas per annum, as before demanded; I asked for an answer in writing to my inquiry relative to the contract stated to have been made between us; he said he had no further instructions, but he would inform the directors that I particularly wished for a written answer.

“ Having waited some weeks in vain for an answer, I went to the company’s office on a board day, taking with me my solicitor; we saw only Mr. Coe, to whom I tendered the amount of my former rate, which he refused to accept; I then desired an answer to my question as to the alleged subsisting contract, and he informed me that the directors had not empowered him to give any further answer, or any answer in writing to my letter; and being further pressed, he said, he did not think they would: upon repeating my inquiry as to the terms of the proposed ‘ new contract,’ he said that the rate would be six guineas a year, as I had already been informed.

“ My supply was not taken off at Michaelmas; but about Christmas last, Mr. Hart, the company’s collector, called and demanded payment of the rate, and at the same time acquainted me that the directors had taken off the guinea demanded as the rate for high service, they having found that my water-closet was on the ground floor; I told him I could prove they knew that circumstance fully a year ago, if not longer, and that it seemed singular they should not till now have thought of taking it off; but that I still objected to any increased charge, and was ready to submit to the loss of my supply rather than acquiesce in their demand until their right to enforce it was decided at law; that the decision would probably soon be obtained, and that it rested with them to put me to the inconvenience of the threatened deprivation of supply or not.

“ The company have not hitherto withheld the supply to my house; on the contrary, my servants inform me that for the last three weeks the water has been supplied almost daily, although it had never previously been supplied more than three or four times a week.

“ I have entered into this detail of my own individual case of resistance, because it tends to show the spirit of the company’s dealing with the public. In my case the supply has been continued, but in numerous instances, and I believe in all, with the exception of three or four more than my own, the water was cut off within
a few

Mr.
John Gibson.

(19 March.)

a few days after the expiration of the notices, where the tenants had not come in to the terms proposed, namely, the payment of the increased rates for eight or nine quarters previously to the expiration of the notice, and an agreement to continue to pay them in future; a species of extortion which I will not trust myself to describe as it deserves, considering the means by which it has been effected, and the relative situation of the parties practising it, and of the parties who have suffered from it.

“ But the most important point to which I would have personally urged the attention of the Committee, if their form of proceeding and the state of my health would have allowed me, are of a prospective nature, in the expectation that their labours will terminate in a new legislative measure for the protection of the public against a wanton and arbitrary exercise of such powers as are now claimed by these companies, and which their late exercise of them has sufficiently proved cannot be safely entrusted to their administration :

“ 1st.—The paramount necessity of doing away all doubts, by a declaratory law as to the legal obligation on the water companies to afford an adequate supply of good and wholesome water to all inhabitants resident within the circle of their respective works, and who shall desire such supply, on payment of reasonable rates for the same.

“ The existing monopoly of the supply by artificial means, and the impossibility, as it respects by far the most numerous portion of the population of the metropolis, of procuring a supply by other means, as long as the privilege of supplying is vested in joint stock companies, and the consideration that the companies possessed of the monopoly are the creatures of the law, cannot leave a doubt, I conceive, of the justice of this proposition.

“ 2d.—The necessity of establishing a tribunal, to which the poorest housekeeper may resort, without fear of being overwhelmed with technical proceedings and ruinous bills of costs, to obtain speedy redress for an insufficient supply of water, or an excessive charge of rate.

“ The costly and tedious law proceedings to which the associated householders have been obliged to have recourse, and hitherto without effect, to obtain a judicial decision on the questions now at issue, and the technical difficulties which have been opposed to their prosecution, are ample grounds for the establishment of such an institution.

“ 3d.—In the event of the companies being allowed to charge at their discretion, for water consumed for other than domestic purposes, or for water supplied at a high elevation, the enactment of regulations, distinctly defining what shall be treated as an extra supply, and what shall be considered to be high service.

“ At present, the companies impose an extra rate of charge on all tradesmen and others using any quantity of water beyond the mere consumption for ordinary household purposes, and for all cisterns at 18 inches above the pavement of the street; although, in the former case, the whole consumption should not exceed the ordinary quantity supplied to a private family; and in the latter, notwithstanding the numerous cisterns on the ground floor, and at much higher elevations than 18 inches, in various parts of the town, and even in the higher districts, had been supplied for years before the erection of the new works by the old companies in their ordinary service and without extra charge; and therefore under this head I would suggest, that where the party does not consume more water than is commonly supplied within the usual period of service, and through a pipe of the ordinary bore for household purposes, or where a cistern is situated below the level of the first floor, which, on an average, may be stated at 12 feet above the pavement of the street, no extra charge can be justly required for such supply or service. It seems to me likewise to be due to that portion of the householders who have been compelled, by the imperious necessity of the case, to submit to the exaction of payment of the increased rates demanded by the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies, that some measure should be adopted to enable them to recover back their payments in excess of the rates legally chargeable, and which the companies themselves have admitted in the notices they have served they were not lawfully entitled to demand. I shall only add that I anxiously hope my infirmities will not preclude the Committee from receiving the subject matter of this communication as evidence applicable to the purposes of their inquiry, and that I shall be most happy and willing to give any further information they may desire.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir, with great regard,

“ To W.H.Fremantle, Esq. M.P.
Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry into
the state of the Supply of Water, &c.”

Your most faithful humble servant,

“ H. C. Englefield.”

Mr.
John Gibson.

(19 March.)

[It was then resolved, that the Committee were of opinion that the facts of this case do not differ materially with the others, and therefore they decline hearing any further explanation as to the facts of this case, and as they do not materially differ from those circumstances which have been before the Committee, it would be contrary to the principles of the Committee to go further into it.]

Mr. *William Matthew Coe*, again called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

NOW will you have the goodness to proceed?—It will be necessary for me to state that which I believe I did at some former period of my evidence, that when the directors first issued their notices in 1818, from having looked into the rates of 1810, they considered that there was a great inequality in them, and therefore they stated in their notice, that the final increase and equalization of the rates would take place.

Which notice do you refer to?—The notice of the 11th of August 1818, which was put in.

You are sure of that date?—I think it was the 11th of August ; I am almost sure it is ; the short printed notice ; it was the notice that has been doubted as to the delivery of it.

A kind of general publication of their intention?—A general notice ; it was to this effect, that the inhabitants are requested to take notice that the final increase and equalization of the water rates will take place at Michaelmas 1818, and will be collected at Lady-day 1819. I only mention that first to show that the directors having examined the rates of 1810, and it appearing that they were unequal, they wished to apprise the public, that, probably, the equalization might take place ; and when we were before Parliament, it operated certainly on us, to get it inserted in that bill, that there should be on the aggregate charge only an addition of twenty-five per cent. as I pointed out the other day, and as it is stated in the bill.

Have you a copy of the bill as presented to the Lords?—This, which I have, is styled an act, and therefore I have no doubt it is the same as presented to the Lords.

Can you turn to the clause alluding to that ; what period in 1818 did you examine the rate of 1810?—What period of 1818?

Yes.—I think shortly after we took them out from the New River books, and previous to issuing those notices ; in April 1818.

It must have been between April and August?—Yes.

Did you make the same mistake as was made by the West Middlesex as to 1810?—As to what?

As to the general calculation as to those rates?—No, we had no calculation on it at all ; the first information the Grand Junction had of the amount of the rates in 1810, as applicable to the district that had fallen to their lot, was upon the examination of the New River and Chelsea books, which must have taken place somewhere about April or May 1818. Having observed the inequality of the rates of 1810, and having issued a notice of the equalization, our company wished it to be inserted in the bill, in words to this effect.

Give us the substance of the clause?—That the increased rate shall not exceed £. 25 per cent. beyond the rate charged in 1810, and which houses and buildings shall be rated in such manner that each house shall bear its due proportion of such aggregate rate. Now, after this bill had gone through the houses, and pursuant to that notice which we had issued in 1818, the board again took this matter into consideration, as to the equalization ; and they saw, or I imagined they saw, it would be attended with infinite difficulty, and perhaps, in many instances, a great deal of dissatisfaction might arise, and they issued the rate then at the twenty-five per cent.

Without equalization?—Without equalization.

On the individual houses?—On the individual houses. Several complaints came to the office of this inequality, and the answer generally given to those persons was, that we had put twenty-five per cent. on the rate that those persons were charged, and twenty-five per cent. on the others ; and the reply generally made to me was, that they had nothing to do with the twenty-five per cent. if the company were making any alteration, the complainants said, we think we ought all to pay alike. Several persons called and stated these circumstances ; one I can recollect in particular, as having been sent for by the Marquis of Winchester on this subject: the Marquis of Winchester's rate then was £. 8 8s.

The old rate?—Yes. And the Marquis of Winchester, upon his notice being sent to him, begged of me to wait on him, to have some explanation. The Marquis

saw

saw that his house would be increased from eight to ten guineas, without the high service. I waited on him, and begged to inform him of the rate of other houses in the square. His lordship stated to me, that he recollected perfectly well the bill being in the House, and that he had paid a great deal of attention to it himself; that he had understood from this bill that each house was to be made to pay alike; one neighbour was to be made to pay the same as the other: I stated, that there were some houses in the square similar to the Marquis of Winchester's, and he would find that he would have to pay, with the twenty-five per cent. on the rate, ten guineas; and that the Marquis of Bath, whose house was considerably larger (as his lordship observed to me) would have to pay £.6. 12s. for I think the Marquis of Bath's house was charged £.5. 5s.

What is the difference that would be made in both the houses?—One would be £.6. 12s. and the other would be ten guineas.

From what was Lord Bath's raised?—From £.5. 5s.

Where were they?—They were both in the same square.

Then Lord Bath's was raised from five guineas to six guineas?—The Marquis of Bath would have been raised from £.5. 5s. to £.6. 12s. I was not prepared with the Marquis of Winchester's rate of 1810, when I waited on his lordship, as not exactly knowing what he might want; it appeared that he had paid more during the competition than he did in 1810; but I was arguing with his lordship on the principle of what the increase would have been, really supposing the Marquis had paid eight guineas in 1810; but it appears from our copy that he had paid only six guineas in 1810.

There was no great inequality it seems then?—Well, but then Mr. Lowther was charged eight guineas in 1810.

What the inequality is can be best seen by looking at the books, can it not?—Yes. When I made this representation of the Marquis of Winchester's rate, and of several others who came to the office and reported to the court of directors that a vast number of complaints were made of the inequality of the rate, they again took it into consideration, and on looking into the rates again they saw that there was a very great inequality, not only comparing the rate of one house with another, in the same square, but comparing that house with other houses in other parts of the town; they then directed that the collectors should not call upon any house where they had not left the increased rate until some examination of the houses in the parishes was made, and something like an equal rate fixed, and the board of directors directed the engineer and myself to survey the houses in the parish generally. When the engineer and myself went out on the survey, we were determined not to be fettered with the rates of 1810 at all; we would not look at them; we would not take out the particulars of those rates of the houses we surveyed; we did not go into the inside; as far as that survey went it was only external, and is one which I have no doubt may be incorrect in some instances.

When was the survey made?—We began the collection, I think, in July 1819, collecting the rates that were due in the March previous; and I think this must have been within a month afterwards. When we returned with these rates to the office, we compared them with what the twenty-five per cent. on the rates of 1810 would be, and a vast number we found exactly as the twenty-five per cent. would have been; our value was within a shilling or so; some were considerably under, and others were considerably over; but we considered that we had done it in the fairest way we could, to the best of our judgment; and upon that rate being fixed so it was issued; the directors having it always in contemplation that those houses upon which the rate had been issued at the twenty-five per cent. increase should undergo the same investigation, because we found in the poorer neighbourhoods that the rate of 1810 on the houses was as high as on houses in much better situations. I have selected a few cases from our books in order to satisfy you, gentlemen, of that inequality.

From the rates of 1810?—Yes, from the rates of 1810. I should also state, that when we went on this survey we kept in mind that these were the principles upon which we should proceed to rate, viz. according to the size, the situation, and the occupation of the houses.

We do not know what you mean by occupation?—The class of the occupiers generally, whether tradesmen or not. I had found at first, when I looked into the rates of 1810, that that principle seemed to be, and it always appeared to me to have been generally adopted by the old companies, as tradesmen, although they occupied as large houses as noblemen, there was a great difference in the rate.

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(19 March.)

The rates in Bond-street, where there are large houses, the average rates were, in 1810, 24s. 26s. and 30s. a house. There are houses in King-street and Carnaby-street where a much poorer class of people are living, which seem to be rated as high, for there is hardly a house which was not rated 30s. in 1810. In Berkeley-square, in 1810, the Countess of Albemarle's house was rated at 30s. If we proceed to put twenty-five per cent. upon that, her ladyship would be paying no more than the poor persons in Carnaby-street and King-street. There is Mr. Egerton's house in the same square, which was rated at 40s. in 1810, when in the same square Mr. Palmer's and Mr. Glynn's houses, which are rather smaller than his, are rated at £.5; that is in the same square. Then I may refer again to Grafton-street; the houses in Grafton-street, particularly on the eastern side, were rated in 1810 at £.5. 5s. Lord Clive's £.5. 5s. Lord St. Helen's £.6. Mr. Holme Sumner £.8. 8s. and we considered those houses over-rated at that period, in our judgment, and we charge nearly the same rate now, and in some instances less.

Then there is no increase?—Lord Clive's was £.5, and is now £.5. 5s; Lord St. Helen's was £.6, and is now charged £.5. 5s; and the others that were charged £.5, are now charged five guineas. Another rate which struck me very forcibly was that of Mr. Scott's, in Lower Grosvenor-street; that house was rated in 1810 at sixteen guineas a year, a house which is now rated at nine; I mean that gentleman's rate, without the high service. The whole of the rate on Mr. Scott is £.12. 12s.

What is the frontage of that house?—It was the Duke of Rutland's house; it was supplied by the Chelsea company once.

It now belongs to Mr. Walker, I believe?—Mr. Scott was the person occupying when we rated it.

It was originally Lord Hertford's house?—I think it was the Duke of Rutland's.

Do you mean Mr. Claude Scott?—Mr. Scott of Lower Grosvenor-street.

It is a large frontage; I believe there are four windows?—It is. There may be many houses that have stables in these places, many of which we may not possibly know of. I recollect a circumstance of Lord Rochford's; I waited on his lordship two or three times, and his lordship stated, that for his stables at the back of his house he had a pump.

You have stated to the Committee, that the mode which you laid down, that the system which you followed in the survey of these premises, was by an outside survey?—Yes.

Now is that all you went by?—Generally. Now I just wish to state to you, on this principle of equalization, Grafton-street and many other streets, in the whole produce less than twenty-five per cent; Grafton-street produces £.6. 8s. less, in the aggregate, than twenty-five per cent. on the rates of 1810 would produce.

And has your calculation been made on the rates as they stood in the New River books?—Yes. I have also to state, as to Lower Grosvenor-street, the total amount of the rates of Lower Grosvenor-street in 1810 stood at £.280. 5s. twenty-five per cent. on which would be £.350. 7s; whereas by the equalization it produces only £.345. 7s.

You mean to say that the twenty-five per cent. on the rates in Lower Grosvenor-street amount to more than they were in 1810?—Certainly more than in 1810; but by the equalization the street produces less than twenty-five per cent. on the rates of 1810 would produce: as I stated on the other day, we have got more in the whole of our district than the twenty-five per cent. on the rates, by about seven pence per house. With regard to Carnaby-street and King-street, and other poor streets, the directors, taking into consideration the occupation and situation of those houses, are of opinion that the rates upon them should be reduced; those houses which are rated now at 38s. are too high in proportion to the rates in Bond-street, which are not more than two guineas a year upon the average.

Had you any means of knowing how far the rates of 1810 had been affected by the particular frontage you recollect his house might have?—No.

You took the frontage of the house?—Yes.

I want to know how extra supply was to be calculated in the New River company's books in the rate of 1810?—I have had instances in streets which have been charged at the rate of twenty-five per cent. where persons have been curriers, they have come to the office and complained of being charged more than their neighbours, and the information I have got from the collectors has been, that they were curriers;

I have

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(19 March.)

I have explained to them that I understood curriers used water in their business: they said they certainly did use a great deal of water in their business formerly, but it was very different now all that business, for which the use of water might be required, was removed to another part of the town; and although they were at present carrying on the business, with regard to cutting leather, still they ought not to pay the extra charge which the company put on them as curriers, as they had no occasion for water for their business, and they did not use more water than other persons: on that explanation the rate has been reduced to the ordinary rate.

Is there any distinctive mark in the books, which marks the persons who have an extra supply?—Yes, I think so, but I am not sure.

(To Mr. Mylne.)—The New River company have distinctive marks to all that are charged, have they not?—I believe so.

(To Mr. Lynde.)—Those marks, I take it, are introduced into the books to persons charged with extra supplies?—Yes.

(To Mr. Mylne.)—Had they distinct marks in the New River company?—Yes.

(To the Witness.)—In your books of 1810, were there distinct marks to those who had extra supply?—A very few; there were some.

(To Mr. Mylne.)—When you state that distinctive marks were placed for extra supply, do you mean to speak of trades supply?—There was an explanation for the rate being higher.

For instance, if a fishmonger was supplied extra, was he entered as a fishmonger?—Yes.

Suppose it happened in a particular case of a peculiar consumption in a particular house that a greater price was charged, was that marked?—I can find it marked also for a perpetual supply on the main.

(Mr. Lynde.)—It is, for fishmongers, brewers, public-houses, and schools.

(To Mr. Lynde.)—Were those marked especially on the books?—I do not know that; I do not think they are marked on the books, but they might be when they were first entered.

I would ask whether the commissioners had the means, by looking at those books, of knowing; whether, on their looking in the books, they could see the extra charges?—I do not think they could.

(Mr. Mylne.)—Nor in the New River books, for it is so only in the collectors books.

(To Mr. Mylne.)—Has the New River company the opportunity of knowing it except by the collectors books?—No.

(The Witness.)—Give me leave to explain: with regard to the New River company's books, I do not know that I saw them, except when they were here; our clerk copied the rates of 1810 from them at the New River office; neither did I see the Chelsea books of the rates of 1810; Mr. Lynde can bear me out in that; I requested him to give me a copy; the copy of his books of 1810; the rates of 1810 I have now by me; I have not extracted the public-houses as having an extra supply.

You have mentioned hotels?—The rates on hotels are very considerable, being mixed up with the rates for high service.

Did you take that view of it?—I took the rate of 1810, and settled the rates at 25 per cent. on the aggregate rate of 1810.

Where the inequality appeared to be a patent inequality, you would cut it off, but a latent inequality, you know nothing of that?—I took the rates of 1810 from the aggregate rate.

And you extracted, if I understand you right; we will suppose for a moment, (which I presume to be the case,) you extracted the principal extra charges upon hotels and cellar-keepers in your district, you extracted that charge from the general rate of 1810, previous to your presuming the equalization or before fixing the 25 per cent?—Yes.

It is perfectly clear it must be so in point of fact, and as there are but few, it is more advantageous to have a separate understanding with them?—Referring to the rate of 1810, in Carnaby-street, I found it generally at 30s. each house; there were a few at 36s. and it struck me as a particular rate for particular houses; I inquired what they were, and they were found to be public-houses.

Do you think you could not find good reasons for the inequality?—I think that was a reason for the public-houses being charged higher.

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(19 March.)

If you had searched further you would have found that the inequality was not so unequal as you supposed?—Finding that they were public-houses, of course I put the 25 per cent. on those houses.

Without rating them further?—Yes, generally.

Will you allow me to put a question, which is in the case of a street containing two or three hotels; Lower Brook-street; there are two or three hotels there, we will suppose, or only presume it: we will suppose with those hotels, that you choose to come to an agreement with them before you come to the equalization, and before you come to the calculation of the twenty-five per cent. on the rates in 1810: now did you extract the rate previously paid by those hotels, and then deal with the rest of the street on a principle of equalization at twenty-five per cent. and separately with the hotels, or did you leave them in the general calculation?—We took them both ways, only considering those as extra supplies who are known to be large consumers of water.

Do you know of an instance in which you dealt separately; I wish to know whether you did extract from the New River books when you made your calculation of any description of persons where there was such a discovery as this found, where they were charged with extra supply in the New River books?—Oh, no; the clerk merely took a copy of the rates, and when they were entered in our books, we noticed whether they were extra supplies or not.

At one time you say many persons were to be charged extra supply which you have added, and then made that twenty-five per cent.—When persons were charged high, in particular cases; for instance, the engineer and myself, when we came to an hotel, we said, we would pass it by, because we considered that as a special case.

The same with fishmongers?—I do not suppose in our district we have above four or five fishmongers whom we charge extra. Now Mr. Grove of Bond-street has an extra supply, for he has a little river running through his shop to keep the fish alive. I am sure Mr. Grove has an extra supply, and he has acknowledged that the river is very useful.

What they call a pea ferule?—I do not know that they call it a pea ferule, but it is a little river. I hope you will have the goodness to bear in mind that we have been stopped in the middle of our operations. It has been the intention on the part of the directors, and I hope the respectable gentlemen who are in the direction will be a sufficient guarantee that everything will be strictly correct as to the increase being twenty-five per cent. in the whole. Mr. Cockerell, the brother of a member of this House, (and I only wish to allude to this particular circumstance) went down to a public meeting in St. James's, and stated, that the company had no intention to exceed twenty-five per cent. on the rates of 1810, but that they had found it absolutely necessary to equalize the rates; and I am sure that gentleman would rather resign his seat in the direction, and sacrifice his whole property in the concern, than countenance any underhand attempt to obtain a further increase. Now I wish to explain further, with regard to the difficulty we may have had to contend with in this respect: with regard to the equalization there may not have been so much necessity for it in the parish of Mary-le-bone; the houses are new built, and are much more regularly built, and the New River company having had almost the exclusive service of that parish, I think it is probable that the rates may have been more on an equality than they were in those parishes which were supplied by the Chelsea and other companies; I think that may account for the rate in 1810 bearing a better proportion in the West Middlesex district than it does in ours.

You have stated, that the general mode of equalization was found in the first instance, when you went to make it on individuals at twenty-five per cent. that it created a great deal of ill-will, and such a sort of disturbance in the parish, that you thought it necessary to refer to this equalization system; now I put it to you, that knowing that the equalization system would operate to a result of fifty per cent. in some houses, and in others to a much lower sum, what did you conceive, or what was it possible for your company to conceive, adopting such principles that were more likely to increase than remove that disturbance and that impression that existed?—From the general observations made to us, and it has been generally admitted to me by persons whom I have spoken to on the subject, that the principle of equalization in the rates is the fairest principle for the company to proceed upon. I will state a case with regard to a gentleman of the name of Agar, of New Norfolk-street; he has two houses there, and he made his application to the office to

know

know why his rate was raised. The first house of Mr. Agar that I am speaking of was not raised twenty-five per cent; and I explained to Mr. Agar that in proceeding upon a principle of equalization, his house was not raised twenty-five per cent. and then he thought the principle perfectly fair. I went to the other house, and found that it paid more than twenty-five per cent. and he added both together, and he found it was more than the other way, and then he did not think it was fair.

Have you had several complaints of inequality resulting from your equalization?—Upon my word I cannot say that we have had many. When complaints have been made, nine times out of ten they have been found to come from persons having to pay for high service.

That has been really the general question of complaint?—It may be seen in the cases brought forward here, that that has been the case. It was mentioned, I think by Mr. Thorowgood, that Miss Dumergue, of Albemarle-street, had been raised to five guineas; we considered the house worth three guineas, and when we referred to the rate of 1810 charged upon her house, we found the twenty-five per cent. added to it, produced the same amount; the other two guineas which made up the five guineas, with which Miss Dumergue was charged, was for high service. Now Miss Dumergue, I cannot help thinking, must have been in a general communication with her sister, who I believe lives in Piccadilly, and she must have known that her sister was not raised above five per cent. for Miss Dumergue in Piccadilly paid £.5 in 1810, and only five guineas now. We have taken pains to send printed notices to persons who have been charged, to say that every explanation will be afforded upon application to the office.

The utmost you can give is a view of your books?—Certainly; but it has always been explained to persons complaining, that what they have considered to be a great rise of the rate is separated into two rates, a high and a low service. The outcry that has been raised has been by a vast number of persons who have not known this difference, and have not known that they could have the option. They have considered it as a regular charge, and that they had no option to discontinue the high service.

I wish to ask how many new houses there are in Mary-le-bone?—

(*Joseph Blagrave, Esq.*)—There are about 1,500.

(*The Witness.*)—I do not like to speak from recollection, and I am not quite sure what the number is.

What number is there altogether?—We supply about 7,200 altogether.

We should be glad to know what principle is pursued with regard to Mary-le-bone?—Some are equalized, and some are raised twenty-five per cent.

What is your aggregate rental?—It rather exceeds £.20,000.

Mr. *Pickering*, again called in; and Examined.

YOU have no high service?—No, sir.

Then there was something mentioned about a rate according to the size of houses?—If you will turn to the latter part of the scale, you will find that there is for houses containing above ten rooms something about 5s. and so on, which is added.

Does that relate to consuming trades?—Not all of them; I think to brewers and distillers it does not; they are so numerous that they are kept quite distinct from the rest.

What do you call watering-houses?—Public-houses on the road side, where carts stop to give the horses water.

You have not put anything down with respect to bakers, brewers and distillers?—They are rated there, brewers and bakers both.

Allow me to ask since when you have been acting upon this plan?—About two years.

Will you be so good as to tell us upon what plan you acted before that?—We had no regular plan before that.

In the first instance you regulate the house on the rate and then put it upon the new footing?—Not all.

When you have so done you then put the new rate on each house; do you not do that on every house?—Not an additional rate upon all. I think I stated before, that in making the equalization, several houses had been adduced where no rise had been made at all.

Mr.
Pickering.

(19 March.)

In point of fact, Mr. Pickering, you never thought of twenty-five per cent?—Certainly not.

This scale was framed, and then your operations amounted to reduce this scale into effect, and that is what you did?—As near as possible.

But you have acted upon that scale as near as possible?—As near as possible. In many instances rises have been made under that scale, which have been appealed against, and in many instances reduced.

In putting the general rise into effect, you acted upon this scale?—Certainly.

And you never thought of twenty-five per cent?—No.

If anything can be added on the return which has been alluded to, you will do it?—Very well.

Have you furnished the returns to the other orders?—I have got them all ready but one.

Mr. *Matthias Koops Knight*, called in ; and Examined.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

I WOULD ask Mr. Knight whether the West Middlesex company, in making their increased rates of twenty-five per cent. added twenty-five per cent. to each individual charge as they stood in the New River books, without distinction of extra supply, and subsequently added charges for extra supply, on account of the West Middlesex ; or whether they extracted the charges made for extra supply by the New River company, of the district taken by them, and adding twenty-five per cent. to the common supply, made it under the subsequent arrangement of the extra supply with their tenants?—It is possible that I may not answer directly to the point, but I think it will be more clear if we begin at the beginning. The first operation in making the new rate was to copy into a book the reduced rate ; then the rate of 1810, leaving blank columns for the increase and the total.

The reduced rate of the New River?—The rate as it stood of all the companies. The first operation was to make a rental of the whole district without reference to particular parishes, or particular places. We took the streets alphabetically ; we took the names as they stood, whether they had been supplied by the Grand Junction company or the New River. In the first column we put the rate of 1817 (the reduced rate,) in the next column the rate of 1810, leaving a blank column for the advance to be made, whether eight or ten shillings, or any other sum, on the twenty-five per cent. be it more or less, and a column for the new rate. That being made and compared with the books of the New River company, as far as related to the rental of 1810, which some of my clerks and myself went over, as it was wished by the directors that we should do so, because it was in their intention that in all the poor streets if they possibly could they would make an abatement. They did so, and a great many of the poor streets and courts were increased some ten per cent. some twelve and a half, some fifteen, and others twenty, on the rate of 1810, according to the particular class or ability of the party to pay.

That was below twenty-five per cent?—Yes ; and instead of twenty-five per cent. they directed an advance of ten, fifteen, or twenty per cent. to be made on those particular cases. The committee on that occasion marked down in red ink against the particular street what the advance was to be. The next operation was then very simple, and it only went to add in the blank column, whether it was 5s. or 10s. according to the particular sum ordered to be added, to make out the total. The better streets uniformly were raised twenty-five per cent.

Not above twenty-five?—South of the New-road, certainly not.

You did not add the deficiency in abatement in the poor streets to the others?—No.

Were you not compensated for the reduction in the smaller streets?—Not at all. In some of the cases, and I can name two individuals, (and I mention them because those individuals have been particularly active against the company,) I will mention those two cases, because they will directly answer the question as to the mode of charging trades ; I mean the cases of Mr. Harvey and Mr. Lowe, in Cleveland-street : it appeared that the general rating in 1810, in that street, was 30s. per house. It is not a very good street, and was not considered to be that sort of street which we could put twenty-five per cent. on, and therefore instead of making it 37s. we made it 36s. Mr. Harvey and Mr. Lowe were two neighbours, and Mr. Harvey stood at 36s. in 1810, and his neighbour, Mr. Lowe, at 36s. and that led to an inquiry, as the other houses were 30s. and it turned out that one was a baker, and that the other kept a shrimp shop ; they were raised twenty-five per

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(19 March.)

per cent. making £.2. 5s. considering the difference of 6s. for the trade; both those individuals appealed, and both of them stated to me that they did not use any water whatever for their trades; they stated that, and I represented it to the directors; and under the instruction I had received, and a slight discretion of my own, I reduced their rates to the same as their neighbours, who were private housekeepers; yet notwithstanding I had done this, those two parties were the first to call a public meeting, and to apply to Mr. Weale for his aid; and they were two of the greatest fomenters of this disturbance. I mention that just to show why I recollect it.

Did they state how they stood charged in the New River books to you?—They said they supposed it to be so; they took it for granted it must be so, because their house stood the same as their neighbours. In charging them twenty-five per cent. my mind went to the circumstance of their being extra consumers, the one being a baker and the other a salt fishman.

Did you not conceive it as having been previously charged, as having been here charged for a further supply by the New River company?—I have stated that, sir. I conceived they might have been charged for their trade to a certain degree, but I might differ with them as to the particular amount; they were not in very extensive trade, and on those particular cases we looked it over and took it as it stood.

Was that a general rule?—Yes, except we found upon a survey any reason for interposition. The survey I allude to was a work of great labour and time, and I was going to say that I went into thousands of houses in order to ascertain what were the relative situations of the houses, and particularly to understand what consumption there was in each particular business. In various cases in the course of that survey in 1819, we found consumers of water to a much greater extent than I had any conception of, and that too in cases where they had not been charged at all for their trade; all this has ceased to a certain extent, by our turning up every day persons who have large supplies that we had no knowledge of whatever, and this same sort of survey is going on, and I dare say it will be two or three years before we ascertain the proper account of extra supplies. In the great case of Mr. Jenkins, in which Mr. Weale has moved for a mandamus, that gentleman applied to me for a mere domestic supply of water to a person who lived in a cottage at his nursery. When we laid our water on, Mr. Jenkins pledged himself it was only for the use of the woman: that being a supply of water, as described to me, merely for the woman, I had said that two guineas would be sufficient; but after it had been laid on for that purpose, Mr. Jenkins made a tank, containing a fountain, in his garden: I then said to Mr. Jenkins, two guineas does not apply to a fountain or ornamental pond for your garden, and I called upon him with an engineer, and had a conversation with him.

I will ask now, as matter of information, without alluding to Mr. Jenkins, the number of trades, and what they are, that you treat as extra consumers of water; what is your real way of proceeding with respect to that?—You have heard that the Grand Junction do not consider among them fishmongers. Mr. Coe has mentioned that there are not above three or four fishmongers, though I think it has been clearly stated that a great number of fishmongers do exist in that district; he has stated that a large proportion were not charged; that they did not charge a large proportion with extra supply.

(Mr. Coe.)—In all probability twenty-five per cent. is put on them.

What was your rule with respect to trades in general; and did it include all trades, and what trades?—I will tell you what our intention was, because, as I stated, the thing is imperfect. Now the intention was to go over the district, and to make a difference between persons using water for ordinary domestic purposes, and persons consuming water in their trade or business. One question has been put, as to what persons using water an extra charge is to be made. Now I say, if they use it for the purpose of manufacture or trade, a charge follows as a matter of course, according to the quantum used. If it happened that in the New River company's books a difference appeared; if it happened that one man was charged more than his neighbour, the houses being small, and there was a small trade, such as a baker or a public-house, we put the twenty-five per cent. on the high rate which appeared to have been paid the New River in 1810, more than the neighbours. Supposing a case in which a man possessing one of those trades paid 36s. and his neighbour 30s; our rate now is upon the first £.2. 5s. and his neighbour's 37s. That is the case as far as it is gone, except that we find large consumers, such as watering-houses,

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(19 March.)

houses, and others who require water to be thrown upon the top of their houses; the survey is still going on.

I will ask one question with respect to this point, which must occur in your district, and I know there are a great many in the Grand Junction, and I think there must be a great many in your district; I allude to women who get their livelihood by washing; I do not speak of great laundresses; was it your view to raise the charge of supply to them?—Why, it is difficult to answer; in one word, laundresses vary so much; I should say, in common cases, where an individual washes for herself, we do not make a difference. I apprehend there are many laundresses who employ ten or fifteen women; then I say that we should charge them according to the quantity.

Do your extra charges go so minutely to that, as if it is a little laundress who does a little in lodgings?—Certainly not; the number of the laundresses in our district is very great, but their employment is very small. One word more, with regard to laundresses, to show that the board have taken all classes of people into consideration, as to what advance should be made; a laundress might employ ten or fourteen women, and we should charge her two guineas only, and yet she would use as much water as those paying ten guineas; whether the individuals have power to pay is a great consideration with them.

When did you first have access to the New River books in order to clear up that mistake which you had been under in February 1818?—On the 19th of February 1818 that mistake arose, and it still seems to require some explanation. I will endeavour to explain it shortly; it arose upon an estimate given to us that a greater depression—

By whom?—By the New River company. That a greater depression in the rates of 1810, by the competition, had taken place, than actually appeared when the rates were copied out. The gentlemen of the New River did not look into it more than ourselves, and we did not expect that we should have been called upon as we were. When two or three streets had been looked at, in several of those streets there was a diminution found, which it was thought was general, but it turned out not to be the fact, to the extent supposed; many houses in Mary-le-bone were not reduced at all, but the general reduction was fifteen or twenty per cent.

Then in point of fact you wrote that letter, in consequence of merely a less estimate which had been transmitted to you on the part of the New River company?—Certainly; our belief being, that the rate of 1810 in the district we supplied, came up to between £. 17,000 and £. 18,000.

After that, you made an examination of the books of the New River company; that was in April; now had you any communication after that, because just previously to that, a rate was made by the Grand Junction; had you any communication with the Grand Junction on that operation?—They all did it together, by the desire of the House of Commons; it was not done till then. Mr. Taylor had submitted that a committee should be appointed, and the first order of that committee, when appointed, was to ascertain correctly what the rates of 1810 really were; while the bill of the vestry was pending upon that committee: the first intimation we had of dissatisfaction was at the beginning of February 1818: on the 3d of February, the committee of the water companies (a deputation of each) attended the Mary-le-bone vestry, and I have got a minute of what actually took place; there was an explanation there, and a considerable deal of violence was shown, and the board were very much pressed on the statement. I the other day remarked, that with regard to the advance intended to be made by the board, it was so large, that the board were anxious to stop this in limine, as to give an idea of what their intention was; and, as I stated before, the chairman made use of the words “no advance is contemplated at present:” many gentlemen caught hold of the words “at present,” and reported them about; many of the gentlemen who had been in the vestry room had said that the rates would be £. 20 or £. 30 per house: then the directors were anxious to set this upon a proper footing, and the gentleman who had so stated it was told, by a gentleman of the West Middlesex company, that he would pledge himself that his particular rate would not exceed five guineas; it turns out that he is rated at £. 4. 7s. Perhaps in conclusion I might state, that anterior to that letter of the 19th February, was written several other papers, put in, in the interim between the 19th of February and April, all discussing the question of rate, not one alluding to that letter, but putting questions, just as if it was never in existence.

That

That will appear?—That will appear: the reason of the mistake was this; the reduced rates of 1817 were known, and an assumption was made that they had been reduced 25 per cent. below the rates of 1810; that was in consequence of occasional information they had received, but on inquiry it was found that the reduction had not been so great. When it was found, by an accurate investigation of the New River books, that this mistake had been made, we gave in a report, which has been put before you, namely, the 1st May 1818, in which 25 per cent. was charged.

The regular letter was written to retract that of the 19th February 1818, upon the 11th of March?—Until that time the companies were in consultation with the vestry. When the bill had been read a first time, which was on the 6th of May, the companies, we said, “the whole town shall know on what principle we mean to go, it is the public that are our tenants, and not the vestry of Mary-le-bone; we will allow every body to judge of his own case, and we will therefore publish this letter, so that everybody may know what the state of the case is.” We just put it to the committee; the three gentlemen of our board, and the Mary-le-bone vestrymen, have always been anxious that unpleasant discussions on either side should be averted, so that it may not create ill-blood between the parties. The gentlemen have come into our board, gentlemen who are well known to many gentlemen of the Committee, and have endeavoured to temporize the ill-blood which existed. There are many circumstances in the course of this investigation which have occurred, that, as a point of feeling, we wish very much to be kept, if possible, out of the view; any strictures that may have passed, on the part of West Middlesex I have thought it necessary to make, on the Mary-le-bone vestry, conceiving it not to apply to a large number of that body. I have now said every thing I wish to say on the Mary-le-bone vestry, unless I am called upon to lay the whole facts before the Committee.

Do you happen to recollect the official person connected with the New River company, who gave that which you have been alluding to; that statement?—It was given by a committee of New River directors to the West Middlesex directors. There is one other thing I would wish to state, which is, that shortly after the 19th of February, a further question was put as to the rate, and the answer given was, that the vestry would clearly see that the West Middlesex company must have at least £.17,500 a year to pay 5 per cent. for their capital; now it so happens that the 25 per cent. was within one hundred, more or less, which shows what my mind was when that letter was written.

I beg leave to ask, in point of fact, whether that is the answer of you?—Yes it is. (*The Witness.*)—I see that a mistake and some difficulty has arisen from taking my words more strictly than hypothetically; I meant it to be taken more hypothetically than strictly.

Mercurij, 21^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Matthias Koops Knight, again called in; and Examined.

THE Returns, I apprehend, will show that the particular rates laid upon the town have not been laid with a view to give any particular interest upon the capital of the company, the companies having acted upon the limitation proposed by Mr. Taylor, namely, twenty-five per cent. on the rates of 1810, south of the New road, and the water-rents have been established on that basis, as I explained the other day.

Can you show how the proprietors will be affected by those rates, in respect of the interest that they will yield upon their capital?—Yes, certainly; I have to state to the Committee that the company has actually received from the subscriptions £.352,976. 6s. 9d.

You mean money actually paid into their coffers?—Yes; money actually paid in, after deducting £.4,562. 5s. 4d. for discount on prompt payment. I have deducted that, in order that there should be no charge brought against the capital that could not be substantiated; from that sum of £.352,976. 6s. 9d. I deduct a further sum of £.12,412, (it is stated in the return £.12,410, but I find it is

706.

£ s

£.12,412,

Mr.
M. K. Knight.
(19 March.)

Mr.
M. K. Knight.
(21 March.)

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(21 March.)

£.12,412, £.2 more having been paid since from the money actually received,) that sum was paid back to the proprietors in 1810 and 1811 for dividends on estimated profits; those profits never were realized; and in making up a general statement of the company's accounts to the 30th of September 1818, which was furnished to the proprietors, that sum was deducted, leaving the actual money received by the company and expended on the works, £.340,564. 6s. 9d. The Committee will observe, that the shares issued by the company have nothing to do with this particular sum that I am stating, because 2,000 of the shares were issued at £.100 each, that produced £.200,000 of capital; the concern then became so depreciated, that they could raise no more money at that ratio. From the commencement of the concern, the shares were constantly at a premium, more or less, varying from five to I believe I have heard as much as £.150 premium, to the year 1812; at that period the depreciation began: and I think I have stated, that up to that period about £.200,000 had been raised; the remaining £.40,000 of the capital was apportioned among the subscribers to the £.200,000, and a legal question arose, whether those proprietors were bound to contribute it at £.100 a share, and an opinion was taken whether they were compellable to pay it; it was not a voluntary contribution, one quarter of that sum was in dispute after the passing of the act in 1813, and it must certainly have been that the depreciation took place in 1812, otherwise the company never would have gone to Parliament, to enable them to raise shares at a depreciation of seventy per cent; it was then the new shares were issued; a certain number were authorized to be raised by the proprietors. Then the old proprietors, who were paying at that time subscriptions at £.100 a share, brought the matter forward at the general assembly, when shares were authorized to be raised at £.30 a-piece, complaining of the great hardship upon them, of being compelled to pay £.100 a share, when they could go into the market and buy them at £.35. The sum involved in this was the £.40,000, the £.30,000 in the course of payment, and the other £.10,000 which had been suspended; the subject was discussed, and it was agreed by the general body of proprietors, that those who had paid their subscriptions to the extent of £.30,000 should have bonus shares, so as to reduce the money they had paid to the price at which the new shares were to be issued, namely £.30 a share; and further, that they should be considered as new shares paid in prompt, that is, subject to a further reduction of £.2, making the actual receipt £.28; and therefore the different shares which were issued for these £.30,000 are all included in the shares of £.30. I have a very minute statement I made out some time ago from my books, which, if I lay it before the Committee, will explain it. The new shares were raised, as I stated, at £.30 each, and with a deduction for prompt payment of £.2 a share, and hence arose this sum which I have just mentioned of £.4,562. 5s. 4d; some choosing to pay by instalments at certain periods, others paid prompt, deducting £.2 a share. That seems to me all that is necessary to say with regard to shares, excepting that the remaining number of the shares were made up in that way by new subscriptions, at £.30 shares; and the new shares, and the shares arising from the £.30,000 already mentioned, amounted to 5,542. The proprietors in the course of the succeeding years, I am speaking now of the year 1813 to the year 1815, I am now going to speak of 1814 particularly; the proprietors were very averse to raising shares at this great depreciation, and they therefore availed themselves of one of their clauses in the third act of parliament to raise money upon what they called optional loan: it was resolved to raise a sum of money upon optional loan for a particular purpose, and to the amount of about £.28,000 were paid into the treasurer's hands; that particular purpose was never carried into effect; it was some of Mr. Nash's ideas of making a reservoir in Mary-le-bone park; they could not give us the rights stipulated for, and therefore it was not carried into effect. This optional loan had this sort of privilege attached to it, that at a given day named, the proprietors were entitled either to call back their principal subscription, with five per cent. interest upon it from the day of subscription, or they might fund it in the company's stock at £.30 a share, receiving a bonus of half a share for every £.100 funded. The company in point of fact having paid a great part of this money away to satisfy the pressing demands of the iron-founders at that time, were not able to repay to the proprietors, to a considerable extent, the principal monies subscribed, but some they did pay, to the amount, I think, of about £.9,900, the others funded it, together with the interest which had accrued upon it; the particular sums are stated in the account I have referred to. They funded this loan, receiving the half share bonus which I have just described; and that still further reduced

reduced to them the cost of the share ; they actually paid for it, losing all interest, about five or six-and-twenty pounds a share ; that share was still a £.30 share. The fact is, that this £.18,000 that I speak of was amalgamated with the general capital of the company, and forms part of the £.340,556, which I have returned as the money actually received into the treasurer's hands, and expended by the company.

Then in that sum of £.340,554. 6 s. 9d. there is nothing nominal ?—Nothing whatever.

It is the actual money paid into the treasurer's chest ?—Yes ; and paid from that chest by the directors to the tradesmen. I will pledge myself that every shilling of it was paid, so that any price at which shares might have been sold can have nothing to do with the company's actual capital.

The last act, of the 53d of the King, differed from the other two acts in this respect, that it enabled you to divide your shares, that is, to divide your £.100 shares into fractional sums ?—It enabled us to raise money in shares, at such prices as the proprietors might think proper.

In the operation of that act, in the meeting which took place afterwards, that meeting decided that a part of the sum which you were entitled to raise by the former act, which did not give you that authority, they agreed should be altered from the terms of the act of 1810, and put upon the terms of 1813, namely, by making them shares of £.30 instead of £.100 ?—It had that operation ; but it was in this way that the party had the share that had been issued to him at £.100, and paid for, still remaining to him, the company of proprietors giving to that individual three new shares, he paying in a fractional sum to make up the money that four new shares would cost.

Was it not in consequence of an order of the directors of the company that the £.40,000 was apportioned among the proprietors ?—It was the act of parliament.

Was it not by an order of the court of directors of the West Middlesex water company that the remaining £.40,000 was demanded of the previous proprietors at £.100 a share ?—The directors of themselves have no power to raise shares, it was the general assembly in their half-yearly meeting ; it was to that effect certainly : a general assembly resolved that the sum authorized to be raised under the first act shall be raised : the preamble of the third act says the sum authorized to be raised by the second act has been raised, or is in the course of payment ; and that debts have been contracted which require a further sum to liquidate.

Did the general meeting of the proprietors order the sum of £.40,000 to be raised by application to the various previous subscribers at the full amount before they made the bonus which you speak of ?—Clearly ; it was considered that the proprietors then in the concern were to take their proportion of that £.40,000 ; I think that was one-fifth for every £.100.

Previous to the taking counsel's opinion they made this requisition ?—Certainly.

Then when they refused to pay, counsel's opinion was taken ?—Yes, on some of the proprietors refusing to take their proportion.

And it was after that that the general meeting gave the bonus that you alluded to just now ?—Certainly.

So that the operation stands thus, that they required the previous proprietors to subscribe the £.40,000 at the full nominal value of the shares ?—Yes, they did.

Counsel's opinion having been taken, at a further meeting they determined to apportion the bonuses alluded to in a former part of your evidence ?—Yes, they did.

Among those who had actually paid the £.30,000 ?—Yes.

You have stated in a former part of your evidence, that the depreciation of the shares occurred at the time when it was necessary to raise the £.40,000 ?—Yes.

And that the previous sum had been raised during the time that the shares were at a considerable premium ?—Yes.

Then under those circumstances there was no necessity for that bonus to the two thousand shares ?—No ; but whatever might have been done then, has nothing to do with this £.340,000.

Are there any other acts or any other authorities whatsoever, which enabled you to raise money and to establish this company, but those three acts to which you have alluded ?—None whatever.

No other power under any other act ?—None whatever.

You have stated, and very truly, that the whole sum raised by you has been within the capital sum established by the different acts of parliament, beyond which you are not to proceed ?—Certainly so.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.
(21 March.)

In short, that the whole sum raised has been £. 352,976?—Certainly.

But in your mode of dividing the interest on the capital sum, you took this on the capital, all the shares being equal?—Being £. 100 shares.

Do you apprehend that by the last act of parliament the shares are allowed to be subdivided below the sum of £. 100, but that you have power to equalize all the shares in the manner you have done with respect to your capital?—We did not equalize them.

You do in respect of your dividends?—It is a matter of internal regulation to give each of the proprietors such proportion as they may agree upon among themselves.

Are you not bound by your last act of parliament, which enables you to subdivide the shares into smaller fractional parts, to apportion the interest according to the size of the share?—No, the dividends are to be all equal.

In point of fact, in your divisions of interest which took place in the last two years to the amount of £. 28,000, you paid all that interest equally to all those 7,542 shares at the same interest?—Yes, certainly, and £. 2 a share.

Conceiving that the act entitled you so to do?—Certainly; in addition to the £. 340,564. 6s. 9d. the company conceived themselves entitled to receive five per cent. interest from the time of the different payments, as will be seen in my return, amounting to £. 113,872. 6s. making a total of principal and interest, £. 454,438. 12s. 9d; that is the sum which we call our capital.

That is made up at five per cent?—That is made up at five per cent. simple interest; and I divide that sum by 7,542 shares, which gives about £. 60 and a fraction, as the average value per share. The interest account is made up to March 1819, and I shall be able to show, that up to that time there was no surplus revenue, the expenses having consumed all the income from water rental; I therefore claim to have the shares of the West Middlesex company considered as £. 60 shares, and I claim to be allowed a fair tradesman-like profit upon that, in a concern like the waterworks, where the machinery is constantly wearing out and subject to renewal. Whatever interest is apportioned, I claim that it be apportioned upon the £. 60 shares, or upon the share valued at £. 60, and no more. The increased rates have been now in operation since Midsummer 1818, and we have received four half-yearly payments, and the fifth is now in the course of collection up to Christmas last: the proprietors up to Christmas last have declared four dividends, according to the return which I have made for the two last years. The proprietors received a dividend of £. 1. 15s. in the first year, and £. 2 the second year, upon each share, which is a £. 60 share; that has consumed the whole of the net revenue; we have not been able to make any reserve whatever for keeping up the works, or for the renewal of the works, but have divided the whole.

In the course of this period, when those dividends had been declared and paid from the 27th of July 1819, to the 7th of November 1820, had not there been outstanding bills or works going on which had required considerable sums of money to be expended on the part of the company?—There certainly has, to a small extent; perhaps £. 4,000 or £. 5,000 may in the course of that time have been expended in what I should consider new works.

But that you paid in your current expenses?—Yes, we have paid them out of the revenue.

Have you made a correct distinction between the current expenses and the extraordinary expenses during that period?—Yes, I have.

Has the amount of the extraordinary expenses during this period been considerable, and to what extent?—I can only give it in round numbers, because I have not the papers before me; I should think it is about £. 5,000.

For the two years?—For the two years; our current annual expenses are about eight thousand two or three hundred pounds per annum; that is, the poundage, coals, labourers wages, salaries, and every thing of that kind.

Have not you, within the last three or four years, paid off a debt?—No; all our debts were paid off previous to Michaelmas 1817.

Before you began to make any advance?—Certainly; we have no debt whatever.

What do you reckon to be your effective current gross income, deducting the average of bad debts and empty houses, and so on, under the new rates?—Including ordinary supply, extra supply, and every thing, £. 25,000 gross rental, from which I deduct £. 1,000 for empty houses, &c.

You estimate that it will produce you that in future years?—Yes.

Have

Have the Committee the returns of what it has produced you for the last year?—They have.

What is the amount of that?—The actual receipt on all classes of supply in 1819, amounted to £.18,422. 19s; for 1820, including £.50 for land, to £.23,333. 11s. 1d.

How do you account for the large difference in these two years?—Because in the year 1820 a greater sum has been received, being the arrears of the preceding year.

Is this sum which you stated in 1820, the actual receipts of the year?—The actual receipts of the year, paid into the treasurer's hands.

Out of which an expenditure was to be paid of £.8,200 or £.8,300?—Yes.

And you consider that the average extraordinary expense exceeds £.2,000 a year?—No, that depends on circumstances; I expect to be called on this year to lay down four or five miles of pipe.

That is an increase of capital?—Yes; the return of income which I have given in, will not enable you to judge of what profit they have made in the two last years, namely 1819 and 1820; the actual rental of 1819, exclusive of high service, is £.22,566. 15s. 7d. which I consider good; the rental of 1820 is £.22,679. 13s. 8d; the receipt will show you, that in the one year £.18,000 were received, in the other £.23,000 were received; but the sums I have now given were the actual rental of the company for those particular years, from which I deduct the £.8,000 above stated; the difference is the profit of the concern for those two years.

Why do you state £.24,000 as the present rental?—Because in the last year the high services came into collection. In addition to the current expenses of the company, amounting to £.8,200 or £.8,300, it will be indispensably necessary for the company to reserve a certain portion of that revenue to keep up the works.

What do you estimate that at?—That is an inquiry more properly belonging to the engineers.

Do you know whether there is any notion of what it is?—No; but the engineers were preparing themselves to report it to the Committee, but they were told it would not be required.

Your present current expenses include no reserve for your repairs?—Certainly not.

And you are of opinion such a reserve will, in future, be indispensably necessary?—Yes; and further I would state, that all new works for the supply of new buildings, by a special order of the board, are to be provided from new capital.

Do you mean further subscription?—Yes, if it should go to any considerable extent; we conceive it will not go to any considerable amount. The company hold in their own hands forty-two shares, and as they want new capital they will issue these shares; these were shares forfeited by individuals under the act of parliament, for default in the payment of instalments; when that fund is exhausted, it will be matter of consideration how the money is to be raised; it must be by the issue of additional shares under the last act, or on loan to be repaid when the rents shall enable them to do so. I have already stated there is a survey going on with respect to high services, that great deception is practised on us as to high service, and that I do not know half the high services which exist, and it cannot be known till the houses are examined.

You conclude there will be an improvement from that?—Yes.

To what amount you cannot say?—No; when I was examined before, in the House of Lords, I stated, and even in the report given in to the Mary-le-bone vestry so early as May 1818, (upon which report all the new rating has been founded) I stated that the high services were estimated to produce £.2,000; I have not yet got in my book more than £.1,660, and I am daily discovering them, and hearing of cases where parties, without any notice to the company, employ plumbers to make high services, giving them instructions not to tell the company.

Those new rates of course include the twenty-five per cent. and are formed upon that calculation?—Yes; twenty-five per cent. over the rates of 1810, and assuming they will all be paid; but some have sunk wells of their own, and thereby diminished the rental £.200 a year, or something like that; but that sum has been replaced by new buildings which are coming into charge.

The profit which you have stated you expected to receive, what interest would that give on the sum of £.454,438?—I recollect distinctly that in the account furnished to the House of Lords and House of Commons, a sum of money was there

Mr.
M. K. Knight.
21 March.)

put down as the reserve the company expected would be necessary to keep up and renew their works, and I think it was there stated to be £.3,000; £.3,000 or £.4,000; that of course was added to the annual charge.

Have you made any calculation what interest the profits which you have stated you expect from the rents as they at present stand would give you upon your capital of £.454,438. 12s. 9d?—Yes; about four per cent.

What interest would it give you upon the principal money without the interest?—Not quite five per cent.

That is losing all the interest for a great number of years, and getting nothing?—Yes.

That capital that you have stated includes a sum of money that was expended previous to your coming into the metropolis?—Upon that point considerable misstatement has been made, which I shall be able to show you: with regard to the capital stated to be expended before we came into the metropolis, there is a very great mis-statement; the first act enabled the company to raise £.80,000: you will find by the returns which I have given in, that up to the period of the second act, not more than £.50,000 of that money had been paid into the treasurer's hands.

How much was outstanding in debt?—I do not know; the two old engines were erected; the two reservoirs at Hammersmith were made; at Kensington the land was bought and the reservoir was in progress; the pipes at Hammersmith, Kensington and that neighbourhood were laid to an extent perhaps of ten miles, and I conceive that the whole of those works, speaking from supposition, could not cost much less than the sum I have mentioned of £.50,000; but upon the company's works coming to town the engines were found inadequate; they were competent to the original project, but were incompetent to the enlarged sphere of operation.

Were they destroyed in consequence of that?—No.

What use was made of them?—None whatever.

Are they not part of the capital of the company disposable at the present moment?—Yes; the engines have been sold, and the produce given credit for in the account. In the expenditure of the £.340,000, of course these engines form a part, but not being useful to the company after the new engines were built, they have been sold, and credit has been given and set off against the engines at the other place.

Was the loss considerable upon them?—The whole cost of the old engines and reservoirs could not exceed £.20,000.

What was lost on taking them down?—The buildings are still there, and the land is there to be sold, and it has been put up to auction, but not sold.

Then you have not given credit for the land?—No, only for the engines; the land is part of the capital now, but it is greatly depreciated in value; for instance, what cost £.20,000, would not now fetch more than one fifth part of the £.20,000, including the engines, the land and the reservoirs.

All this has become useless to the company?—Yes.

The engines have been disposed of, and you have credited the account to that amount?—Yes.

The land and houses are still on sale, and the proceeds when they are sold are available to the company?—Certainly.

But you have not credited this account for the specific value of those premises?—No; I should wish to represent to the Committee that the cost of those engines was fairly incurred; they were engines erected by Mr. Nicholson, and they were adequate to supply Hammersmith, Kensington and that neighbourhood, but they became useless when we enlarged our sphere of operations under the new act.

It has been said, that you had originally a large main, which afterwards proving unfit for your purpose, was taken up and another put down?—That is not true; that main is now in use.

In point of fact, as to the reservoirs for your original undertaking, would you have constructed them for the works that now apply to the metropolis?—No, not the two that I allude to; we had another, purchased with the money raised by the first act, which is now supplying the town, that at Kensington; I have taken into the account all that portion of the work which was originally intended to supply the district, but which has since become useless, inoperative in short.

To what amount do you give that, including that which is not sold?—£.20,000.

That includes the whole?—Yes.

That was the original cost of it?—Yes.

The company will not realize that?—No; we have realized £.1,000 for the engines

engines sold, and we have estimated the land and the buildings to be worth perhaps £. 4,000 ; that would make a loss of £. 15,000.

In what way do you consider that that £. 15,000 can enter into the calculation of any capital of which the public is now profiting?—I do consider that it ought fairly to be taken into the account, because it was fairly and justly expended for a supply of a portion of the company's district ; it was expended for a legitimate object ; and in every great work of this description, particularly in one that is begun upon a new principle, as they proceed they are constantly finding that some improvements may be made ; money is expended in one operation, which, by a subsequent improvement, is found to be useless ; and I have never yet viewed money so expended as money improperly expended ; but that it is liable to a fair claim of the company for a return upon that capital, it having been fairly and *bonâ fide* expended for a proper purpose.

At what period was it that you had more extensive views of supply, which made these original works useless and inadequate for the views or purposes of the company?—1809. The company, under the powers granted to them by their first act, in which, after enumerating certain places and parishes, the words "parts adjacent," are added, conceived, and to this hour believe, that they were legally empowered to carry their works throughout Paddington and Mary-le-bone, these being the places adjacent to the parishes specifically mentioned ; that acting on that belief they had formed their reservoir at Kensington, and had brought their main to London, and were proceeding to supply Paddington and part of Mary-le-bone as a matter of right and not as a matter of favour. In 1809 that led to the question, (and I think this material, because a great deal has been said, and papers put in to rebut something which I should here like to speak upon,) that led to the objection made by the Mary-le-bone vestry, which has been stated, with regard to taking up pavements in 1809.

In point of fact, the views of the company could not have extended to a more extensive district, and consequently to more extensive works, previous to the year 1809?—No ; only so far as regards Mary-le-bone and Paddington.

Had the company any definite views of extending their concern beyond the necessity of those two original reservoirs, and the works attached to them, previous to the end of the year 1809?—Certainly they had ; and they formed their upper reservoir at Kensington precisely with that view.

That was in 1809?—That was in 1809.

But previous to the end of the year 1809, had they any views of extending it?—Yes, they had, to the parts I mention ; the views of the company originally were, to have two twenty-horse engines at Hammersmith, two reservoirs at Hammersmith, and the upper reservoir at Kensington, for the purpose of supplying the district which they considered they were legally entitled to supply under their first act, and that includes Hammersmith, Kensington, Paddington and part of Mary-le-bone ; the works were constructed for that particular purpose ; and certainly beyond that they did not, previous to 1809, contemplate a supply ; but those works were considered adequate for that particular purpose ; but when they obtained their bill to take the several parishes in London which are enumerated in that bill, these two engines would not be adequate for that extended supply ; they then erected their large engines upon the banks of the Thames, two seventy-horse power engines, disused the two twenty-horse engines, together with the two small reservoirs connected with them, and pumped at once for their whole district, Hammersmith and Kensington included, into their Kensington reservoir, and from thence into town.

If the Committee understand you rightly, these were two distinct speculations, up to the year 1810 ; the original works were equal to the original intention of the company ; subsequently their views became more enlarged, and they increased their concern?—Yes, they did.

In that view of the case, was any profit realized on the expenditure previous to the year 1810?—None had been realized certainly ; the works were not opened till I believe, the end of the year 1810. It has been stated that the company had at that time six years experience as a water company. I think the Kensington reservoir was opened in the month of November 1810, at a meeting at which Mr. Byng presided ; the first rental the company acquired was in 1811, where it appears we received a small sum, about £. 280.

Then on what principle do you charge interest on the preceding years?—The works were forming.

Mr.

M. K. Knight.

(21 March.)

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(21 March.)

In point of fact, you have stated that in the contemplation of serving Mary-le-bone, these original works were constructed, and which you have stated were adequate for the service to be performed; at the present period you only serve a part of Mary-le-bone, and yet these works have been considerably enlarged in order to make them capable of such supply?—That was precisely what misled the company; they were informed that that reservoir at Kensington would hold water for the supply of 40,000 houses; that the whole of their district mentioned in the second bill the parishes that would have extended the works to Gray's-inn-lane and Temple-bar; that the whole works necessary could be constructed for £. 150,000, in addition to the £. 80,000 mentioned in the first act; that was stated by Mr. Ralph Walker; I have Mr. Walker's original estimate now before me, and that estimate is given at length, as all engineers estimates are, so many yards of pipe at so much a yard. The Committee will find, that before we had covered Mary-le-bone alone, we had spent almost twice that sum, and we had only then covered about one-fifth of the district contemplated; and we now find, and have found from the experience from 1810 downwards, that our supply takes fourteen or fifteen hours a day (according to the returns,) of the two seventy-horse power engines to supply Mary-le-bone and Pancras, and the small district we have besides, comprising altogether 10,000 houses: the Committee will at once see the inference to be drawn from this; the company have been charged with being speculators, and called various harsh names, and great astonishment has been expressed that they should be so deluded: who could they inquire of but their engineers? The directors say, if we can get 40,000 houses for £. 150,000, the average rate is so and so, and we can supply at cheaper rates, and still derive an adequate profit.

Then you were, in point of fact, deceived by your engineer?—Yes. The Committee will allow me further to state, as to the delusion the West Middlesex were under. Mr. Dodd was the projector, and he was employed for the first year; he was refractory, and disputes arose where the works should be, which caused delay, and ended in the dismissal of Mr. Dodd before a brick was laid. I believe in the original plan suggested by Mr. Dodd, they were to have these two reservoirs at Hammersmith, to give particularly fine water; that the tide should flow into them, and then filter. With regard to the main which was laid down in 1809, and the reservoir which was constructed in 1809, they are now daily in operation for the supply of part of Mary-le-bone and Paddington, doing their proper services.

Are you enabled to state what the expenditure of the company on the last reservoir at Kensington amounted to?—No, I never made any calculation of that; I have an account of buildings, engines and reservoirs, and that sum altogether amounts to £. 54,511.

Is that including the £. 20,000, of which you have before spoken?—Yes; and also including the two seventy-horse engines which are now in use.

Can you state what number of the original proprietors still continue members of the company?—About 176.

Out of how many?—Out of about 350. I include the second act as well as the first; I include all the proprietors of shares at £. 100 each: in the first act there were only seventy subscribers; these were men of fortune, living in the district, and builders and people of that description, and not city speculators, for there are only thirteen that live in the city.

Would your books enable you to show how many of the original subscribers remained members of the company at any given period; for instance, at the termination of three, four or five years after the commencement?—I think that they would, but it really would take a great deal of time; there is no doubt that they would, but it would certainly take a great deal of time to furnish the Committee with it.

How long ago was it since you made this enumeration of the proprietors?—About two years ago.

Do you think the variation has been material since that?—No, I think not.

Do you mean that the proprietors of shares of £. 100 each amounted to 350 originally?—No; but I never counted them; 350 is the number of the present body.

Can you state what proportion of the original subscribers under the first or second act, at £. 100 each, now remain on the books?—I will furnish the Committee on Friday next, if I can, (and I feel a moral certainty that I can) with a list of the precise individuals, striking out those names that have sold their shares since that book was printed, which was several years ago, leaving the names of the others in print; there are at least a hundred new names.

Have

Have you kept any distinct account in your books of the expense incurred by the removal of pipes or mains at the period of the partition?—That account can be made out; we have not kept any distinct account, but it is very trifling; it cannot exceed £.2,000; not so much I should think as £.1,000.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.
(21 March.)

Veneris, 23^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,
IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Matthias Koops Knight, again called in; and Examined.

I BEG to state, that with regard to the £.40,000 stock, which we technically call parliamentary capital, remaining upon the two first acts, a subscriber of £.100 received in the first instance one share for his £.100, but afterwards, in consequence of the depreciation, he received two shares more without any payment, and a further share on the payment of £.12, so that he received four shares, at £.28 each, for £.112 paid into the treasurer's hands.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.
(23 March.)

That is £.12 in addition to the £.100 that he originally paid?—Yes.

What do you mean by saying in your last answer that this was allowed in consequence of the depreciation?—When this £.40,000 was called for, the shares had fallen to a discount of £.65 per cent.

That is, they were selling at £.35 in the market?—Yes.

Previous to the passing of the act of 1813, counsel's opinion had been given that the old proprietors were compelled to subscribe to the £.40,000 remaining?—That is my impression; I have never seen the opinion; I will look for it, and see whether it is in existence.

That opinion was given previous to the introduction of the new bill to Parliament?—I apprehend so.

When did the general meeting of the proprietors take place, which entered into those resolutions?—The 1st of September 1812.

Are there any records of the resolutions passed at that meeting?—These are copies of them.

[They were delivered in.]

Was there any communication made, previously to the arrangement which took place at this meeting, to the original subscribers to the 2,000 shares?—None.

They were not consulted previously?—It was the proprietors who did it.

Do you happen to know whether the bill of 1813 was framed in the contemplation of affording this relief to them?—I cannot possibly enter into the motives at that time; I was not then secretary.

Had it any reference to their power of raising money by the former bills?—The preamble of the bill, I apprehend, will state what it was passed for.

Mr. William Matthew Coe, again called in; and Examined.

WHAT number of houses do the Grand Junction serve in Mary-le-bone?—1,387.

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

Can you state what is the capital of the Grand Junction company?—There are two acts of parliament, one of the 51 Geo. 3, and the second bill received the Royal assent the 25th March 1816; and the original Canal act, which first obtained the power of service of water, was the 38th of Geo. 3.

What did the first act empower you to raise?—The first act empowered us to raise £.300,000.

What was raised?—We raised of that £.150,000.

At how much a share?—£.50 for a £.50 share.

At par?—At par; three thousand shares at £.50 a share; and in June 1816, subsequent to our second act, which passed in March 1816, fifteen hundred additional shares were raised at £.25 a share.

Was that £.25 a share expressed at that rate in the act?—The circumstances were these: when we were about to raise further money under the first act, the shares were very much depreciated, and it was a consideration at a general meeting of the proprietors, whether they could raise, under their original act, £.50 shares at £.25; that

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(23 March.)

is, whether if the share was sold at £.25, the person taking the share would not be liable to all the calls upon it to the extent of £.50, and whether it would be legal for the company at any time hereafter to allow a person taking a share under the first act, interest on £.50, he only having paid £.25; and when it was proposed at this general meeting that shares should be taken in that way, there happened to be two or three legal gentlemen at the meeting of our proprietors, who started this objection; they gave an opinion that any persons taking a share of £.25, the subsequent proprietors might come in and compel them to pay up all the calls to the extent of £.50, the consequence was that no person would take a share, and the meeting came to a resolution to apply to Parliament to enable them to raise £.50 shares, and sell them for what they could obtain; that occasioned the application to Parliament for the second act, and after that act had passed, at a subsequent general meeting that was held, 1,500 additional shares were created under that second act; our first act gave us the power of raising £.50 shares, and the second act enabled us to raise shares at not less than £.10 nor exceeding £.50; these additional shares were all taken up by the original proprietors, at £.25 a share, although they were selling at the time in the market at £.23.

All by the original proprietors?—Yes; a loan had been raised previous to the passing of this act, and that loan was liquidated by those shares after the act passed.

You had no new subscribers at the £.25?—No, there were some few persons who had sold their optional loan notes, and I believe that introduced one new subscriber.

What did you raise by those shares?—We raised by those shares £.37,500.

Giving them a right to an equal interest with those who paid the £.50?—Yes, which I believe this act directs, making a total of £.187,500; that is all the money that has been raised.

That is your principal capital?—Yes.

Is that sum the sum which you exhibit to the Committee as the capital now claimed by the company, or have you any addition to make to it, and in what respect?—We claim interest upon that sum from the periods at which the money was raised.

Have you any account of that interest with you?—Yes, I have; it amounts to £.52,670. 16s. making the total capital £.240,170. 16s; the interest is calculated to the 31st March 1819.

Your interest is calculated upon the sums from the date of their subscription and payment into the treasurer's hands?—Yes.

Can you proceed to show the Committee how your proprietors will be effected by the increased rates as to interest upon that capital?—I am not quite prepared upon that point, certainly.

Was that whole sum received and employed in your works?—Wholly.

Was there any sum laid out at interest in the manner Mr. Knight described in the original progress of the concern?—We hardly called for money till it was wanted.

Have you a statement of the yearly receipts?—Yes, that has been delivered in; in the return that has been made I have given also the years in which the money has been raised, and that money has been raised only as it has been wanted.

Have you a detailed expense account of the manner in which that money was applied to your works?—I have that detailed account up to the 31st March 1819, calculated with interest.

Is it in a state to be exhibited to the Committee now?—I can state what it was, I can give the items.

There appears upon the face of your account of expenditure the sum of £.10,810 incurred for stone pipes, those are not now in use are they?—No, they are not.

Do you introduce them, in point of fact, into your present capital, for which you claim a remuneration?—That is brought into the charge against the capital as appearing like an expenditure, it stands upon our books apparently as a loss sustained, by the arrangement of the stone pipe company; the account between us and the stone pipe company was somewhere about £.33,000, or between that and £.34,000; the charge for stone pipes and all the incidental expenses attendant upon them, laying and carting, amounted to £.33,790; and this was the account as it stood at the period that the stone pipes failed, not having sufficient power to stand the pressure of the works, and finding we could not any longer use them, the company called upon the stone pipe company for a reimbursement of all the sums of money paid to them, and also for the expenses that had been incidental to the stone pipes; various communications took place, and conferences with the stone pipe company and the

Mr.
W. M. Coc.

(23 March.)

court of directors upon this subject, and the stone pipe company put it to the body of the proprietors whether, as there had been a material difference in the price of iron pipes at the time the company first contracted for the stone pipes, and the actual cost of iron pipes at the time when the stone pipes failed, they ought not to be allowed that difference? and the board of directors considering all the circumstances of the case, that the company had been induced to use the stone pipes, considering it a purer conduit than any thing before laid down, there being a strong prejudice at that time against the use of iron that they were induced to adopt stone, certainly under very strong evidence of Mr. Rennie, on another bill, that they would stand the pressure required, and that the stone pipe company had incurred very heavy expenses; under these circumstances they did consider that it was very fair to allow the stone pipe company this difference in the account.

What did they allow them?—We received from the stone pipe company £. 22,985.

Was that difference more than equivalent to the difference which the fall of iron had made in the actual cost of the iron pipes you subsequently put down, to what they would have cost you if you had bought them in the first instance?—About the time that we were contracting for the stone pipes, iron was from £. 12. 10s. to £. 13 a ton; when we actually made our contracts for them, they were from about £. 9. 15s. to £. 10 a ton, but then there were a variety of other articles which we got in exchange, a number of iron pipes which had been connected with the stone pipes where branches could not be made, which were returned to us by the stone pipe company, and which we use in our present works; and therefore the directors considered that they had got a fair sum.

You considered that there was that amount saved to the company in their outlay?—Certainly.

Consequently saved in the amount of your whole expense account?—Certainly; but we could not strike it off the books, because it appeared to stand as a loss.

Are you able to state to the Committee what number of your original proprietors remain proprietors at this day?—I think I can.

And have been so ever since the beginning of the concern?—I think there are named in the first act sixty proprietors; of those sixty, eight-and-twenty have sold their shares and never returned to the company, never purchased in again; twenty-one of those persons are with the company to the present day, and have all of them considerably increased their property in the concern instead of diminishing it, because they have taken the additional shares, and shares which were also selling by the stone pipe company; eight persons of the stone pipe company, who were obliged to sell their shares, and three of the proprietors died; I believe that makes the sixty.

You stated that upon the increase of capital of the shares reduced to £. 25, the original proprietors took them all?—Yes, there were some loan optional notes issued before those shares were created, and some few of the holders sold them to others, and I believe one person was new to the company: when the stone pipe company paid us this money, they had, I conclude, no other means of paying it but by shares, and the company found them purchasers; that was the only difference; the stone pipe company instead of selling their shares to any individuals they could find, and paying us the money, the company found them purchasers; the stone pipe company surrendered 917 shares, and those shares were sold to such of the then existing proprietors as chose to take them, and new proprietors were admitted also by those shares.

At the market rate?—At the market rate.

Did those shares stand in the name of the stone pipe company as a body corporate?—No, of the individuals of that company; they were not a body corporate, only partners.

That was the only way in which you obtained payment of the £. 22,000?—Yes; it is just the same as if the stone pipe company had gone into the market and found purchasers, and came to us and paid the money.

Those 917 shares stood in the names of eight persons only?—No, those 917 shares stood in the names of twelve persons.

You raised £. 150,000, £. 50 shares; then you raised £. 37,500 by £. 25 shares; did your own company produce that?—Yes.

Was that equally partitioned between the whole proprietors?—A loan had been raised in 1814 to the amount of £. 18,314, and when these new shares were created, those loan-holders were to have the option of converting this loan into capital if they pleased by the act; a vast number of them did so, by far the greater proportion of those

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(23 March.)

those loan-holders converted their loan into stock, and the remaining shares were to be divided among the proprietors, in proportion to the number that they then held, and the offer was made, of course, to every proprietor, whether he would take his proportion, and those who took them had them, and if any refused then another division was made among the other proprietors who chose to take more than their proportion, so that the whole were taken by the company.

The whole of this transaction was at the rate of £. 25?—Yes.

Those holders of the loan of £. 18,314 were distinct from the proprietors?—No, they were proprietors; we raised the money among the proprietors.

Then your whole number of shares is what?—4,500. It was stated at the general meeting that £. 25 per share was too high a price to issue them at, because they could get them at £. 23 in the market, but the proprietors had a good opinion of the concern, and they did not choose to let them be hawked about at a reduced price.

What interpretation did the directors put upon the acts of parliament affecting the Grand Junction company, as to raising a capital stock beyond the amount of the real stock mentioned in the act?—I do not think it ever entered into their contemplation, because we had not raised to the amount we had power to raise.

Your second act allowed you to divide your shares, which the first act did not?—Yes, it gave us a power to divide shares into smaller fractions.

In the apportionment of dividends you have considered all those shares as equal shares?—Yes; or we could have got no purchasers.

And have you made any calculation as to the value of those shares, in order to affix a rate of interest upon them?—Divide the capital and the interest by the number of shares, will make it about £. 55 per share.

What is the expense you have been put to in resisting the attempts that have been made for the institution of new companies, or in the apprehension of such attempts?—I think somewhere about £. 1,000; but that does not come into our charge here.

You have been put to an expense?—Yes, by the bill of 1819, I think about £. 1,000.

You do not claim any remuneration for that from the public?—It is not in the account.

In what way have the expenses been paid on account of Mary-le-bone parish in their attempt to obtain the last act of parliament?—I do not know that I can answer that; I imagine it was paid by the Mary-le-bone vestry.

Perhaps on a future day you can ascertain the fact?—I do not know.

(Mr. Weale.)—I was one of the opposing parties, and it cost me about 7 s. out of my own pocket.

Mr. Thomas Nelson Pickering, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
T. N. Pickering.

UNDER what authority does your company rest with regard to the raising money and capital?—The first act of parliament was 47 Geo. 3, c. 72, in 1807.

The only act under which you carry on your proceedings is that act?—And another act of the 48 Geo. 3, c. 8.

Those are the only two acts under which you raise money?—Yes.

Those acts were in 1807 and 1808?—Yes.

What was the amount that those acts authorized you to raise?—£. 380,000, (by the first act, £. 60,000 and £. 40,000; by the second act, £. 130,000 and £. 150,000,) raised in shares of £. 100 each, except on a small part of the shares upon which a loss accrued of about £. 4,841; that was occasioned by some of the proprietors who did not pay up on their shares; these shares became forfeited, and they were sold at a depreciation; there was a loss upon them, so that the sum was diminished by £. 4,841, which makes the return of £. 375,159 actually paid in.

The whole of those were paid at 3,800 shares?—Yes.

You have no power or authority in your act to divide those shares in any way whatever, to raise them upon any other terms, but *bonâ fide* £. 100 for each share?—Certainly not.

There has been no dividend made since February 1820; how is that, when by the statement before the Committee it appears that, deducting the poundage to your collectors, which is £. 1,670, at five per cent. upon the gross, deducting the £. 11,000 current expense, there remains £. 22,591, so that more than five per cent. upon the 3,800 shares might be divided?—From the large expense we have been at in increasing our mains and services we are now in debt, for money borrowed, £. 24,000 besides; there has been a great loss in the collection of the rates; the whole of the rate has not been collected.

Have

Have there been any attempts to institute new waterworks in your district?—
We have heard of something of the sort.

Do you know whether parishes have been put to an expense in consequence of that?—No.

Mr.
T. N. Pickering.
(23 March.)

Lunæ, 26^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. William Matthew Coe, again called in; and Examined.

WITH regard to the state of the direction of our company, there have been of the original directors three in office ten years, one nine years, one eight years, four seven years, and one six years, making the ten directors. There have been but nine other gentlemen in the direction; two were of the stone pipe company, and were obliged to resign; three were supposed to be particular friends of the stone pipe company, and resigned from the feeling that prevailed against them on the part of the proprietors; one resigned from the pressure of his private affairs; one resigned from ill health, and two died.

Mr.
W. M. Coe.

(26 March.)

(*Mr. Knight.*)—In my last examination the Committee will recollect I stated that not expecting to be examined that day, I was not sufficiently prepared to go into so full an explanation of the early proceedings of the company as I wished; that I had not brought my papers, and that what I might then state must be understood as subject to correction. I have since read my evidence over, and I find I was mistaken in two or three dates and sums; I do not know whether they are material: I have stated that Mr. Dodd was dismissed in 1808, that was two years after the bill passed; I find Mr. Dodd was dismissed in December 1806; that he had originally proposed the establishment of the works at Hammersmith, and had formed his estimate for those works; that after the bill passed, he altered his mind, and wanted to have them established at Poole's-Creek, somewhere near Fulham, in a very disadvantageous situation as it was considered by the proprietors, and they therefore questioned Mr. Dodd, and as he was very refractory he was dismissed; Mr. Nicholson was then appointed, and he formed the works at Hammersmith, nearly on the plan Mr. Dodd had laid down. This was the beginning of 1807 when Mr. Nicholson was called in. In the course of 1807 and 1808 the works were in progress; in 1808 Mr. Nicholson suggested a new project, that was the extension of the pipes to the north-west of Mary-le-bone and Paddington, and he gave in his estimate for that particular part, and I have an extract from his report at that particular time, and I wish particularly to call the attention of the Committee to these words, because it will explain what I meant the other day when I stated the company intended to supply Paddington and Mary-le-bone as a matter of right under the first act. I find a question put by the directors to Mr. Nicholson was, "What may be the demand for water in Paddington and its vicinity?" he then reported, "that the mains were laid from the New River company, and from the Chelsea company, in that part of Mary-le-bone which lies in the angle between Oxford-street and the Edgware-road, and that the Chelsea supply went as far into Southampton-row as Chapel-street, the New River supply extending no further along the New-road than Quebec-street; the houses which are not served by either of those companies, namely, at the north-west corner, are upwards of 1,200, which may be taken at the average rent of 30s. making in the whole a rental of £.1,800 annually; the buildings in progress and to be erected to the eastward of Gloucester-place may be stated at 750 large houses with stabling, and 250 smaller, averaging respectively 40s. and 30s. making an additional rental of £.1,875." He then alluded to the Portman estate, which had then been laid out for building, and various other places that he had seen, and which places were wholly unsupplied with water at that time; the estimate for this work was £.11,309; that included the new reservoir at Kensington, and the ten-inch main to London; that reservoir was made, and that main was brought to London in 1809, and upon these pipes being laid, arose the question with the Mary-le-bone vestry as to pavements; the estimate for supplying those 2,200 houses amounted to £.11,309; that the estimated rental from those houses was £.3,675 a year; he put down the

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(26 March.)

expenses at £.1,200 a year, leaving a profit of £.2,475 a year. I mention this to show to what extent the works in 1808 and 1809 were intended to go; not to go into competition with the old companies, but to supply the houses at the extremity of their works, and to which their plans had not extended. I will just notice here, that I find in the minutes of that period a scale of rating laid down, and as it was entirely upon a new principle, the Committee will at once see they did not begin their works with an idea of underselling the old companies; it is put down so explicitly, the thing explains itself:—

“ May 1809:—The board resolved, that houses should be rated a shilling in the pound if they were rated in the parish books at £.30 a year or under, and nine pence in the pound if they were larger,” which, in point of fact, is a higher rate than the rates of 1820. It has been stated that the new companies, the West Middlesex especially, was established on a principle of fraud; that the proprietors were a set of speculators, who although they knew the concern could not possibly answer, yet went on raising money and laying pipes, for the sole purpose of raising shares; this has been repeated so often in the course of the late proceedings at public meetings, and in the various publications circulated, that I myself could not altogether divest myself of the belief, that although part of it was certainly untrue, yet that Mr. Weale would not have ventured to express himself so strongly on such points, without some grounds for his assertion. That feeling made me examine the proceedings of the company at the period alluded to, with more than ordinary industry and care (for I was not myself in office till four years afterwards,) and the result of my research has been, that a more unfounded assertion was never thrown on any man or body of men. In addition to what I stated before, I have merely to add, that at the period of 1809 and 1810, the act of parliament which brought the company to London in competition with the old companies, was obtained on most unquestionable evidence, that a great want of water existed in many parts of the town; an evil which the old companies, without a great outlay of capital which be it remembered they had no means of raising) could not remedy, to say nothing of the general insufficiency, or as Mr. Weale has been pleased to say, the “ general economy,” which the use of that necessary article at that time required. To suppose for a moment that these complaints were for the most part groundless, as asserted by Mr. Weale, is, in my opinion, a libel on the legislature, who at that period passed acts of parliament for the establishment of no less than three new water companies, in the preamble of every one of which I believe the evils I have mentioned are stated as the sole ground for their establishment; not one word about cheapness of supply being to be found in either of them; that is my belief; I am sure it is not in ours; this I believe is sufficient to show the “ fraudulent principle” on which, on the authority of Mr. Weale, you are to believe the new companies were formed. Now with regard to the “ knowledge” possessed by the proprietors at that time, that the concern would not possibly succeed, I conceive the charge is too ludicrous to need a serious comment. I stated on a former day what was the engineer’s estimate for the works alleged to be necessary for the establishment of the West Middlesex waterworks in the supply of the several London parishes enumerated in the act of 1810, and also what expectation had been formed of the number of houses which might be obtained; but as I am now upon this particular part of our case, I will shortly state it, as being more in order: by the first act we were enabled to raise £.80,000, by the second act we were enabled to raise £.160,000, making the capital £.240,000. Under the first act the reservoir at Kensington had been formed, and pipes brought to the new buildings at the north-west corner of Mary-le-bone, namely, Gloucester-place, &c. The estimate for the works contemplated in the second act amounted to £.157,000, and the number of houses to be supplied were computed at 40,000, averaging from 25 s. to 30 s. a house, which gives a gross rental of £.50,000 or £.60,000 a year on a capital of £.240,000. That was the statement made to the proprietors by their engineers; on such a statement, who could doubt that the old companies made immense profits? especially as at that time the New River shares (generally believed to have been originally £.100 shares) were selling at £.10,000 and £.12,000 a-piece. It has been sufficiently in evidence before this Committee, in what gross delusion the public was in this respect in 1810; and how were the unfortunate proprietors of the new companies to escape this delusion more than their neighbours? I have mentioned these circumstances to show that the proprietors were not the deluders on that occasion; they were the deluded; and that therefore they could not possibly know that they could not succeed; on the contrary, they had every expectation of deriving a very considerable

considerable profit from their works. The fact simply appears to be this; that in 1810 the engineers and proprietors of the new companies were theorists, who laughed at the practical men, the old companies, and suspected them of unfair practices: in 1820 the theorists of 1810, though they have now become the practical men, have found to their cost the difference between reality and illusion; but though they give the most unequivocal testimony of this, Mr. Weale and his party (the theorists of 1820,) ridicule the theorists of 1810, since converted into practical men, and persist in maintaining that the water can be supplied at a cheaper rate. With regard to the shares, I have been particularly circumspect in the examination of the memorials of transfer, (that is the title which we give them,) and have ascertained that the 2,000 shares which were in existence in 1812, and which were all £.100 shares, were held by 224 individuals; of whom have since sold, at very considerable loss, 84 individuals, leaving 140 of the original proprietors still in the concern, holding the same shares; of the 140, 79 have never sold any of their shares, 61 have sold a part; then, of the 140 still in, 105 took their proportion of that £.40,000, and paid upon it; three took their proportion, and paid a part, but afterwards forfeited; 32 did not take their proportion, from death, absence and poverty; there were nine deaths and two bankruptcies; the others refused; and 97 of the 140 proprietors before mentioned, were contributors to the new stock, at £.30 a share. This account is made up to the 10th of December 1820; here are all the names, which the Committee are very welcome to see.

What is the number of proprietors now?—350, within five, more or less; but since the new shares have been created, of course they have been subdivided; there are 350 shareholders now, 140 of whom are original proprietors, at £.100 shares.

Do you know what number of shares are in their hands now?—I do not know the number of shares, but I should think by far the greater proportion. I take the concern now, with regard to the rise and fall of shares, from the commencement. In May 1806, when the first subscription was paid in, till November 1808, the shares uniformly were transferred at par; namely, £.100 a-piece; there had been no fluctuation, consequently there could be no speculation: the first premium that I find is in November 1808, when they began to talk about bringing their pipes to that north-west corner of Mary-le-bone, and that raised them to a premium of £.8; and they rose from £.8 to £.20 premium between November 1808 and September 1809.

Was that whilst you were in progress with the second bill?—No, before the second bill: then came the second bill: notices were given, and application was made to Parliament in the spring of 1810; the shares then gradually rose to the premium of £.45, till March 1810; at this period the whole 800 shares had been raised, which were authorized to be raised by the first act. When the application was made to Parliament for the extended powers, it was intended to appropriate to the old proprietors (the holders of the 800 shares,) all the new shares to be raised under the second act; and as the shares were then selling at a premium in the market of £.45, it evidently became a great object of the proprietors to possess themselves of those shares, which would give them the privilege of taking a proportion of those new shares; hence arose a sudden rise of the stock from April to June; and they rose in those three months, the demand being so great, from £.45 premium to £.125 premium. As that particular period is of course the period which I conceive has been alluded to by all parties as the period of the great advance of shares, I have been particular in taking out the names of the parties who bought and sold during those months; I have ascertained whether they were transferred once or twice, and I can dissect them entirely; I have taken all the transfers from April to June 1810, and the premiums rose to £.60, £.70, £.80, £.90, £.100, £.110, £.120, £.125, and then it stopped; the bill then passed, and the new appropriation was made. Now the transfers of that particular period require explanation, and I give it in this way: there were then about 180 holders of the original 800 shares; of those only 28 were the sellers on this occasion; 15 sold out entirely, and never came into the concern again, and 13 sold out a part; the number of shares actually transferred (for they were transferred in ones, in twos, in threes, and so on) only amounted to 122, which were bought by thirty new individuals; it appears that there were not more than 20 shares, during this great demand in the market, and the consequent great rise in the stock from forty guineas to one hundred and twenty-five, transferred twice; of course in a rising market every body is anxious to get in. At that time there were only three people who bought in at the beginning

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(26 March.)

Mr.
M. K. Knight.
(26 March.)

of the advance, and sold out at the high premium, and left the concern; the first was a man of the name of Wormsley, of whom I never heard before; he bought five shares at £.42, and sold them at £.87; and there are two other individuals, whose names I do not know, who bought in the same way and sold out, and I have never heard of them since; thus, about twenty of the number transferred were transferred twice, which would diminish the number of shares actually transferred to about 100.

Had those three speculating individuals any thing to do with the conduct or management of the concerns of the company?—No, they were quite strangers; of the thirty buyers at that high price, namely, from £.40 to £.125, thirteen are now in our concern as proprietors, our chairman and his partner being two, and there were several other gentlemen who were in at that time, and bought in to get a larger share of the concern; there were two sold at a low price when the advance first began, and afterwards bought in again at a higher price to their great loss; three bought low and sold high, and the remainder of the thirty have since sold out at a loss. Now I have the most complete proof that the reason that I have assigned for this sudden advance of shares is the correct one; the act passed, I believe, in June or July 1810, the act allowing of this additional sum of £.160,000 to be raised; the very instant the act was passed, the shares came down to their level of forty-five per cent. premium. I find from June 1810 to July 1810 there were no transfers at all: immediately the allotment took place, and the 1,200 new shares were issued, the shares stood in the market at £.45 premium, old and new; and in the course of the following year they fell from that £.45 premium to par, namely £.100 a-piece, in a regular gradual descent; from June 1811 to December 1812, the shares continued in a regular depression from par to £.65 discount, which was the price when all the questions arose with regard to the £.40,000 capital discussed the other day, and the optional loan. I have the resolutions on that subject, which being put in, will explain the thing better than I can in my testimony. Then in 1813 came the third act; and to induce the then existing holders to take the whole of the new shares to be raised, some boon was necessarily held out; the proprietors would not give more than they could purchase them for, and £.30 being the price fixed on, £.74,000 was raised in 1813 at £.30 a share, which, as well as the £.100 shares previously raised, in the course of that year down to the years 1815 and 1816 were as regularly depressed as from five to four, three, two and one, till they came down to £.22. 10s. and one individual, who was a director, from some circumstances it is not necessary to mention, sold his sixty shares to one individual in one transfer at £.20 a share, which was the lowest; this sale was some time about 1815; then after they had got to that minimum, they were stationary for some time, I think very nearly a year, and I am speaking now more from memory, it being entirely during my own time in office; about a year, I think, they remained at that depressed state, viz. £.22, till towards the close of the years 1816 or 1817, when they raised a further sum of £.24,000, at £.30 shares, (the shares having in the mean time gradually ascended to that price,) to pay off a debt; that makes the whole raised under that act.

State the sums that were raised under the act of 1813?—£.74,000; £.24,000 in 1816, and the £.40,000 which completed the £.240,000; of this sum £.30,000 was paid in and funded in shares at £.28 a share. I have the resolutions here, which I will put in, and they will show the whole transactions; the company were disappointed in one session of Parliament on a point of form.

Though that resolution was in the year prior to passing your bill, that same bill was pending at the time the resolution was taken, was it not, but was defeated in that session by a formal objection?—It was.

Then the actual transaction of funding them took place when?—In 1813, the resolution having passed the first of September 1812. By the optional loan the sum funded was £.18,496, and £.2,418 is the amount of the fractional sums paid on the funding of that loan and of the £.30,073 parliamentary capital.

What was that funded at?—At £.28.

What is the total raised under all the acts?—£.340,000; that being the sum, after deducting from the money actually subscribed, the £.12,000 dividend and the £.4,000 interest. In the subsequent period, (subsequent to 1816) when the shares were raised at £.30, the shares gradually increased up to £.54, which was their maximum when Mr. Taylor's bill was in Parliament; but they have since been depressed down to £.49. I should state also, that the 140 proprietors have

been

been the largest contributors of the £. 30 stock; they have been uniformly the great supporters of the concern.

In point of fact, the shares were at a premium before all the instalments were paid up?—No, the first shares were all at par; so that if £. 50 had been paid on a share, it sold for £. 50; and they stood at par two years and a half, without any fluctuation in price.

Were they at par in the market before the instalments were paid up?—Yes; because on the passing of the act, as soon as the allotment was made, and the original proprietor had paid his ten per cent. on the new, he could go into the market, if he thought it necessary, and sell his share.

At what period was the whole subscription paid up?—In the course of a year and a half, I suppose.

In point of fact, were not the first 800 shares at a premium before the instalments were paid up?—Those 800 shares were raised at three different periods; and to the first period I should say no, but the second period might include the £. 8 premium.

Notwithstanding any premiums, were the instalments all paid up ultimately?—Certainly, every shilling; as well for the 800 as the 1,200, except in the instance of a broker, who speculated and was ruined.

In point of fact, before the shares obtained their maximum, dividends had been paid out of the capital?—No, the dividends were paid afterwards; I do not know their motives that induced them to declare a dividend; but when they brought their pipes to London, it appears to me they went on the principle of the West India docks, and declared a dividend in the first instance, in order that they should not have an interest account opened with the proprietors, to be afterwards liquidated when profits were realized.

Did your company support or oppose Mr. Taylor's bill?—The companies acceded to it; it was forced upon us.

Ultimately, did they or did they not wish it to be passed?—Yes, though merely for peace sake.

In point of fact, they did wish it?—I should say not; no farther than it was likely to calm the disputes.

They did wish it, in point of fact?—Yes.

Do you know the expense the company have been put to in consequence of the opposition made to them?—I apprehend about £. 2,000.

Was any management or contrivance ever resorted to by the companies to raise or fall the stock for the purpose of jobbing?—I can most unequivocally assert, in my time nothing of the sort, but precisely the reverse conduct.

Have your directors practised any jobbing in shares for themselves?—Never.

Have those who have subscribed for original shares or purchased them, or purchased stock, gained or lost very considerably?—Lost very considerably; many proprietors were buyers at £. 125, shares which will not produce them now £. 50 in the market; there is a gentleman who has been in the board eleven years, holds six-and-thirty shares, which he bought at £. 100 and upwards.

Calculating the loss on one side, and the dividends on the other, what is the loss up to the present day, deducting only a dividend?—£. 80,000 or £. 90,000.

Is it your opinion that the attacks of the new companies have arisen from speculating gentlemen supposing your profits very great in order to obtain to themselves some of those profits?—I cannot answer the question; if such projectors be, I know their expectations will not be realized.

Have you had any notices from the parish of Mary-le-bone, or any other parish, of an intention to institute proceedings against you in any way or form?—Two bills were introduced into Parliament in two successive sessions to establish parochial waterworks.

Could parochial waterworks be instituted to underwork the present waterworks, or to be useful to the parishioners?—I should think it would be most injurious to the public, because the individuals would have no option; they must pay whether they took water or not.

Is it within your knowledge that Mr. Weale has opposed both the parochial and other projected companies?—I have heard Mr. Weale state that he has opposed the parochial scheme, and I believe he has given in evidence that he is inimical to any new company being established.

You have said that in 1809 there was an intention of raising a rate at 1s. on the rental below £. 30, and 9d. above?—To charge at that price; they were new houses that had not been served by any company.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

Previous to that calculation had an estimate been made of the expense of the undertaking?—Yes.

(26 March.)

And it was found such a rate would be a fair remuneration to the proprietors?—Yes, on the calculation which their engineers had informed them would be sufficient; almost every estimate I have seen, however, has been just one third or one fourth of the cost.

Previous to your being secretary, Mr. Sloper was secretary, was not he?—He was chief clerk; I hold both offices now.

Did he act as secretary?—No.

What distinction do you make between chief clerk and secretary?—There is a distinction in the act.

Was Mr. Sloper chief clerk?—Yes.

From the first origin of the company?—Yes.

Was he a considerable proprietor?—I should say not a considerable proprietor; he held shares certainly; the index will show how many shares he has ever held.

Are you a shareholder?—No.

Mr. Lynde.

(Mr. Lynde.)—The company, in the year 1810 were in possession of £.40,000 three per cent. consols, a saving from the interest which was yielded by the water rents; all that has been expended lately upon new works, since the year 1810, the whole of it at Chelsea; the large engine house there erected, and the engine in it (and there is another erecting,) and the iron main which has been laid, have cost altogether £.30,000 cash.

Were those expenses incurred in amplifying the powers of your works and improving them, or merely in restoring old works?—In improving them: those works would cost £.120,000 or £.130,000 to make again, though if broke up they would not sell for more than £.50,000 or £.60,000: since the first expenditure of the capital there have been at least £.30,000 worth of iron pipes laid down, which are now in use in the district we now supply.

And the expenses of the iron pipes began even from 1735?—No; the first main we laid in iron was in 1746, which cost us £.2,740, and is now in use.

What is the diameter of that main?—I think twelve inches.

What has been the condition of that main from 1746?—The engineer is the proper person to ask on that subject; I am not capable of giving any information upon it. I have made out a capital of £.120,000 and upwards, the interest of which is £.6,000 a year at five per cent; our gross water rents amount to £.13,700.

Deducting your current expenses, what is left?—Deducting the current expenses of £.10,000 a year, we shall have £.3,700 left to pay a dividend on what I have stated to you, £.120,000, and then there is nothing laid by for any exigence that may happen next year or the year after, and we are in expectation of having to lay out £.3,000 or £.4,000; there is an engine now building which will cost £.5,000.

What is the reserve you think will be necessary to meet those exigencies?—I have not made an estimate of that yet, but the engineer can give that; we have but £.3,700 to divide on that capital of £.120,000.

How many shares are there in your company?—Four thousand.

How was it you have stated that this £.40,000 accrued, which existed in 1810; had the company forborne all dividend?—Not all dividend; they were content with two, and two-and-a-half, and three per cent. instead of five per cent; they were receiving from 1797 to 1807, £.2,000 a year.

Was that division independent of that reservation by which you saved this money?—Yes; the accumulation of stock began in the year 1765, so that we were a long time raising that £.40,000.

What was the annual division per share from 1765 down to 1810?—It has been 10s. and 8s. a share.

And then it was progressive to the year 1812, 9s. 10s. 11s. and 12s?—Yes.

From 1765 to 1810 there was a sum of money accruing, and the dividend was paid regularly during that time; what was the amount of dividend from 1765 to 1810, or nearly the amount?—We may call it 8s. a share; it was only 6s. a share some part of that period; but from 1763 to 1771 they divided £.1,200, and that was upon 4,000 shares, that is 6s. a share; it rose progressively from £.1,200 to £.2,000.

What did you divide, subsequently to 1810, amongst those 4,000 shares?—Ten shillings.

From

From 1810 what was the sum annually divided among the subscribers?—Twelve shillings a share; we have never divided more.

Up to what period?—This moment; we are dividing now 12s. a share.

What rise has taken place between 1810 and 1820 in your water rents?—I do not know of any rise.

Have you not added twenty-five per cent?—Yes, we have; but we were reduced to £. 10,000 by the competition, and then we put twenty-five per cent. on the rates of 1810, which brought us up to about £. 13,700.

By the competition your rental had fallen?—By the division of the town we were left with a rental of about £. 10,000.

In 1810, by the competition, you lost some part of your rental?—Yes.

What was the variation in consequence of the competition?—I suppose we lost £. 4,000 a year.

From what to what?—From near £. 17,000 to £. 13,000 or £. 14,000, as nearly as I can speak from recollection.

What rise afterwards took place in consequence of the partition?—It brought us back to about the same rent that we had before the partition took place.

To £. 17,000?—No, to £. 13,000. The tenants that we lost, and the reduction of our rents, reduced us from near £. 17,000 to £. 14,000; and when the division took place, we were reduced again to £. 10,000; we threw up £. 3,000 a year.

The reduction which you state to £. 10,000 was in consequence of the surrender of a considerable district on your part, and therefore the remaining district left to you only amounted to £. 10,000?—Only £. 10,000.

What did you add to the £. 10,000?—Twenty-five per cent. on the rates of 1810.

Then what did you make altogether?—What I have stated before, £. 13,700.

Mercurij, 28^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *William Chadwell Mylne*, called in; and Examined.

HAVE you ever turned your attention to observing what may have been the probable waste of water during the use of wooden pipes, so as to inform the Committee upon the difference, for instance, between the quantity discharged from the head, and the quantity delivered into the houses, I mean in the proportions?—I have.

State upon what ground you say so, and what is the result of your observations?—There is no accurate mode of ascertaining what the loss is, but I have generally considered it as a fourth part. From the nature of the New River company's works, from being extremely old, the mains were in an indifferent state of repair in their length, so that whenever the turncock by accident shut up all his first services before he opened the next set, the pressure upon the pipes immediately was equal to the difference of level between the ground where the main was situated and the New River head; the main uniformly gave way, so that the first intimation we had of the failure in the main was, a deficiency in the supply of the tenants. The side of the pipe would give way into the sewer. After the mains were put in of iron, from the effect produced at the New River head, I have generally considered the proportion of the water saved to be about one fourth.

By using iron mains and pipes instead of wooden ones?—Yes.

The variations of the level of the head are under your observation, as you live there?—Yes.

You speak of the waste now from the wooden pipes arising not only from leakage but from accidental fracture, arising from the accidental pressure of the water alone?—Certainly. It is supposed that the works ought to be always perfectly tight; if perfectly sound there would be no leakage.

You have had an opportunity of observing pretty extensively the state of the mains and wooden pipes when taken away?—I have.

From what you observed of their state, was you led to conclude that there had been considerable wastage of water in the use of wood?—Very great.

State to the Committee what led you to that conclusion?—I have often found an aperture

Mr. Lynde.

(26 March.)

Mr. W. C. Mylne.

(28 March.)

Mr.
W. C. Mylne.

(28 March.)

aperture in the side of the main as large as this book, [*alluding to a book which the witness held,*] or the size of my hand, which we were not aware of till we took it up, and that might have been running on for two or three years; the average work of that main was found deficient, but we did not find the cause.

Did not the ground discover it?—No; where the wooden pipe lies immediately over the sewer, the air from the sewer will affect it so much that it will not last above a year or two, although all the other parts of the pipe may be perfectly good; of course when a greater pressure comes upon the pipe, it pushes out of that piece the rotten timber immediately over the sewer. We used to send our men into the sewers continually in search of defects. I have known explosions of foul air and fire damp in these sewers.

You have stated that you consider the difference in the waste of water by wooden pipes, when compared with iron pipes, as being nearly one fourth; do you mean one fourth independently of the friction of iron?—That is a loss of power; it is perfectly water tight. The turncocks were always instructed to open the next set of services before they shut up the services that were at work, the last services; if they did not, the main uniformly blew out and gave way.

Have you any wooden pipes remaining?—None.

The old rule, as to the division of expense between the company and the tenants, was, that the tenant was at every expense relating to or occasioned by the leaden pipes, and the company at every expense relating to or occasioned by the wooden pipes?—Yes.

Has there been a considerable relaxation of that practice during the time of the competition?—It was entirely given up; the company even did the plumber's work at that time; but although they do no plumber's work at all, the company pay for the pavement and the labour of opening the ground.

That you consider as a deviation from the established practice of the company from the old times?—Certainly; the repair of the mains, perhaps, costs the company a year's rent only for opening the ground.

Under what article is that included?—Under street expenses.

[This Witness begged leave to add the following observations to his former evidence.] The description of high and low service was not known in the way the business of the New River company was formerly carried on; they did not profess to serve above the level of the pavement; but as the water generally rose somewhat above that level, if any person chose to take advantage of it, he was at liberty so to do. During the contest with the other companies, when the powers of machinery applied to the New River service were increased, high service, like every other advantage, was exacted from the company in most instances, without any retribution at all; no rule was or could be laid down. Since the arrangement with the other companies on the western side of the town, the New River company has always considered service for any height above the ground-floor as high service, and if the service required on the ground floor considerably exceeded the former height in the house where it was required, that also has been regarded as a high service, but small alterations in height have not been noticed. No more definite rule than this has yet been laid down by the company. With regard to extra and ordinary services, the company has not yet adopted any rule of distinction, having preferred in all cases where it was possible to await the final settlement of the questions respecting supply of water, in order to avoid the discontent and confusion which would result from frequent change of rules.

The following are the rates charged by the New River company for the supply of water to the trades, &c. under-mentioned:—

Brewers, two guineas per 1,000 barrels brewed; distillers, one guinea per 1,000 ditto of water delivered; sugar-refiners, £.2. 10s. per pan; dyers, in proportion to the water consumed; fishmongers, from £.3 to £.8 per annum; potatoe-washers, from £.2 to £.5; carriers or leather-dressers, 10s. for each currier employed; stable-yards, 3s. 6d. per stall; cow-houses, 2s. 6d. per Cow; slaughter-houses, from 40s. to 60s.; eating-houses and public-houses, twenty per cent. on ordinary charges; hotels and coffee-houses, in proportion to their magnitude; bakers, pastry-cooks and butchers, about twenty per cent. additional; baths, about £.3 each; printers, twenty-five per cent. additional; colour-factors, in proportion to quantity used; steam-engines, £.10 each horse power; vinegar-yards, in proportion to quantity used; tripe-boilers, from £.3 to £.10 per annum; glass-houses, about £.3; soda water makers, about £.5 per annum; chemists, from fifty to a hundred per cent. extra; iron-founders, about 40s. per annum; bacon-makers, from £.3 to £.5; soap-boilers,

soap-boilers, from £.6 to £.10 ; watering-houses, from seventy-five to a hundred per cent. extra ; houses warmed by steam, in proportion to the quantity used ; work-houses, 1s. per head each pauper ; lunatic asylums, £.20 per annum ; prisons, from £.10 to £.50 ; theatres, in proportion to quantity used ; menageries, about 50s ; gas works, £.10 each gasometer ; coach-makers, from £.2 to £.6 ; whalebone-boilers, from £.2. to £.3 ; brick-makers, 1d. per 1,000 bricks ; bottle-washers, from £.2 to £.2. 10s ; watering streets and squares, for each season of six months, if done by a cart, 5s ; if done by a scoop, 7s. 6d. per 100 yards superficial carriage way.

Mr. *Lynde*, again called in ; and Examined.

YOU have got the minutes of the last day's proceedings, have you any thing to add to your former evidence ?—I do not know that I have any thing to add with respect to capital, unless the Committee object to the statement already given in, of interest ; that account amounts to £.182,600, and if the Committee object to that paper, and wish the capital stated in any other way, I shall be prepared to state it at the next meeting in any other way the Committee think proper, but at present I can only state it upon the interest of £.60,000 laid out.

Your expenditure in 1809, of £.30,000, was incurred with a view to a more extensive improvement in the supply of water ?—Certainly.

But if I understood you rightly, you said that you find in the present mode of supply, that it is not more than adequate to the supply of a comparatively contracted district ?—Yes.

Even with your work so improved ?—Yes ; I conceive that if we were to supply the parish of Mary-le-bone and St. George's, we should want another engine ; that is merely my opinion.

But when you contemplated these improvements, you did not mean to stop as they have now stopped, but to extend them as much as you could ?—I considered that it was for the improvement of the then supply, and not for an extension of the works.

Do you mean that, by this additional expenditure of £.30,000, your company had it in contemplation to carry pipes into places where they never had them before, or that they had it only in contemplation to better their supply in the districts they then occupied ?—They had in view an extension to the town about Mary-le-bone, and it was going on ; we had it in view.

What have become of those mains ?—The wooden mains are still left in the streets.

I wish to ask you, whether in your opinion is the district which you now supply much better supplied for the public advantage, from your being now contracted to a certain district, than it would have been if you had extended your mains and pipes as you once designed to do ?—I mean to say, that at present the district is better supplied than it was in the year 1810.

Veneris, 30^o die Martij, 1821.

WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Thomas Simpson*, Called in ; and Examined.

I THINK it has been stated that the first iron main was laid down in 1734 ?—
In 1746.

Is that main still in use ?—Yes.

An iron main, is it not ?—Yes.

That is a main which brings up the water from the Thames to the height necessary to distribute it to your district ?—It does.

What is the dimension of that main ?—Twelve inches.

When was it laid down ?—In 1746 or 1747.

Have you laid down any further mains to bring up the water to the height necessary to distribute it in your district since ?—Yes, an additional twelve-inch, twenty-eight years back.

You always worked through that one main ?—We had two mains, but we took
706. Z z one

Mr.
W. C. Mylne.

(28 March.)

Mr. *Lynde.*

Mr.
Thomas Simpson.

Mr.
Thomas Simpson.

(30 March)

one up and removed it into Pall Mall, when we removed from the upper district, we did not find it necessary to have two mains; we had one five-inch main in Pall Mall.

What means had you of carrying the water up to the height necessary to distribute it into your district; what mains do the Chelsea company now possess?—Twelve-inch ones.

How many?—Two; one twelve-inch one we took up and laid in Pall Mall; there we only wanted one.

Then, if I understand you right, it is this; that you had two mains to bring the water up to the height necessary to distribute it to your district; you had two originally, but that was previous to the subdivision of the district?—Yes.

Then in consequence of the subdivision of the district you took away one twelve-inch main from the purpose of bringing up the water to the height necessary for you to distribute it to that district?—We did; it was not necessary after withdrawing.

Are we to understand by that that the Chelsea company could decidedly, with that additional main, serve a more extensive district, had it not been for the subdivision?—It was calculated to serve a greater part of Mary-le-bone than we did.

You had two twelve-inch mains to bring the water up from the Thames to the height necessary to distribute it to that district?—We had, to Mary-le-bone.

With those two twelve-inch mains that you have said to have existed before the subdivision, is it your opinion that the Chelsea company could have served a much more extensive district than they now serve?—We could; but not to a much greater extent.

Than you now serve?—Yes.

With those two twelve-inch mains?—Yes.

Do you think that the main you took up from where it laid before, and laid down in Pall Mall; what purpose did you intend it to serve, or for what purpose do you now find it necessary in Pall Mall?—For the high service; we could not do without it.

For high service in particular houses, I suppose?—Yes; about Pall Mall and Charing-cross.

What is the high service known to your company by?—According to the height the water is carried to; it is sometimes carried two or three stories, and sometimes goes to the roof of the houses.

The employment of that main has become necessary in consequence of the modern luxury and use of water?—Certainly it is; we must have had the main.

Do you believe that those present existing mains are more than sufficient to supply your present district at the present rate and mode of consumption?—No.

Do you believe that with the present mains that you have you could distribute water to a larger district than you do?—We certainly could extend it; we could serve a larger district than we do now.

With your present means of machinery?—Yes.

To what extent, can you state?—We only work about eighteen hours and a half a day on the average with two engines; that is nine hours a day on each engine; now we could work those engines perhaps thirteen, fourteen or fifteen hours a day each.

Do you apprehend that with your present means, supposing that you were to replace the main where it was before, that you would be able to supply the district which you formerly had at the present increased consumption of water and the increased high service?—Certainly not; we could not.

Can you give us any medium between the two, the old one and the present one?—We had not height; we could not go so high as was necessary for high service in the old one.

Is it that you could not produce the quantity, or that you could not go to the height?—We could not go to the height.

The quantity you could produce, but you could not go to the height?—We had the quantity, but we could not go to the height.

Do you apprehend now that there is, house for house, a greater consumption of water than there was in former times?—I believe there is, certainly.

From your company?—From our company, a great deal more.

Do you find by experience that you use more water, supplying the same number of houses, than you did before?—Considerably more.

Can you state at all about how much?—I should think full one third more than we did five or six years ago, in the same district which we now supply.

Are

Are your observations directed to low service only? The question which the Committee have addressed to you is as to the low service only.—I take it that the low service has; for we are serving streets now which we serve seven times a week, when before we used to serve the same streets only three times a week.

Then you think that there is more water used for low service?—I think there is.

Do you recollect what number of hours you used to work the same engines before?—Yes.

What number of hours did you use to work them?—We used to work one engine then about fourteen or fifteen hours a day, but then we did not work on a Sunday.

You only worked one then, and not two, I suppose?—We had only one, but we had four large water wheels in addition.

The engines which you now work you work between the two eighteen hours a day?—Yes.

Are the water wheels at work now?—We work them very trifling now.

Why did you give them up?—Two of them got very old, and we found that no dependence could be placed upon the tides, and we could not work them above two hours sometimes, and not more than six or seven hours at other times, a day.

Have you any water wheels at work now?—Yes, sometimes.

Can you tell us the proportion that water wheels bear; can you give us the proportion of steam?—I think upon the same proportion of full one-third more.

To the present contracted district, do you mean that?—I do mean that.

There are many streets now served five, six, or seven times a week, which you used to serve only three times a week?—Yes.

Can you tell in any way what quantity of water you did throw up when you had the larger district in hand, and what quantity you now throw up?—I can state that in 1810, with the engine and wheels, we sent up 8,410,740 hogsheads.

And what do you now?—We serve now 7,533,900 hogsheads.

That is too for the smaller district?—Yes.

Then the quantity of water served now in proportion is much more than it formerly was?—Yes, we had then almost double the district we have now.

Then you supply double the quantity you used to do, that is, in proportion?—Pretty near.

That is admitting that you had double the houses to supply before?—It was not then twice the district which we have now, I do not think.

I asked you whether you thought with the old mains as they stood before that contest you could have supplied a considerably greater district than you then did?—No, not a considerably greater district.

You could not have gone much more with your then mains?—Not without more engines and mains; when we had the whole of the district, we could not have gone much further, because we worked about fourteen or fifteen hours a day; but then we had the water wheels, which supplied the lower district.

At what time did you add the second engine?—In 1811.

Then that was previous to the partition of the district?—Yes, certainly.

Afterwards you added that second engine?—No.

That was after the contest began?—It was begun previous and finished during the contest.

What was your motive for adding it?—We had commenced the foundation and got it very near above ground before the contest began.

With what view was that engine set up?—It was set up with the view of extending in Mary-le-bone, at least in Paddington; we did not extend it in Mary-le-bone, except to the Alpha cottages, and we had a great difficulty in serving it there.

It was with the view of extending your district to that part was it?—Yes.

Which you did not at that time serve at all?—Yes, we did; but they were going to build upon St. John's-road, and therefore with the prospect of their extending the buildings we thought it necessary to have a new engine on the new freehold.

Do you mean to say that it was for the improvement of the work?—It was for the improvement and extension certainly.

Then you apprehended that after you had got that second engine you would have been capable of supplying a greater district than you did before?—Certainly.

Could you have supplied a greater district with equal advantage to the public than the district you now supply?—I say properly (but perhaps improperly) what I mean is we could not have gone to the height necessary for high service.

Could you have supplied, with equal advantage to the public, the more extensive district than you now supply?—With respect to the low service we could, but we did

Mr.
Thomas Simpson.

(30 March.)

did not profess to serve with the high service ; with a very few exceptions, we served Maida-hill and the Alpha cottages, which are high situations.

Do you think, with reference to the increased quantity of water which you now consume, that you could have supplied a more extended district with those mains than you then did?—Certainly we could ; because, as I observed before, we never worked more than fourteen hours a-day with one engine ; the lower district was served wholly from the water wheels.

Are you able to say, to form any estimate in your mind what the increased quantity of water was that you could have thrown up with those two steam engines if you worked them to the utmost?—Perhaps a fourth or a fifth more.

Now you work two engines?—Yes, but we could not do it then.

That is to say, supposing then the supply was eight million hogheads, you could have made it ten?—Perhaps we might have made it nine or ten ; perhaps ten.

Should you as an engineer, supposing those two engines were all you had to rely on, should you think it prudent to be working them both at the same time continually?—No.

Why not?—Because in case any accident might occur, then we should be obliged to lay them aside for three or four days or a week, and perhaps two weeks : if our service required twenty or two-and-twenty hours a day, then I think we could not have worked them both together ; but we had a reservoir.

Is it with reference to that reservoir that you answer my question as to the increased quantity of water which you think might be thrown up with two engines, beyond what you did throw up?—I mean to say, we worked about fourteen or fifteen hours a day ; we could have increased it to perhaps eighteen hours a day.

Of each engine do you mean?—Only one engine.

You worked fifteen hours a day with that one engine?—I said we had done it formerly.

Now suppose a second engine was made, will you tell me how many hours you could get out of both those engines in prudence?—Perhaps we might get eighteen hours a day out of the two.

Do you think in prudence ; I want to know what you think you could get out properly a day?—Eighteen hours in two engines a day ; now we work eighteen hours and three quarters with two engines, take them together.

Could you get six-and-thirty out of the two?—No.

How many hours, in prudence, could you work out of those two engines?—We could work them eighteen hours each. I think it would be imprudent to work more than sixteen hours a day.

Both engines?—Yes.

Then if I understand you right, to do more than you do at present?—Yes.

You have two at work now?—Yes ; we work them nine hours each a day on an average.

Is the Committee to understand that those engines might be worked eighteen hours a day without inconvenience?—Sixteen or eighteen.

Each of them?—Yes.

With safety?—With safety they might be worked sixteen hours a day.

What, as an engineer, would you advise your employer to put the engines to work, what number of hours, so as not to run the risk of their failing?—Not more than fifteen or sixteen.

For the two?—Each.

Then you see that would come to the same objection?—We can manage that.

You said you could not, with prudence, work them more than eighteen hours both together?—Each.

Suppose you worked sixteen hours a day each?—Yes.

That is thirty-two hours for both engines to work in one day ; suppose one fails, then you have not the possibility of doing above sixteen hours out of the two-and-thirty?—Not without particular management.

What management could you substitute for the time which it would necessarily require to repair the engine?—To look to the preservation of the water more particularly ; for instance we have a reservoir ; we could supply three or four days from our reservoir.

Then the use of that reservoir is as a guarantee against accidents?—Yes, in case of fire, or any other accident?

With your present means of reserve should you think it prudent, and if your supply

supply required it, to take thirty hours work out of these two engines?—Perhaps not.

What time would you, under your responsibility, advise your employer to work the engines?—Twenty-eight hours perhaps.

You mean fourteen hours each?—Yes.

Am I to assume that that would give you a sufficient quantity of water for the quantity you now throw up, as fifteen is to twenty?—No, certainly not; I say we should make up the difference between what I state and ten hours; we should make good with the reservoir and management.

You now work eighteen hours a day out of both?—Upon an average, nine hours each engine.

Am I to understand that you work twenty-eight hours, and that the quantity of water you throw up would be as twenty-eight is to eighteen?—No.

Is there any thing to disturb that proposition?—Yes, with the assistance of the reservoirs.

Since the year 1811, how often have those engines been interrupted by any damage, or by any accident occurring to them, or any defect?—The new engine has been damaged once from a thunder-bolt, and it stopped us three or four days; and the second engine twice, and then we were ten days putting in a new boiler; ten days each time.

In that interruption, were you obliged to diminish the supply to the public?—No, we did not; then we were obliged to work night and day.

With the other engine you worked night and day?—Yes.

Did you apply to your reservoir?—We always do occasionally.

Did you then more than usual?—No, we did not.

Are your reservoirs always filled?—We generally kept them full; we make a point of keeping them full.

As to that part of the town which lies higher than the reservoirs, your reservoirs could be of no use whatever?—None whatever.

And which was the case in the greater part of the old district?—Yes, a very large part of it.

Almost the whole of Mary-le-bone lies higher than the reservoir?—Only about Maida-hill and the Alpha cottages.

With respect to the height you used to supply the water before you took up that main and brought it to Pall-mall, were you not of opinion, at that time, that the high service did not pay the company; were you not of opinion that the supplying the water to any height did not pay, and did you not persuade them from it?—I was of opinion that, beyond Oxford-street, we were not paid; that we were not paid properly beyond Oxford-street.

Did you not, in broad terms, state to the gentlemen, that you thought high service would not pay them?—I did.

On high ground I mean?—On the high ground.

Did you give that opinion?—I did, certainly.

That you had said the high ground would not answer their purpose to supply?—Not at those prices.

What part of the town did you particularly allude to when you stated to the company that you had dissuaded them from supplying a certain district with water at a certain height?—I beg pardon, I did not persuade them.

You gave your opinion that it would not pay them?—Yes.

What part of the town did you mean by that?—The north of Oxford-street.

Then that district, a great part of which was then supplied by the Grand Junction and which is now supplied by the Chelsea company, you think would not have paid if it had been continued?—Some part of the Grand Junction might have paid.

Grosvenor-square would have paid, would it not?—Yes.

Recollect when you gave that opinion to your company, about the year?—I should think it must be some time in the year 1806 or 1808.

Then I ask you this question; there seems to have been some contradiction; I want to know whether you did not with a view to supply, with a view to extend your supply in that very part of the town which you have been alluding to that the company incurred expenses after that period?—They did incur expenses after that period, for the service of the Alpha cottages.

That was the highest part?—It was.

Did you propose to supply that at the same rate, or what?—We added twenty-five per cent. I think, on that, or a little more.

Mr.
Thomas Simpson.

(30 March.)

What time was that addition made?—At the time when we commenced supplying them we made an addition of near thirty per cent.

On which rate?—The rate generally paid.

Do you recollect what date that was?—I think it must be about 1807 or 1808.

If I understand you right, your opinion was general, given generally to your directors, that the service at those rates did not then pay them north of Oxford road?—Yes.

Now I wish to ask you this question; you have said that the main which was taken and which was relaid in Pall-mall served the purpose of your company; now for high service do you mean?—It does now.

How does it serve the purpose of the company for high service when your company charge nothing for high service?—We found it necessary that we should make a high service, and I thought they then could not make it with a wood main.

Has the company gone to the expense of laying a new main for high service without any remuneration?—It was only the expense of relaying the old main; I recommended it to be laid there.

Have we had in evidence distinctly why the company, the Chelsea company, have not charged high service?—If you give me leave, I will explain.

Since 1810 what is the reason you have not charged high service?—I beg to state we dropped it previously, from the difficulties we had, and since that it has never come on before the court.

You laid down the pipe in Pall-mall in the year 1818 for the purpose of giving the high service?—Yes.

What is the reason you did not in consequence of that charge for it?—It has never been brought before the court; we never thought of it.

Mr. Lynde, again called in; and Examined.

Mr. Lynde.

WHAT is the reason that high service has not been charged since 1810?—When the Chelsea company put twenty-five per cent. on the rate of 1810, they determined to give all the service that was necessary for every house without charging anything extra for high service or water-closets, from a principle of forbearance and an endeavour to make an increased rate to pay the expenses and give them a dividend; it was merely on a principle of forbearance.

Did you in the first instance put fifty per cent. and then reduce it to twenty-five per cent. and then mean that to cover every thing?—Every thing,

You did it with the view of raising it to the same proportion as the other companies had?—Yes; the board of the Chelsea company are fully aware it cost them an extra sum of money; and it is merely for forbearance that they do not charge it.

Mr. William Chadwell Mylne, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
W. C. Mylne.

WITH regard to the service of Mary-le-bone, the high parts of the town, you have heard what Mr. Simpson has said as to his opinion of not paying the company at the old rates?—Yes.

Are you of opinion that it paid the New River company at the old rates, or that it paid them as well as the rest of the town, or what is your opinion?—It certainly did not pay them so well as the other parts of the town; indeed the extremities of their works never did pay them in proportion, east or west.

Do you think if the New River company had sat down to reform their then income in a just proportion throughout the districts they then served, that the result would have been a rising of the rates upon Mary-le-bone?—Yes.

Upon what ground?—From the distance which Mary-le-bone is from the works at the New River head, and from the level of the ground.

You think it is attended with more expense to supply under those circumstances?—Far more; far greater.

Have you anything you wish to give as an illustration of your opinion?—I have; I believe the average, that of the extremities, will be very nearly the same as the average of the centre of the works.

You mean, that the average of the distant parts of the works are very near the same as the average of the near parts of the works?—I can give you the average of two districts, if you wish it. The average rental of the Whitechapel walk was 17s. 6d. per house; Shoreditch, which was the next walk to it, was 15s. 3d. making an average of about 16s. a house. The average of the Cornhill walk—

You are talking now of old times?—Yes, old times, previous to 1810; the average of

of Cornhill was £. 1. 3 s. 9 d. yet the expense of supplying the water to Shoreditch, the capital supplied in affording Shoreditch, must have been six times the other.

Have you a calculation as to the west part?—Yes, as to Mary-le-bone and St. James; the average of Mary-le-bone was £. 2. 3 s. 6 d. in the same year.

Previous to the year 1810, I suppose?—Yes, in the year 1804. In the year 1804 the average of St. James was £. 2. 1 s. 3 d.

Now, was the comparative expense in serving Mary-le-bone much more than in serving St. James's?—Mary-le-bone was considerably more, though they were both at the same distance; but there is a considerable difference in the level.

One you supplied from the high pond, the other from the ordinary head, I suppose?—Yes.

One was supplied with machinery, the other without machinery; is it not so?—Yes; there is a difference of 2 s. 6 d. only in a house between St. James's and Mary-le-bone.

I would wish to know whether you are of opinion that the New River company could have supplied that distant and high district of Mary-le-bone and the others without an addition of fresh capital expended on machinery?—Certainly not; the capital employed by the company, by the New River company, was never greater than sufficient to afford the supply required at the time. We were continually adding to it; and every new street that was built required a fresh capital.

That is, in mains and service pipes?—Yes, and machinery.

I think you gave it as your opinion in your former evidence, that the consumption of water is very much increased since former times; that the present consumption of water, house for house, is greater than it was in former times?—Yes.

Now, with reference to your increased consumption, and looking at the present state of consumption, do you apprehend that the New River company could have supplied Mary-le-bone, and those other higher parts of the district, without an additional expenditure of capital?—Certainly it could not.

In what way must that have been?—In mains from the high pond to Mary-le-bone, and the engines must have worked so many hours a day more to have supplied that.

Had you any tenant in St. James's, or within the district now supplied by the New River company, say for example Piccadilly, which was not supplied out of those 10,000,000 hogsheads, which you stated in an early answer given to the Committee to be supplied by machinery?—Any tenant in St. James's?

Had you any tenant in St. James's, or within the district now supplied by the New River company, say for instance Piccadilly, which was not supplied out of the 10,000,000 of hogsheads, which you stated in your former evidence to be supplied by machinery?—Yes; the whole of St. James's, which is now supplied by the Grand Junction company, was supplied by the New River; I have coloured it in a map, which shows that the engine supply comes down to Brewer-street, Grosvenor-square; every thing south of that was supplied from the natural head.

Was the whole of that part of Pancras, which is now supplied by the West Middlesex company, served out of the same 10,000,000 hogsheads, or from the lower pond head?—The whole of Pancras, which is now supplied by the West Middlesex company, was supplied from the high pond, by machinery; it is a very narrow slip.

Mr. *Matthias Koops Knight*, called in; and Examined.

IF an inhabitant should avail himself of the option afforded him, and discontinue the high service from the company's works, and put up a force pump, would you continue that portion of high service charge, or would you make an increase of rate for low service, on account of the water still required for the use of the closets, and which would still be required for the upper stories of the house?—No, certainly not.

(*To Mr. Coe.*)—I would put the same question to you that I have to Mr. Knight, do you give the same answer?—I give the same answer as Mr. Knight has given, no, certainly not.

(*To Mr. Knight.*)—Would the same supply of water be continued to be given to cisterns on the basement, without any extra charge in respect of increased consumption, in consequence of the water being taken to those stories, from the supply of the cisterns to the upper stories, by means of forced pumps?—As I understand the question, it is this; whether all the cisterns on the basements would be filled,

Mr.
W. C. Mylne.

(30 March.)

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

Mr.
M. K. Knight.

(30 March.)

if the water was carried to the upper stories by forced pumps? I answer, that all the cisterns on the basements would certainly be filled; they would be filled whether there was one cistern, or whether there were five; or whether they held a greater or less quantity, no matter, they certainly would be filled; those cisterns would be filled every water day.

(*To Mr. Coe.*)—Is that your answer, Mr. Coe?—I always considered the high service as a charge or set-off for the machinery: I will just add, that as long as the water is on, the individuals for private consumption may fill what cisterns they please.

(*To Mr. Knight.*)—Suppose a water-closet at the top of the house, that you would consider as an article for high service?—We never have done it yet.

You have allowed water-closets without charging them then?—Yes, when they have pumped the water up.

When it is upon the ground-floor?—Not without it is below six inches.

There was an agreement entered into in the year 1815 or 1816 for the consolidation of the New River and your company?—Yes.

What proportion, can you inform the Committee of the proportion of consolidated capital which was to be considered as the share the West Middlesex company was to take out of that?—I could speak to the rental within a certain line; it was one-fifth.

That was the capital?—It may be considered as the capital and rental at one-fifth; there was to be a subsequent division of the profits beyond a certain dividend which should be paid to the New River company. The West Middlesex was entitled to one-third.

There was no estimate of the real value of the works upon that occasion?—Yes.

And then the subscribed capital was the basis they stood upon?—Yes.

You were to have one-fifth of a certain amount, and one-third of the surplus profits?—Yes.

And the New River company was to lay out all the capital necessary to place their works in iron?—Yes, the West Middlesex works being all in iron.

You have stated the supply to the basement of the Alpha cottages to be, and that it was, equal to the high service?—Yes.

Can you tell me what is the level of the ground above mid-tide of the Thames?—I cannot tell the precise level; but I can tell the height to which we are obliged to raise the water for the supply of those houses, it is one hundred and fifty feet.

Can you tell me what is the difference of the level between Piccadilly and the New-road?—No, I cannot.

Could you give it in in writing?—I have no means of knowing what it is.

(*Mr. Anderson.*)—I could give it in if the Committee considered it necessary.

What is the level of the Grand Junction reservoir above or below the basement of the Alpha cottages or Maida-hill?—

(*Mr. Anderson.*)—It is considerably below the basement of the Alpha cottages.

(*The Witness.*)—I should certainly think it is below.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

Appendix

- (A.)—Papers delivered in by the Vestry Clerk of St. Mary-le-bone - - - - p. 191
- (B.)— - - Ditto - - by the London Bridge Waterworks Company - - - - p. 199
- (C.)— - - Ditto - - by the New River Water Company - - - - p. 202
- (D.)— - - Ditto - - by the Chelsea Waterworks Company - - - - p. 215
- (E.)— - - Ditto - - by the York Buildings Waterworks Company - - - - p. 225
- (F.)— - - Ditto - - by the East London Waterworks Company - - - - p. 226
- (G.)— - - Ditto - - by the West Middlesex Waterworks Company - - - - p. 232
- (H.)— - - Ditto - - by the Grand Junction Waterworks Company - - - - p. 238
- (I.)—Estimate of the Fund necessary to provide against the Wear and Tear of Capital for
a Waterwork - - - - - p. 243
- (K.)—Abstract, showing the Rental and Divisions of the Old Water Companies, pre-
viously and up to the Year 1810, under the Rates then paid - - - - p. 245
- (L.)—Comparative Statement of the quantity of Water delivered to the Metropolis on
the North side of the Thames, in the Years 1809 and 1820 - - - - p. 246
- (M.)—Comparative Statement, showing the Gross Expenditure of the New Water Com-
panies, and the estimated Value of the Old Waterworks, together with the
yearly current Expenses of each Company - - - - - p. 247

APPENDIX.

Appendix (A.)

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Vestry Clerk of *St. Mary-le-bone*.

EXTRACTS from the Minutes of the Vestrymen of the Parish, being the Reports and Correspondence between the Vestrymen of *St. Mary-le-bone* and the Water Companies.

Appendix,
(A.)

St. Mary-le-bone, March 28th, 1818.

Correspondence,
&c. between *Mary-le-bone* Vestry and Water Companies.

AT a Vestry held this day, the following Reports and Correspondence between the Vestry and the Water Companies were ordered to be printed and sent to each Vestryman.

January 17, 1818;—The following report of a committee was read and approved:

Resolved, That it be recommended to the vestry, on Saturday next, to direct that a circular letter be written to the different water companies to inquire whether they are not withdrawing their supply of water from different parts of the parish of *Mary-le-bone*, or whether it is the intention of the companies to supply the inhabitants as heretofore, and at the same rates, or what the companies propose doing; in order that their answer may be laid before the parishioners, who have expressed the greatest alarm and apprehension on this important and serious subject.

January 24, 1818;—The clerk reported that Mr. Holford, one of the proprietors of the *New River* company, requested that the board would appoint a committee to meet some of the proprietors of the respective water companies in this parish, when a statement would be made by them regarding the supply of water to the inhabitants of the parish, in conformity with the resolution of the vestry on Saturday last.

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to meet a deputation from the respective water companies, on Thursday next, at twelve o'clock, at the Court-house.

February 7, 1818;—The report of the committee to confer with the deputations from the water companies was read; a copy whereof is as follows:

“The committee having met, they were waited on by Messrs. Holford and Smith, as a deputation from the *New River* company; Messrs. Green and Fisher, on the part of the *West Middlesex* company; and Captain Blgrave, on the part of the *Grand Junction* company. The committee were informed by the deputations, that the *New River* and the *Chelsea* water companies had withdrawn their supply of water from the parish, and that the inhabitants were at present supplied by the *West Middlesex* and *Grand Junction* companies alone, the *Grand Junction* having only a very small part at the west end of the parish, and that the remainder of the parish is to be supplied by the *West Middlesex* company. Upon the subject of the future charge for water, it was distinctly stated to the committee that the companies had it not in contemplation at present to raise the price; but it was also as distinctly stated, that at some future period they imagined they might be compelled so to do, as it could not be expected that they should supply at a loss.

“The deputation from the *West Middlesex* company observed, that the parish would be much better supplied with water than heretofore.

“The deputation from the *New River* company assured the committee, that they had it completely in their power to return to the parish and supply it with water in an effectual manner, if at a future time prospects should be held out to the company of an advantageous nature; and, with a view to afford assistance in cases of serious fire, that it was their intention to fix a stop-cock at their reservoir so as to afford an immense supply of water in the shortest possible time, the parish being subject to certain regulations to prevent a waste of it.

“The deputations from the *West Middlesex* and *Grand Junction* companies stated, that they are willing to supply the vestry with plans of their different mains and services in the parish, specifying upon such plans the size of the mains and services, and also the situation of their different plugs; which your committee recommend the vestry to apply for.

“The deputations also stated to your committee, that if they would appoint one or two intelligent and discreet men to meet any of the companies, they would appoint a like number, and give them every information that might be required, both on the present and on all future occasions.

Appendix,
(A.)

Correspondence,
&c between Mary-
le-bone Vestry and
Water Companies.

“ The deputation from the West Middlesex company stated, that they were bound under their act of parliament to keep their mains always charged, which they would always do, as they formed part of their reservoir.

“ The deputations stated, that they did not intend to disturb their works in the parish.

“ Your committee beg to say, that the above is the substance of the communication from the deputations of the water companies.

“ Your committee take leave to remark, that the competition, which was the foundation of the West Middlesex and the Grand Junction companies application to Parliament for their acts, and which induced Parliament to grant them, is now completely done away, and the parish is not only deprived of that advantage, but is left exposed to all the uncertainty, and the numerous evils, such a situation subjects them to; and since the New River and Chelsea companies have withdrawn their supply, a great many of the inhabitants, who are now without water, are reduced to the alternative of either having the water from the only company left to the district in which they live, or to go without; and in the event of their submitting to apply, they must then be at the expense of changing the pipe, of opening and repairing the pavement, which would have been unnecessary, if the supplies had remained as before. And they earnestly recommend to the vestry the necessity of taking this subject under their most serious consideration, in order to prevent, if it be possible, the parish being delivered over to the mercy and discretion of perpetually fluctuating boards, who may make such exorbitant demands, that will materially deteriorate the property of this parish.

“ They further recommend to the vestry to take into their most serious consideration the possibility of the vestry supplying the parish with water from an establishment of their own, upon the same principle that this parish was originally paved, when the sum of £.200,000 was borrowed on bond to carry such measure into effect, and which has been all redeemed and paid off. And if such a plan could be carried into effect, the parish would be secure that no rise could be made to the parishioners in their charge for water; and that in the course of time the money would be discharged, and the only sum to be raised would be the expense of the service; and from the experience which at present exists, the expense of such new establishment could be ascertained within a few thousand pounds, and therefore recommend the vestry should apply to some able engineer to know what he would charge for making an estimate of the expense of so supplying the parish with water, previous to any application to Parliament.”

Resolved, That the said report be taken into consideration on Saturday next, and the board specially summoned for that purpose.

February 14, 1818;—The board then took into their consideration the report of the committee appointed to confer with the deputations from the water companies.

Resolved, “That the report be approved, and that the recommendation therein contained be carried into effect.”

February 21, 1818;—Read the following letter from the West Middlesex waterworks company, as follows:—

West Middlesex Waterworks Office, Berners-street, 19th Feb. 1818.

Sir,—Notwithstanding the explanation given to the committee appointed by the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone, to confer with the deputation from the water companies, the directors of the West Middlesex company find that the most erroneous rumours are in circulation in the parish with respect to their intention on the subject of rates; and they feel themselves called upon, therefore, to state specifically, that no advance will be made *until* the parishioners are indemnified for the expense they have incurred in the change from the old works, nor will any advance whatever be made for the usual supply of water, beyond what the inhabitants paid to the old companies in the year 1810, every objection to which arrangement must appear groundless, when it is considered that the permanent advantages arising from the improved principle of the West Middlesex works are incalculably great, compared with the difference existing between such rates and the present charges; and with respect to fire, it is manifest, from the improved principle before alluded to, and the concentration of the supply, that the efficiency of the works are more than equal to the powers of all the companies heretofore existing in the parish.

The directors of the West Middlesex company conceive, that on this statement no doubt can reasonably be entertained of the moderation of their views and intentions, especially as no return has hitherto been realized to the proprietors on any portion of the capital so beneficially employed for the parish.

The directors therefore trust, under these circumstances, that the vestry will at least pause before any ulterior measures are adopted.

Should, however, any further information be desired by the vestry, the directors of the West Middlesex company, in order to prevent the possibility of any misunderstanding, again suggest the propriety of meeting a deputation from the vestry, which the directors feel confident would prove the means of effectually removing all difficulties, and lay the foundation of an amicable arrangement.

By order of the board of directors,

To the Chairman of the Vestry
of St. Mary-le-bone, &c. &c.

(signed)

M. K. Knight, Sec.

February 28, 1818;—The following letter from the West Middlesex waterworks company was read:—

Appendix,
(A.)

“ 26th February, 1818.

“ The directors of the West Middlesex company understanding that some objections have been made in the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone to the rates of 1810, the vestry is informed, that with the view of reconciling all differences of opinion on the subject, the directors are desirous of meeting a committee, consisting of four or five gentlemen of the vestry, in order that all matters relative to rates may be satisfactorily adjusted.

Correspondence,
&c. between Mary-
le-bone Vestry and
Water Companies.

“ It having been alleged that the West Middlesex company have occasioned the parish an expense of £.50,000 for paving, the directors think it right, in reply to this assertion, to observe, that although the legislature has granted power to the company to take up the pavement, yet it very wisely provided they should not lay it down. That the pavement is relaid under the direction of the surveyor of the parish, and by their paviers: that the ground is measured by themselves, and charged at their own price: and that the bills have always been sent to the West Middlesex company, and *paid by them.*”

By order of the board of directors,

J. H. Greenwell, Esq.

(signed) M. K. Knight, Sec.

Same day;—Resolved unanimously; The several reports and proceedings of this board, and its committees (with the report of Mr. Potter) respecting the application to Parliament for better supplying the inhabitants of this parish with water, having been this day taken into mature consideration,—that application be made to Parliament for carrying the same into execution, and also for empowering this board to enter into contracts with any water companies, for the supplying this parish with water, and to empower any such companies to contract with this vestry.

Resolved, That the clerk do write immediately to the New River, Chelsea, Grand Junction and West Middlesex water companies, requesting their attendance at the Court-house, at twelve o'clock on Wednesday next the 4th of March, with any proposals in writing they may have to make for supplying the parish of St. Mary-le-bone with water, and that the committee do report thereon to this board on Saturday next.

4th March 1818;—A committee from the several water companies attended, and delivered in the following statements on behalf of their respective companies:—

“ The New River company during the last eight years has sustained very heavy losses in the service of those quarters of the town into which the works of the new water companies have been generally introduced.

“ They believe those companies have suffered as severely, perhaps more severely, than themselves.

“ From experience they are satisfied that such a consequence is inseparable from a state of competition between large capitals, consisting in fixed machinery sunk in the same place, and incapable of being withdrawn or transferred, where there is not upon the whole sufficient demand to make a return to all the capitals so engaged.

“ In ordinary cases the depression of prices finds its fair limits in the interest of the competing parties, those who cannot afford to sell at a loss, transferring their capital to some other trade, or at least to some other place.

“ But when capital cannot be so transferred, it is obvious that there is no check or bounds to depression, except such as may be found in some sort of understanding between the competing parties.

“ It is under these circumstances that the water companies have withdrawn within certain limits, with a view of extricating themselves from a situation which was tending very rapidly to the utter ruin of all their establishments.

“ The New River company has not, nor do they believe that either of the other companies have given or received any engagement, direct or indirect, as to the future, to confine themselves within those limits. That point is left to the sense which either of them may entertain of their own interests, informed as of course they are by past experience.

“ In taking this measure, the New River company have constantly expressed their sense, that it was due to the interests of the parties concerned, as well as of the public, that the situation in which it placed the several companies should not be abused. They have received assurances from the other companies to the same effect, and it has all along been plainly understood, that the observance of the point was a condition on which alone they would enter upon the measure, or abide by it.

“ They have no reason to doubt, that the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies are ready to treat with the vestry for the supply of the parish of Mary-le-bone, upon terms so reasonable, as to leave no ground for imputing to them any disposition to depart from this principle.

“ They take the liberty of recommending to the vestry the appointment of a select committee, for the purpose of treating with those companies, because they apprehend that it is only through such a medium that the body at large can be perfectly informed on both sides of the question, so as to form a fair judgment between the public and the companies.

“ If contrary to their expectation it should be found, in the result of such a treaty, that the companies in question make immoderate demands upon the parish, the New River company pledge themselves, that they will be ready to treat for the supply in strict conformity with the principles above stated.

Appendix,
(A.)
Correspondence,
&c. between Mary-
le-bone Vestry and
Water Companies.

“ Any information which their records, the inspection of their works, or the evidence of their servants can supply for the guidance of such a committee, in treating in the first instance with the West Middlesex or Grand Junction companies, or in the event supposed, with themselves, shall be readily supplied.

“ But until it shall appear that the West Middlesex or Grand Junction companies refuse to treat upon moderate terms, and attempt to abuse their situation; the New River company decline to enter into such a treaty, because they feel that it would be attended with a certain injury to the other companies at a great risk to themselves, and that nothing but such a refusal would justify them in giving occasion to such injury, or exposing themselves to such hazard.

“ The West Middlesex company take the liberty of stating, that they have no wish or desire whatever of requiring any thing from the parish of Mary-le-bone, or any other parts of this district, beyond what shall be deemed by a joint committee of the vestry and the directors of the company which may be appointed for that purpose, a fair and reasonable return of interest upon that part of their capital which has been fairly and judiciously expended; by which is meant, that from the parish of Mary-le-bone they do not expect or desire such return of interest to extend to any thing beyond a fair and just *proportion* of the capital so expended. And in order to elucidate which, they earnestly press for such a committee to be appointed as has been alluded to.

“ It was also stated, on the part of the Grand Junction waterworks company, that they are willing to enter into a treaty with the parish of St. Mary-le-bone for the supply of the small part of the parish to which they contribute, upon fair and reasonable terms, with reference to the capital expended by them.”

The chairman then put the four following questions to the deputations from the West Middlesex waterworks company:—

1st. “ Can you state the amount of the proportion of the fair, reasonable and judicious expenditure by the West Middlesex waterworks company, so far as respects this parish?

2d. “ What annual sum would they require for the annual expenditure for the supply of water in this parish?

3d. “ What will be the additional charges for high services, according to their respective heights, on each house, or in gross, for the whole parish?

4th. “ What gross annual sum of money do they expect from the parish for supplying it with water?”

When he declared his inability to give immediate answers thereto, but added, that he had no doubt he should be able to do so before the meeting of the vestry on Saturday next.

Similar questions were also put by the chairman to the representatives of the Grand Junction waterworks company, who agreed to give their answers thereto before Wednesday next.

The committee beg to report to the vestry, that in consequence of the delay in getting answers to the above questions, and which the committee think highly important in the present stage of the proceedings, they did not proceed with the drafts of the petitions to Parliament.

Same day;—The clerk laid before the board two letters, addressed to him by the secretaries of the West Middlesex and Chelsea water companies, copies whereof are as follow:—

West Middlesex Waterworks Office, Berners-street, 6th March 1818.

Sir,—A committee of the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone having requested that the directors of the West Middlesex waterworks would furnish, in writing, answers to the following queries; viz.

1st. “ Can you state the amount of the proportion of the fair, reasonable and judicious expenditure by the West Middlesex waterworks company, as far as respects this parish?

2d. “ What annual sum would they require for the annual expenditure for the supply of water to this parish?

3d. “ What will be the additional charges for high services, according to their respective heights, in each house, or in gross, for the whole parish?

4th. “ What gross annual sum of money do they expect from the parish for supplying it with water?”

I am directed to acquaint you, for the information of the committee, that although these are questions of considerable difficulty, and any answers that can be given in the mode required, much less likely to be satisfactory, either to the committee or the directors, than such as would result from the adoption of the proposition now before the committee, for the appointing a select and limited number of the vestry and the directors, for the purpose of satisfactorily determining these and all other points on which doubts and differences of opinion may exist; yet the directors, desirous of furnishing the best answers they are able from so short a notice, have directed me to state:

1st. That they consider the proportion of the fair and judicious expenditure on their works, so far as respects the parish of St. Mary-le-bone, to be £.250,000.

2d. That as nearly as can at present be ascertained, the portion of their annual expenditure as attaching to the said parish, cannot be taken at less than £. 5,000.

3d. That the directors have not been able as yet to take into their consideration, what ought to be the additional charge for high service, although they are satisfied that this will ever be not only an unprofitable, but a seriously injurious part of their business; for reasons too tedious to be here explained, yet from the desire entertained by the directors

to accommodate the public, they will ever be ready to afford those supplies at very moderate rates in proportion to height and consumption.

4th. That with reference to the fair proportion of capital before stated, and the amount of the annual expenditure or standing charges for the supply of the parish, it will be obvious to the committee, that nothing short of a gross annual sum of £.17,500 for the present supplies, including the now existing high services, can produce to the proprietors common interest on that capital which has been judiciously expended, considering the establishment of the necessary funds to defray a variety of contingent expenses, such as for new boilers, an occasional new engine, the renewal of cocks, for repairing of mains, and many unforeseen expenses, which must frequently occur in the works of this nature and magnitude, and which, in the calculation now made, all remain to be defrayed out of an abatement of the aforesaid common interest, leaving the proprietors with a return not exceeding four per cent.

The directors having thus given the best answers in their power at the present moment to the different queries made by the committee, direct me in conclusion to state, that these answers are to be considered as subject to correction, as given in perfect good faith, and without prejudice to the company, in case of any, or all of them, being disapproved or rejected by the committee or vestry.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

J. H. Greenwell, Esq. Vestry Clerk.

(signed) M. K. Knight, Sec.

Office of Chelsea Waterworks, Abingdon-street, 5th March 1818.

Sir,—I have this day laid before the court of directors your letter of the 28th ult. wherein you state, "That you are directed by the vestrymen of St. Mary-le-bone to request that a deputation of some members of this company will meet a committee of vestrymen of the said parish, at the Court-house, on the Wednesday then following, at twelve o'clock, with a view to making proposals for supplying the parish of St. Mary-le-bone with water." And I am ordered to acquaint you, that the court do not feel they can make any proposals for the service of the parish of St. Mary-le-bone, the company having already lost a considerable sum of money therein.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

To J. H. Greenwell, Esq.

(signed) J. G. Lynde, Sec.

11th March 1818 ;—The following letter from the Grand Junction waterworks company was read :—

Grand Junction Waterworks Office, 10th March 1818.

Sir,—I beg to acquaint you, that the queries transmitted by the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone to this company in your communication of the 4th instant, have been laid before the court of directors of this company, and I am directed to state in reply, that with reference to the proportionate capital expended by the company, as it respects the supply of water to the parish of St. Mary-le-bone, the company are willing to take the gross sum of £.3,000 including the present existing high services, which they consider as a fair and reasonable charge for the present supply.

I am directed further to state, that the Grand Junction water company are ready, in the event of the parish not agreeing to this proposal, to submit the same to parliamentary investigation, in conjunction with the parish, as the company, so far from feeling any disinclination to the interference of the legislature, are most anxious for an opportunity of rebutting, by satisfactory testimony, the unfounded charges which have been made against the different companies, for the adoption of the measures resorted to from necessity, and which they are confident will be ultimately beneficial to the public.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

J. H. Greenwell, Esq.

(signed) W. M. Coe, Sec.

14th March 1818 ;—*Resolved unanimously*, That the signing of the petitions to Parliament be postponed, in order that the committee heretofore appointed by the vestry, do treat with the water companies for their supplying this parish with water, at the rate of ten per cent. lower than was annually and generally rated and paid in this parish previous to the year 1810.

18th March 1818 ;—*It was resolved*,—That a copy of the foregoing resolution be transmitted to the New River, Chelsea, West Middlesex, and Grand Junction waterworks companies ; and to request their respective answers thereto without loss of time.

21st March, 1818 ;—The following letters were read :—

New River Office, 19th March 1818.

Sir,—I am directed by the New River board to acknowledge the receipt of the resolutions of the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone, of the 14th and 18th instant ; and in answer to inform you, that the board beg leave to refer the vestry to the paper delivered to its committee, on behalf of the New River company, on the 4th instant, as fully expressing their opinion upon the proposition of supplying the parish of St. Mary-le-bone with water.

I am, Sir, your very obedient humble servant,

J. H. Greenwell, Esq.

(signed) J. P. Rowe, Sec.

Appendix,
(A.)

Correspondence,
&c. between Mary-
le-bone Vestry and
Water Companies.

Vide p. 193.

Appendix,
(A.)

At a special committee, held Thursday, 19th March 1818.

Grand Junction Waterworks, Union-street, Bond-street.

Correspondence,
&c. between Mary-
le-bone Vestry and
Water Companies.

Resolved unanimously, That the secretary do communicate to the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone, in reply to the resolutions forwarded to this company, that the company cannot in justice to themselves accept the proposals made by the vestry, but that they are perfectly persuaded, that the measures about to be adopted by the company, for equalizing the rates in that part of the parish supplied by them, will be satisfactory to the inhabitants thereof.

J. H. Greenwell, Esq.

(signed)

W. M. Coe, Sec.

Office of Chelsea Waterworks, Abingdon-street, 21st March 1818.

Sir,—The court of directors of the governor and company of Chelsea waterworks having had under their consideration two resolutions of the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone, dated the 14th and 18th instant; the first, "Postponing the signing of petitions to Parliament, in order that the committee appointed by the vestry might treat with the water companies for their supplying the parish of St. Mary-le-bone with water, at a rate of ten per cent. lower than was usually and generally rated and paid in the said parish, previous to the year 1810;" and the other, "That the aforesaid resolutions should be transmitted to the Chelsea waterworks, amongst other companies therein mentioned, and requesting their respective answers thereto, without loss of time."

I am ordered by the board to request you will refer the vestry of St. Mary-le-bone to the answer conveyed in my letter of the 5th instant.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

J. H. Greenwell, Esq.

(signed)

J. G. Lynde, Sec.

Vide p. 195.

March 28th, 1818;—The following letter from the West Middlesex waterworks company, was read:—

West Middlesex Waterworks Office, Berners-street, 27th March 1818.

Sir,—The resolutions of the St. Mary-le-bone vestry, of the 14th and 18th instant, on the subject of a supply of water for the parish, having been laid before the board, I am desired to acquaint you, for the information of the vestry, that the directors regret that their endeavours to induce the vestry to depute a certain number of their members to meet an equal number from the board, for the purpose of taking into consideration a just and equitable scale of rates, should have entirely failed, as they feel satisfied, that if any member had been so deputed by the vestry, they would, on entering into an unprejudiced view of the subject, have been convinced, not only of the impossibility of the company's agreeing to the terms proposed by the vestry, but of the total impracticability of fixing on any scale consistent either with justice to the public or the company, unless the governing principle was suffered to be the quantum and nature of the supply required.

I am desired further to state, that this board had intended, previous to making any alteration in the existing rates, to have devoted their attention to insuring to their new tenants, in every direction, a regular and abundant supply; but as some misconception appears to be entertained, as to the charges intended to be made in future, they have judged it expedient to appoint a committee of their own body to investigate the existing rates, and equalize them on a just and reasonable scale, according to the nature and extent of the supplies required, in order that such a moderate advance only, as may be found absolutely just and necessary, may be determined on and promulgated with as little delay as possible.

The directors think it right to remind the vestry, that a most abundant supply of water, in case of fire, is at all times ready, as their main is constantly charged, according to the provisions of the company's act of parliament.

J. H. Greenwell, Esq. Vestry Clerk.

By order of the board of directors,

(signed)

M. K. Knight, Sec.

Same day;—*Resolved*,—That the foregoing reports and correspondence be taken into consideration on Saturday the 11th of April next.

St. Mary-le-bone, May 2, 1818.

At a committee appointed to meet the deputations from the water companies:—

Your committee met a deputation from the New River, Chelsea, West Middlesex, and Grand Junction water companies, on the 28th day of April last, and again on the 1st instant, when your committee submitted to the deputation the draft of the proposed bill, and the following questions, and received the following answers from the respective companies.

The first question put by your committee, was:

Will you engage not to charge more for supplying the whole parish with water than ten per cent. under the rate charged in 1810?

The answer of the West Middlesex company was as follows:

The West Middlesex company cannot afford to supply at the above rate.

The

The answer of the Grand Junction company was as follows :

The Grand Junction cannot, nor do they think it can, upon any principle of justice, be asked of them. I understand the question to relate to the parish of Mary-le-bone alone.

The answer of the New River company was as follows :

The New River company have already made known to the vestry in their minutes of the 4th of March, why they declined to supply the parish on any terms, except under circumstances which cannot now exist, as the matter is going before Parliament; but I have no reserve in saying, that if the parish were within the district to which they confine themselves, they could not supply it at the rates proposed.

The second question put by your committee, was :

Will you engage not to charge more for supplying the whole parish with water, than at the rate in 1810?

The answer of the Grand Junction company was as follows :

The Grand Junction cannot undertake to do this; and for the reasons of their not doing so, they beg to refer to the proposal made by them and the West Middlesex company to the parish, this day.

The answer of the West Middlesex company was as follows :

The West Middlesex cannot engage to supply at the rates charged in 1810.

The answer of the New River company was as follows :

I refer to my former answer on behalf of the New River company.

If this parish were within the district, I doubt whether they could supply it at the rates of 1810, on account of its distance from the New River head, and the height of its general level. The rates of 1810 within that district will (as the company view their situation) so barely remunerate them, that if they acquiesce in them, it will be very much with a view of putting an end to an odious contest.

The third question put by your committee was :

Will you name any price, in relation to the price paid in 1810, beyond which you will engage not to charge for supplying water in future to the whole parish?

The answer of the Grand Junction company was as follows :

Twenty-five per cent. addition upon the rates of 1810; but for further explanation, see answer to the previous question, (No. 2.) on the part of the Grand Junction company, and the paper delivered in by them this day.

The answer of the West Middlesex company was as follows :

The West Middlesex request that they may be considered as giving the same answer as the above to this question.

The answer of the New River company was as follows :

I refer to my former answers on behalf of the New River company.

The fourth question put by your Committee, was :

Do you mean to oppose the passing of our proposed bill in all or in part, if it contains neither maximum nor minimum as to the price to be charged for water in future?

The answer of the New River company was as follows :

If a protecting price be agreed upon, the companies will concur in any bill for the purpose of carrying it into effect, but they cannot think that in any event the parish ought to have a power of erecting waterworks for themselves, while they can have a protecting price.

The answer of the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies was as follows :

We concur in this answer. When we say protecting price, we mean protection as to quantity, quality and price.

The four questions being put to Mr. Brent, he referred as his answer to the letter of the 5th March 1818, from the court of directors of the Chelsea waterworks company, addressed to the vestry of this parish, a copy of which is as follows :—

Office of Chelsea Waterworks, Abingdon-street, 5th March 1818.

Sir,—I have this day laid before the court of directors your letter of the 28th ult. wherein you state, "That you are directed by the vestrymen of St. Mary-le-bone to request that a deputation of some members of this company will meet a committee of vestrymen of the said parish, at the Court-house, on the Wednesday then following, at twelve o'clock, with a view to making proposals for supplying the parish of St. Mary-le-bone with water." And I am ordered to acquaint you, that the court do not feel they can make any proposals for the service of the parish of St. Mary-le-bone, the company having already lost a considerable sum of money therein.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,

To J. H. Greenwell, Esq.

(signed) J. G. Lynde.

Appendix,
(A.)

Correspondence,
&c. between Mary-
le-bone Vestry and
Water Companies.

Appendix,
(A.)

The Report of the West Middlesex and Grand Junction Waterworks Companies to the Committee appointed by the Vestry of the Parish of Mary-le-bone.

Correspondence,
&c. between Mary-
le-bone Vestry and
Water Companies:

The West Middlesex and Grand Junction Waterworks companies, in compliance with the request made by the committee, have ascertained the amount of water rates paid to the New River and Chelsea companies in the year 1809, by that part of the parish of St. Mary-le-bone then in existence; and the amount of the rates payable in 1817 for the same portion of the parish, to the New River, Chelsea, West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies, which appears to be as follows; viz.

1809 :			£.	s.	d.	1817 :			£.	s.	d.
New River	-	-	11,182	2	—	New River	-	-	5,648	3	6
Chelsea	-	-	2,205	18	6	Chelsea	-	-	1,177	12	6
						West Middlesex	-	-	3,286	18	6
						Grand Junction	-	-	817	10	—
			£.13,388	—	6						
									£.10,930	4	6

From the preceding statement it appears that the difference between the water rents of 1809 and those of 1817, as applicable to the supply of the same part of the parish of St. Mary-le-bone, is £.2,457. 16s.

A reduction however must be made from the rates of 1817 of the sum of £. 2,000, as a fair apportioned charge for high service afforded to about 1,000 houses, which high service did not exist in 1809, and which, added to the above difference of £.2,457. 16s. will, in effect, leave the rates paid by the parish in 1817, £.4,457. 16s. less than in 1809.

In support of the above claim for high service, the companies have to state that it is a most moderate and indeed inadequate consideration for this particular supply to 1,000 houses, with reference to the expense, risk and trouble attending such supply.

With respect to the future rates to be paid by the parish, the West Middlesex and Grand Junction companies have bestowed the greatest attention to this part of the committee's request, and feel the most anxious desire to meet the views entertained by them on the subject.

The following statement therefore will show the claim made by the companies for the future service to the parish, viz.

	£.	s.	d.
Rates in 1809 for the houses then in the parish	-	-	13,388 — 6
Additional charge of twenty-five per cent. upon the above	-	-	3,347 — 1½
Rates for houses built since, estimated at	-	-	2,500 — —
			£.19,235 — 7½

The above sum of £.19,235. 0s. 7½d. will therefore be about the amount required for the supply to the parish, exclusive of the present and future high services, and for any future extra consumption of water for trades or otherwise.

The companies cannot omit calling the attention of the committee to the innumerable advantages which have attended the competition between the companies, and which are fully illustrated by the following facts; viz.

The inhabitants of St. Mary-le-bone have actually received for many years, and continue to receive, more than five times the quantity of water which they did previous to the year 1809, and that, as before appears, at a rent below what was paid at that time; they have consequently had for this period a gratuitous supply of more than four times the whole quantity formerly received.

Previous to the year 1809, the supply was so *scanty* and *insufficient*, that with the utmost care and economy on the part of the parish, the greatest inconveniences were frequently experienced, as was most satisfactorily proved before a Committee of the House of Commons, on the passing of the West Middlesex act.

The parish had no security from fire beyond that afforded by a main of an area of thirty-eight inches, whereas it is now not only nearly surrounded by mains of the West Middlesex company, of areas from 201 up to 346 inches, constantly charged, but it is also intersected in almost every direction, by means of areas from 63 up to 153 inches, by which the general protection is such, that upon the necessary precaution of stopping the gratings in the streets being taken, it is in the power of the companies, at a moment's notice, to inundate the parish in every direction, at one and the same time.

In consequence of the abundant supply, superior attention, and accommodation now existing, the habits of the parishioners are naturally changed: so much so, that nothing short of a continuance of this supply and attention will now be satisfactory to them.

From these facts, to which many others might be added, it is submitted the companies have a fair and irresistible claim for the before-mentioned advance, and which they hope will be readily allowed them.

2d May 1818.

Appendix (B.)

LONDON BRIDGE WATERWORKS.

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Secretary to the *London Bridge Waterworks Company*.

(1.)—LETTER from Mr. R. Till, Superintendent to the London Bridge Waterworks, to W. H. Fremantle, Esq.

Appendix,
(B.)

London Bridge
Waterworks.

SIR,

London Bridge Waterworks, February 20th, 1821.

WHEN I attended you at the Committee on the subject of the Waterworks on Friday, the usual hour of breaking up was so near approaching, that I considered it incumbent on me to give my answers as concise as possible, especially as these works, of which I have the management, have not any connection with the other water companies.

I fear, however, that my conciseness may have occasioned your honourable Committee to have adopted a more unfavourable opinion of our concern than it deserves, and therefore I will, with your permission, make you acquainted with some circumstances which may probably be of use to you.

Our water is worked up by six large wheels, and occasionally by the assistance of one steam engine when the tides are low. We consider the wheels to have the preference of steam engines, inasmuch as they work all night, which the engines do not. Within the last twenty years we have increased our power at least a fifth part; and four years ago we built an iron wheel, which is supposed to be equal to any one in the kingdom: it cost £.6,500: and we are now about building another, which will cost £.5,000.

The increased demand for water is fully equal to the increased power, owing to the number of water-closets which have been erected within twenty years, and from which there is a considerable waste.

In answer to your question, Why we did not erect engines, as the other companies had done, to increase our quantity of water, I beg to mention that we are not in possession of any ground on which they could be built; and I desire to refer you to the observation I have made, that we prefer the water-wheels.

In respect to the laying down iron pipes in the stead of timber, I beg to repeat that we have not sufficient capital; but there is another strong reason for deferring it: in case the House of Commons should determine that London Bridge should be rebuilt, our waterworks would be annihilated, and of course the expenditure for the iron pipes would be totally lost. I request your forgiveness for having omitted to mention that we join our iron pipes with flanches; and therefore I answered to your question, that I calculated iron pipes to be double the expense of wooden pipes; but if they are united in the manner which is now generally adopted, I consider them to be only half more than the wooden pipes.

I did not think it proper to answer the question proposed by one of the honourable members, Whether I did not think the water from these works was the worst of all that was used; but I hope you will allow me to mention, that exclusively of one or two of the companies, the others all pump up the water from the same river as we do. Whenever there has been a great fall of water up the country, the ebb tides bring down a considerable quantity of ground and soil from the different rivers, and the Thames water is then frequently very foul; but if it is left in a cistern for four-and-twenty hours, it will be finer than any other water that can be produced.

The houses of tradesmen in the city are generally very much pinched for room in their kitchens, and consequently their cisterns are so very small that they do not hold more than one day's consumption, and therefore there is not any time for the water to clear itself. I use two large cisterns, and by drawing out the water alternately, every other day, I have as clear water as can be imagined.

I rely on your candour to excuse the liberty I have now taken.

I beg to offer you my sincere thanks for your very kind and polite demeanour to me on Friday; and

I am, with great respect, Sir,

Your very obedient, and much obliged humble servant,

W. H. Fremantle, Esq.

Rich^d Till, Superintendent.

Appendix
(B.)
London Bridge
Waterworks.

(2.)—LEASES by virtue of which the Trustees of the London Bridge Waterworks are authorized to supply the City of London and Liberties thereof with Water.

1581:

May 30.—First arch wheel:—Lease granted by the Lord Mayor and commonalty of the city of London, of the first arch of London Bridge, to erect an engine within the same, for 500 years.

1583:

November 24.—Second arch wheel:—Lease granted by the Lord Mayor and commonalty of the city of London of the second arch, for 500 years.

1701:

November 24.—Fourth arch wheel:—Lease granted by the Lord Mayor and commonalty of the city of London, of the fourth arch, for 381 years.

1761:

September 29. Third arch wheel:—Lease granted by the Lord Mayor and commonalty of the city of London, of the third arch, for 321 years.

1767:

September 29.—Fifth arch wheel and Borough wheel:—Lease granted by the Lord Mayor and commonalty of the city of London, of the fifth arch from the north end, and of the second arch from the south end, for 315 years.

The quantity of water raised by these wheels is now 3,894,317 gallons daily.

The capital stock of the London Bridge waterworks is divided into 1,500 shares; the nominal value of each share is supposed to be £.100; but owing to most of the books belonging to the company being consumed by fire many years ago, the original value cannot be exactly determined or ascertained.

There has not been any account kept of the prices which have been paid for the shares of these works; but since the year 1789 they have been sold for £.70, and last year some were sold at £.50 for each share.

(3.)—ACCOUNT of the Gross Income of the Trustees of the London Bridge Waterworks, from the Year 1800 to the Year 1820:—and, Rate of Dividend paid to the Proprietors on One thousand Five hundred Shares in each Year, from the Year 1789 to 1820.

YEARS.	NET RENTS for Service of WATER.			OLD WOOD, IRON, &c. Sold.			TOTAL GROSS INCOME.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1801 - - -	10,723	1	5	95	—	1	10,818	1	6
1802 - - -	10,813	19	6	91	17	3	10,905	16	9
1803 - - -	10,937	4	—	102	4	3	11,039	8	3
1804 - - -	11,053	12	2	89	9	1	11,143	1	3
1805 - - -	11,349	8	6	98	9	6	11,447	18	—
1806 - - -	11,719	11	—	105	12	7	11,825	3	7
1807 - - -	11,961	—	9	105	6	—	12,066	6	9
1808 - - -	12,117	—	3	104	12	—	12,221	12	3
1809 - - -	12,332	—	—	85	2	9	12,417	2	9
1810 - - -	12,588	12	9	107	4	—	12,695	16	9
1811 - - -	12,559	1	3	90	8	6	12,649	9	9
1812 - - -	12,382	17	9	77	2	8	12,870	—	5
Compensation for a Lease - - }	410	—	—	-	-	-			
1813 - - -	12,198	14	3	61	10	1	12,260	4	4
1814 - - -	12,080	8	—	72	1	—	12,152	9	—
1815 - - -	12,201	11	—	78	5	6	12,279	16	6
1816 - - -	12,120	17	3	78	18	6	12,199	15	9
1817 - - -	12,040	6	8	60	16	8	12,101	3	4
1818 - - -	12,176	2	9	86	1	9	12,262	4	6
1819 - - -	12,266	3	6	57	6	6	12,323	10	—

Rate of Dividend paid to the Proprietors on 1,500 Shares, in each Year from the Year 1789 to 1820.

Appendix,
(B.)
London Bridge
Waterworks.

YEARS.	RATE of DIVIDEND per Share.	YEARS (continued.)	RATE of DIVIDEND per Share.	YEARS (continued.)	RATE of DIVIDEND per Share.	
1790 - - -	£. s. d.	1800 - - -	£. s. d.	1812 - - -	£. s. d.	
1791 - - -	3 — —	1801 - - -	3 — —	1813 - - -	2 15 —	
1792 - - -		1802 - - -		1814 - - -		
1793 - - -		1803 - - -		1815 - - -		
		1804 - - -				
1794 - - -	2 — —	1805 - - -			1816 - - -	2 15 —
1795 - - -		1806 - - -		1817 - - -	2 15 —	
1796 - - -		1807 - - -		1818 - - -	2 10 —	
1797 - - -		1808 - - -		1819 - - -		
	1809 - - -	1820 - - -				
1798 - - -	3 — —	1810 - - -				
1799 - - -		1811 - - -				

The Dividends were paid clear of the Property Tax up to 1816.

(4.)—ANSWERS to Questions put to Mr. Richard Till, Superintendent of the London Bridge Waterworks, March 19, 1821.

To the Select Committee of the Honourable the House of Commons respecting the Waterworks of the Metropolis.

Gentlemen,

IN obedience to your order of the 19th instant, I beg leave to offer the following answers to the questions proposed by you.

We are not in possession of any specific rules on which we act, in respect of the distinction between high services and low, but we consider that a daily supply of a butt to each house is a complete ordinary service, and any quantity more than that is considered as an extra service.

We consider the following trades as subject to an extra charge, in respect of their consumption of water:—bakers, brewers, butchers for slaughtering, bottle-merchants, curriers, leather-dressers and tanners, distillers, dyers, fellmongers, fishmongers, inns, publicans, stable-keepers, taverns and eating-houses, sugar-bakers, soap-boilers, and steam engines; and we have acted upon this custom for half a century.

When any application is made to us by a consumer of water in his business, to supply him, I give directions to the surveyor and the turncock to examine the premises very closely, and to report to me the supposed consumption, together with the size of the service-pipe. I then fix the price; but if, in the course of a year or two, I find that the consumption is either more or less than we thought, I readily make an abatement, or increase the sum, as the case requires.

If any circumstances should occur, in which you may wish for any further information, I shall most cheerfully obey your orders.

I am, with great respect, gentlemen, your most obedient humble servant,

Rich^d Till, Superintendent.

London Bridge Waterworks, }
March 21, 1821. }

Appendix,
(B.)

(5.)—ACCOUNT of the number of Tenants supplied with Water from the London Bridge Waterworks.

London Bridge
Waterworks.

	DWELLING HOUSES, &c. charged for the supply of Water:			Consumers from £. 5 to £. 20 per ann.	Public Buildings.	TOTALS.
	at 20s. per ann. and under.	from 20s. to 50s. per ann.	from 50s. to £. 5. per ann.			
In the district of:						
Mr. James Alden, - - collector	538	1,499	53	16	12	2,118
Mr. John Alden - - - ditto	497	2,125	49	58	22	2,751
Mr. William Alden - - ditto	596	1,073	23	18	25	1,735
Mr. Geo. Hopkins Hunt, collector for the Borough of Southwark	2,598	1,138	32	36	9	3,813
	4,229	5,835	157	128	68	10,417

April 6th 1821.

Rich^d Till, Superintendent.

Appendix, (C.)

NEW RIVER WATERWORKS.

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Secretary to the *New River Waterworks Company*.

Appendix,
(C.)

(1.)—SUBSTANCE of a DEED between the New River and East London Waterworks Companies, dated 9th November 1815.

New River
Waterworks.

AFTER stating the difficulties and losses which led to making the agreement, the deed recites, that the companies had respectively agreed to relinquish their right to supply water, the one to the east, the other to the west, of a certain line described in a schedule and plan annexed, and each to make over to the other the iron pipes, &c. lying in the district relinquished; that these had been valued on each side, and that a balance had been found in favour of the East London of £.7,151, which was agreed to be compensated by a transfer of rental from the New River company, to the amount of £.715. 2s. per annum, or thereabout, which was considered by the East London company as a fair equivalent for the said difference in their favour, being after the rate of ten year's purchase. The deed then contains mutual assignments of the iron pipes, &c. pursuant to the agreement, and proceeds with the following covenants:

AND the said governor and company of the New River do hereby, for themselves, their successors and assigns, covenant, promise and agree, with and to the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks, their successors and assigns, in manner following; (that is to say) that the said governor and company of the New River, their successors and assigns, shall not nor will at any time or times hereafter, except in the cases herein provided, convey or cause to be conveyed any water in, by, through, under or into any of the streets, places or districts on the east side of the said line described in the first schedule hereunder written, and also marked out in the map or plan hereunto annexed, or supply or cause to be supplied with water any of the houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts on the east side of the said line; and shall not nor will at any time or times hereafter do or cause to be done any act, deed, matter or thing whatsoever whereby or by reason or means whereof the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks, their successors or assigns, shall or may at any time or times hereafter be hindered, prevented or obstructed from conveying water in, by, through, under or into any of the streets, places or districts on the east side of the said line, or supplying with water any of the houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts on the east side of the said line, or from having, taking, using and enjoying the said pipes and premises firstly hereinbefore assigned, or intended so to be; and that if the said governor and company of the New River, their successors or assigns, shall at any time or times hereafter, except in the cases herein provided, supply or cause to be supplied with water, any one or more of the houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts on the east side of the said line, then and in every such case the said governor and company of the New River, or their successors, shall forfeit and pay to the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks, their successors or assigns, for every such offence, by way of liquidated damages, and not by way of penalty, double the amount of the following annual rent or rents for the house, manufactory, building, street, place or district, or houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts, which shall be so supplied; (that is to say,) if immediately before the commission of any such offence, the house, manufactory, building, street, place or district, or houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places

places or districts, shall have been supplied with water by the said company of proprietors, their successors or assigns, then during such time as the said governor and company, their successors or assigns, shall supply or cause to be supplied with water any such house, manufactory, building, street, place or district, or houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts as aforesaid, double the amount of the annual rent or rents which was or were payable to the said company of proprietors, their successors or assigns, for the water supplied by them to the same house, manufactory, building, street, place or district, or houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts, and the double amount of such rent or rents shall be paid on or at the same days or times, and in the same manner as the said rent or rents was or were payable to the said company of proprietors, their successors or assigns; but if, immediately before the commission of any such offence, the house, manufactory, building, street, place or district, or houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts shall not have been supplied with water by the said company of proprietors, their successors or assigns, then during such time as the said governor and company, their successors or assigns, shall supply or cause to be supplied with water any such house, manufactory, building, street, place or district, or houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts as aforesaid, double the amount of the annual rent or rents for which the said governor and company of the New River, their successors or assigns, shall have contracted to supply with water such house, manufactory, building, street, place or district, or houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places or districts as aforesaid, and the double amount of such rent or rents shall be paid on or at the same days or times, and in the same manner as the said rent or rents shall be reserved or payable to the said governor and company, their successors or assigns; and that the said governor and company and their successors, shall not nor will at any time or times hereafter, for twenty-one successive days, neglect or fail, unless prevented by casualties, temporary stoppages, or inevitable accidents, to supply or cause to be supplied with good and wholesome water, in an effectual manner, and in such reasonable quantities as shall be required, all the houses, buildings and manufactories, situated in any rows or row of buildings comprising a polygon, circus, crescent, square, street or other subordinate or inferior place, and called or known by the same name, on the west side of the said line, the tenants or occupiers of which rows or row of buildings, either wholly or in part, were immediately before the twenty-ninth day of September last supplied with water by the said company of proprietors, or such of the said houses, buildings and manufactories, the tenants or occupiers whereof respectively shall from time to time be desirous of being supplied with water by the said governor and company or their successors, and who shall pay or be willing and offer to pay such rent or rents as the said governor and company or their successors shall think fit and proper to require for the same: And further, that if at any time or times complaint of any breach of the covenant lastly hereinbefore contained, shall be made to the said company of proprietors or their successors, by and under the hands of the majority of those tenants or occupiers of any rows or row of buildings, comprising a polygon, circus, crescent, square, street, or other subordinate or inferior place, and called or known by the same name, in which the houses, buildings or manufactories shall be situated, where any such breach shall be committed or made, who shall for the time being be supplied or be desirous of being supplied with water by the said governor and company or their successors, and shall pay or be willing and offer to pay such rent or rents as aforesaid, and if upon such complaint any action or actions shall be commenced and prosecuted for such breach of the said covenant, and it shall be proved to the satisfaction of the jury that a breach of the said covenant has been committed or made, so that a verdict shall be obtained and final judgment entered up thereon, then and in such case it shall and may be lawful to and for the said company of proprietors and their successors to re-enter and extend their pipes and other works through the districts or places on the west side of the said line to the rows or row of buildings, comprising a polygon, circus, crescent, square, street or other subordinate or inferior place, and called or known by the same name, in which the houses, buildings or manufactories shall be situated, where such breach of the said covenant shall be so proved to have been committed or made, and to supply with water, in such manner as the said company of proprietors or their successors shall think proper, all the houses, buildings and manufactories constituting the same rows or row of buildings, comprising a polygon, circus, crescent, square, street or other subordinate or inferior place, and called or known by the same name: And further, that the said governor and company and their successors, not only shall not nor will for the said space of twenty-one days neglect or fail in affording such supply of water as aforesaid, but also shall and will from time to time and at all times hereafter, unless prevented by casualties, temporary stoppages or inevitable accidents, supply or cause to be supplied with good and wholesome water in an effectual manner, and in such reasonable quantities as shall be required, all the houses, buildings and manufactories situated in any rows or row of buildings, comprising a polygon, circus, crescent, square, street or other subordinate or inferior place, and called or known by the same name, on the west side of the said line, the tenants or occupiers of which said rows or row of buildings, either wholly or in part, were immediately before the 29th day of September last supplied with water by the said company of proprietors, or such of the said houses, buildings and manufactories, the tenants or occupiers whereof respectively shall from time to time be desirous of being supplied with water by the said governor and company or their successors, and who shall pay or be willing and offer to pay such rent or rents as the said governor and company or their successors shall think fit and proper to require for the same: And further, that if at any time or times hereafter any rows or

Appendix,
(C.)
New River
Waterworks.

Appendix,
(C.)

New River
Waterworks.

row of buildings, comprising a polygon, circus, crescent, square, street or other subordinate or inferior place, and called or known by the same name, on the west side of the said line; the tenants or occupiers of which said rows or row of buildings either wholly or in part were immediately before the 29th day of September last supplied with water by the said company of proprietors, shall be wholly and entirely unsupplied with water by the said governor and company or their successors for the space of six calendar months after requisition shall have been made to the said governor and company or their successors, by the major part of the tenants or occupiers of any such rows or row of buildings, to supply or continue to supply them with water, and such tenants or occupiers having offered or expressed their willingness to pay reasonable rates or rents for such supply, then and in every such case it shall be lawful for the said company of proprietors and their successors, upon request in writing made by and under the hands of the majority of the tenants or occupiers of such rows or row of buildings on the west side of the said line as shall be so unsupplied for such space of six calendar months as aforesaid, to re-enter and extend their pipes and other works through the districts or places on the west side of the said line to such rows or row of buildings as last aforesaid, and to supply with water, in such manner as the said company of proprietors or their successors shall think proper, all the houses, buildings and manufactories constituting such rows or row of buildings as last aforesaid. [Then follow corresponding covenants from the East London company to the New River.] AND the said governor and company of the New River, and the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks, do hereby severally for themselves and their successors, further covenant, promise and agree, with and to the other of them the said companies and their successors, in manner following; (that is to say) that for the space of four calendar months from the date of these presents, it shall and may be lawful to and for the said company of proprietors, their successors or assigns, to use such of the wooden pipes belonging to the said governor and company, on the east side of the said line, as they shall find requisite or necessary for the purpose of supplying with water from the works of the said company of proprietors any of the houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places and districts on the east side of the said line, which cannot at present be conveniently supplied by or by means of the pipes belonging to the said company of proprietors; and that, for the said space of four calendar months from the date of these presents, the said governor and company, and their successors, shall and will continue as heretofore to supply with water, from the works of the said governor and company, those houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places and districts, on the east side of the said line, which the said company of proprietors and their successors shall not from time to time, during the said space of four calendar months, be enabled conveniently to supply with water from the works of the said company of proprietors; and that the said governor and company shall for such last-mentioned supply of water from their works, provided the same be continued up to the 25th day of December next, or for a longer period, be entitled to receive, up to the said 25th day of December next, but no longer, the rents which shall accrue due for or on account of the same; but where the last-mentioned supply shall not be continued up to the said 25th day of December next, all the rents payable from the said 29th day of September last, on account of such last-mentioned supply, shall belong to the said company of proprietors and their successors; and where the said last-mentioned supply shall be continued beyond the said 25th day of December next, all the rents payable on account of such supply after the said 25th day of December next, shall belong to the said company of proprietors and their successors, and that the said governor and company and their successors shall and will at all times, so long as the wooden pipes of the said governor and company of the New River shall be used to supply water on the east side of the said line, either from the works of the said governor and company, or from the works of the said company of proprietors, keep or cause to be kept all such wooden pipes in good repair, order and condition, and also shall and will, once in every fourteen days at the least, deliver or cause to be delivered to the said company of proprietors or their successors, a true and faithful account of the expenses incurred by the said governor and company or their successors, in so keeping the said wooden pipes in good repair, order and condition as aforesaid; and that the said company of proprietors or their successors shall and will, within fourteen days after the said governor and company or their successors shall have delivered or caused to be delivered to the said company of proprietors or their successors any account of such expenses, well and truly pay or cause to be paid to the said governor and company or their successors the whole amount of the said expenses, and the said expenses shall be allowed the said governor and company and their successors, in addition to the rents which, under the provisions hereinbefore for that purpose contained, they may be entitled to receive for supplying water on the east side of the said line, and that immediately after the expiration of the said four calendar months from the date of these presents, the said company of proprietors or their successors shall and will, at their own expense, take or cause to be taken up all the wooden pipes now belonging to the said governor and company on the east side of the said line, which shall or may be used either for the supply of water from the works of the said governor and company, or from the works of the said company of proprietors, on the east side of the said line, save and except such of the said pipes used for the supply of water from the works of the said governor and company as shall be discontinued to be used for that purpose, on or before the 1st day of February next, and that the said governor and company or their successors shall and will at their expense, after such wooden pipes as aforesaid shall have been so taken up, take and carry away the same, with all the cocks, plugs and other apparatus affixed or belonging thereto,
and

and that it shall be lawful for the said governor and company and their successors, at any time or times hereafter, at their own expense, to take up and carry away the wooden pipes now belonging to the said governor and company on the east side of the said line, with the cocks, plugs and other apparatus affixed or belonging thereto, which shall not, under the provisions hereinbefore for that purpose contained, be required for supplying with water any of the houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places and districts on the east side of the said line in manner aforesaid; and that for the said space of four calendar months from the date of these presents the said company of proprietors and their successors shall and will continue as heretofore to supply with water those houses, manufactories, buildings, streets, places and districts on the west side of the said line, which the said governor and company of the New River and their successors, shall not from time to time, during the said space of four calendar months, be enabled conveniently to supply with water, and shall for such supply, provided the same be continued up to the 25th day of December next, or for a longer period, be entitled to receive up to the 25th day of December next, but no longer, the rent which shall accrue due for or on account of the same; but where the supply shall not be continued up to the said 25th day of December next, all the rents payable from the 29th day of September last, on account of such supply, shall belong to the said governor and company and their successors; and where the supply shall be continued beyond the said 25th day of December next, all the rents payable on account of such supply, after the said 25th day of December next, shall belong to the said governor and company and their successors: And further, that if the projected union between the said governor and company of the New River and the company of proprietors of the West Middlesex waterworks shall take place, and if for effecting the same the said governor and company of the New River shall be dissolved, and a new company formed, or the constitution of the said governor and company of the New River shall be so altered or changed as to prejudice or affect these presents, or any of the assignments, covenants and provisions herein contained, then and in such case, and within three calendar months after such dissolution or alteration or change shall have taken place, all such acts and deeds for giving effect to or confirming these presents, and the assignments, covenants and provisions herein contained, shall, at the costs and charges of the new company, or the said governor and company of the New River, (as the case may be,) be done and executed by the said new company, or the said governor and company of the New River, (as the case may be,) and by the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks, as the respective counsel learned in the law of the said two respective companies shall advise and require: Provided always, and it is hereby agreed and declared between and by the parties to these presents, that it shall be lawful for the said governor and company and their successors, at all times hereafter, to supply with water the house, buildings and premises at Stamford Hill, in the county of Middlesex, now in the occupation of Joseph Stonard, Esq. on the east side of the said line, until the same can conveniently be supplied by the said company of proprietors or their successors, upon terms to be agreed upon between the said company of proprietors and their successors and the said Joseph Stonard or the proprietors or occupiers for the time being of the said premises, anything hereinbefore contained to the contrary thereof in anywise notwithstanding. In Witness whereof the said governor and company of the New River and the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks have severally caused their common seals to be hereunto affixed, the day and year first above written.

Appendix,
(C.)
New River
Waterworks.

The First Schedule to which the above written Indenture refers.

[This schedule contains merely a description in words of the boundary line dividing the New River and East London districts: as the Committee have directed a map of the boundary lines to be prepared, that description is not here added, but is ready to be furnished if required.]

The Second Schedule to which the above written Indenture refers.

Agreements made by the governor and company of the New River with the following persons, to supply water; viz. with Messrs. Stein and Smith of Whitechapel, in the county of Middlesex, distillers, to supply them with water for the term of seven years, from Christmas 1811, at the yearly rent of £. 120; the said rent of £. 120 to be received by the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks from the twenty-ninth day of September one thousand eight hundred and fifteen: with Mr. Tickel, of Old Castlestreet, Whitechapel aforesaid, brewer, to supply him with water for seven years, from Michaelmas one thousand eight hundred and twelve, at the yearly rent of £. 30; the said rent of £. 30. to be received by the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks the twenty-ninth day of September one thousand eight hundred and fifteen: with Mr. Severne, the proprietor of ninety-three houses in Splidts Fields, to supply the occupiers of the said houses for the term of seven years from Midsummer one thousand eight hundred and thirteen, at the yearly rent of £. 44. 9s.; the said rent of £. 44. 9s. to be received by the said company of proprietors of the East London waterworks from the said twenty-ninth day of September one thousand eight hundred and fifteen.

The foregoing is a copy of the original agreement.

19th February 1821.

J. P. Rowe, Sec.

Appendix,
(C.)
New River
Waterworks.

(2.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Sums paid in Dividends to the Proprietors of the New River, in each Year from 1789 to the latest period to which the same can be made up; specifying the Rates of the Dividends, and whether the Payments made were discharged of the Property Tax.

THE profits of the New River company are divided into two moieties of thirty-six shares each, which (after payment of the property tax,) have produced the following Dividends per share:—

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
1789	409	17	5 $\frac{3}{4}$	1800	463	12	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	1811	282	12	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
1790	400	9	9	1801	471	9	—	1812	220	13	2 $\frac{3}{4}$
1791	411	17	— $\frac{1}{4}$	1802	451	4	4 $\frac{1}{4}$	1813	113	18	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1792	426	5	10	1803	445	6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	1814	23	2	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1793	441	12	10	1804	396	19	9 $\frac{3}{4}$	1815	60	2	11 $\frac{3}{4}$
1794	431	5	8	1805	486	—	—	1816	85	—	—
1795	425	14	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	1806	450	2	10 $\frac{3}{4}$	1817	120	2	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1796	446	—	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	1807	440	13	2	1818	159	4	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
1797	470	12	8	1808	472	—	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	1819	199	10	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
1798	456	14	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	1809	472	5	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	1820	266	3	8
1799	457	12	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	1810	465	—	6 $\frac{1}{2}$				

A clog or charge, averaging at about £. 13. 17s. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per share, is deducted out of the above dividends, from nearly all the holders of King's Shares, and a small proportion of the holders of Adventurer's Shares.

(3.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Gross Income and Dividends of the New River Company, in each Year from the Year 1800 to the latest period to which the same can be made up; distinguishing therein the amount of the Sums received respectively for Water supplied for Domestic Purposes, for Water supplied to Public Buildings and for the purposes of Trade and Manufacture, and for Water used in watering Roads or Streets, from the Income derived from other sources.

YEARS.	Water Rents for Dwelling Houses, &c.			Watering Roads or Streets.			RENTS received for Lands and Houses.			GROSS INCOME.			DIVIDENDS.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1800	59,976	17	5	—	—	—	941	7	4	60,918	4	9	463	12	1 $\frac{1}{2}$
1801	60,762	14	10	—	—	—	960	1	1	61,722	15	11	471	9	—
1802	61,841	19	—	—	—	—	951	4	—	62,793	3	—	451	4	4 $\frac{1}{4}$
1803	62,230	4	4	—	—	—	914	19	6	63,145	3	10	445	6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
1804	63,678	2	10	—	—	—	918	2	5	64,596	5	3	396	19	9 $\frac{3}{4}$
1805	70,462	5	—	—	—	—	1,153	6	6	71,615	11	6	486	—	—
1806	75,661	19	2	—	—	—	1,482	14	5	77,144	13	7	450	2	10 $\frac{3}{4}$
1807	77,330	7	7	—	—	—	1,440	9	7	78,770	17	2	440	13	2
1808	79,302	9	3	—	—	—	1,412	14	9	80,715	4	—	472	—	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
1809	80,782	12	—	—	—	—	1,630	17	10	82,413	9	10	472	5	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
1810	80,992	4	5	—	—	—	1,464	1	3	82,456	5	8	465	—	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1811	78,161	1	2	—	—	—	1,340	12	6	79,501	13	8	282	12	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
1812	72,917	15	9	—	—	—	1,485	7	4	74,403	3	1	220	13	2 $\frac{3}{4}$
1813	66,920	15	—	—	—	—	1,451	10	5	68,372	5	5	113	18	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1814	64,235	4	—	—	—	—	1,674	1	1	65,909	5	1	23	2	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
1815	64,500	1	6	—	—	—	1,874	13	4	66,374	14	10	60	2	11 $\frac{3}{4}$
1816	64,059	6	7	—	—	—	2,025	15	1	66,085	1	8	85	—	—
1817	63,262	5	—	—	—	—	2,047	17	10	65,310	2	10	120	2	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1818	61,464	2	6	—	—	—	2,033	12	1	63,497	14	7	159	4	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
1819	62,434	5	10	192	10	—	2,653	10	10	65,280	6	8	199	10	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
1820	63,504	5	5	530	9	1	3,240	7	10	67,275	2	4	266	3	8

The company's books do not, upon the face of them, furnish any means of distinguishing the amount received for water supplied for domestic purposes, and for water used for the purposes of trade or manufacture. It would be possible, in many instances, to state the rental for water supplied to public buildings, but in others very difficult, from the mixed nature of the buildings and of the supply. In any particular instance the rental may be readily stated, with such observations as may serve to distinguish the parts of it which are respectively applicable to domestic or public supply.

(3.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the number of Dwelling Houses and other Buildings supplied with Water by the New River Company, in each of the Years 1804, 1809, 1814, and 1819, arranged in distinct Classes, according to the amount of Water Rates then charged thereon respectively; and distinguishing the several Parishes in which the same were situated.

Appendix,
(C.)
New River
Waterworks.

1804:			1809:		
WALKS OR DISTRICTS.	Tenants.	Houses.	WALKS OR DISTRICTS.	Tenants.	Houses.
Whitechapel - - -	2,366	5,890	Whitechapel - - -	2,667	6,196
Cornhill - - -	2,302	2,954	Cornhill - - -	2,258	2,910
Shoreditch - - -	2,768	5,545	Shoreditch - - -	3,039	5,699
Islington - - -	3,090	4,727	Islington - - -	4,048	5,877
Moorfields - - -	2,436	5,160	Moorfields - - -	2,586	5,197
St. Paul's - - -	1,903	2,278	St. Paul's - - -	1,919	2,289
Clerkenwell - - -	2,461	4,312	Clerkenwell - - -	2,652	4,534
Holborn - - -	2,011	3,241	Holborn - - -	2,297	3,449
Fleet-street - - -	1,918	2,170	Fleet-street - - -	2,558	2,909
Bloomsbury - - -	3,292	3,768	Bloomsbury - - -	3,749	4,098
Covent-garden - - -	2,242	2,612	Covent-garden - - -	2,485	2,795
Soho - - -	2,386	2,591	Soho - - -	2,437	2,574
Mary-le-bone - - -	3,675	3,723	Mary-le bone - - -	3,782	3,824
St. James's - - -	2,464	2,576	St. James's - - -	2,646	2,748
Portland - - -	2,940	3,030	Portland - - -	3,677	3,853
On the Banks of the River -	149	104	On the Banks of the River -	160	106
	38,403	54,681		42,960	59,058

1814:			1819:		
WALKS OR DISTRICTS.	Tenants.	Houses.	WALKS OR DISTRICTS.	Tenants.	Houses.
Whitechapel - - -	2,391	4,246	Shoreditch - - -	4,069	6,615
Shoreditch - - -	2,655	5,282	Islington - - -	6,825	9,313
Islington - - -	4,963	6,908	Cornhill and St. Paul's -	4,472	6,152
Cornhill and St. Paul's -	4,278	5,303	Clerkenwell - - -	3,560	6,328
Finsbury and Clerkenwell -	4,402	8,100	Holborn - - -	3,866	5,863
Holborn - - -	3,149	5,128	Fleet-street - - -	4,588	5,484
Fleet-street - - -	2,385	2,617	Bloomsbury - - -	2,689	2,822
Covent-garden - - -	2,156	2,436	St. Giles's - - -	3,036	3,352
Bloomsbury - - -	3,794	3,794	St. Martin's - - -	5,146	5,179
St. James's - - -	2,379	2,414	On the Banks of the River -	155	125
Portland - - -	2,614	2,630		38,406	51,233
Soho - - -	2,187	2,308			
Mary-le-bone - - -	2,886	2,957			
On the Banks of the River -	152	124			
	40,391	54,247			

New River Office, }
19 February 1821. }

J. P. Rowe, Secy.

Appendix,
(C.)New River
Waterworks.

(5.)—STATEMENT of the supply of Water to the parish of Mary-le-bone, part of Soho, and part of St. George's Hanover-square.

IN the year 1767, there were four 7-inch mains leading to the above districts, all of which were supplied from the low ponds at the New River head, but as that level was not sufficiently high to give any tolerable supply, they were connected with the high pond, for a certain number of hours each day (which pond is 32 feet above the level of the New River at Islington); the hours of their connection being as under:—

1767:—Soho Main	- - - - -	21	} 66 hours each week through a 7-inch main with a head of 34 feet.
Grosvenor Main	- - - - -	24	
Oxford Main	- - - - -	15	
Portland Main	- - - - -	6	
1768:—	- - - - -	27	} 117 ditto.
		33	
		27	
		30	
1773:—	- - - - -	27	} 150 ditto.
		39	
		39	
		45	
1780:—	- - - - -	33	} 229½ ditto.
		45	
In this year another main was driven for Mary-le-bone only.		54	
		57	
		40½	
1787:—	- - - - -	42	} 301 ditto.
		57	
		57	
		66	
		79	

When a fire happened in these districts, notice was sent up to the New River head, and the water turned on, as the low pond would rarely rise out of the ground in the above districts.

(6.)—STATEMENT of the number of Strokes and the quantity of Water raised by the Engine at the New River Head, in each Year from 1787 to 1809.

		Number of Strokes.	Quantity of Water, in Hogsheads of 54 gallons each.
In 1787	Islington supplied by engine	2,061,502	4,940,243
- 1788	August 15th, Water-wheel set to work complete	1,686,659	4,041,952
- 1789	- - - - -	700,213	1,678,019
- 1790	- - - - -	823,359	1,973,100
- 1791	- - - - -	1,048,323	2,512,116
- 1792	- - - - -	1,587,932	3,804,348
- 1793	- - - - -	1,510,646	3,620,167
- 1794	- - - - -	2,301,570	5,515,566
- 1795	- - - - -	2,670,419	6,399,486
- 1796	- - - - -	2,507,843	6,009,889
- 1797	- - - - -	2,690,989	6,448,776
- 1798	Axle of water-wheel broke	2,936,156	7,036,308
- 1799	ditto	3,409,682	8,171,087
- 1800	Wheel at work again	2,295,042	5,499,926
- 1801	- - - - -	2,517,407	6,032,812
- 1802	- - - - -	2,852,616	6,835,906
- 1803	Supplied the Hampstead tenants	3,708,811	8,887,966
- 1804	No account of these years to be found.	-	-
- 1805			
- 1806	- - - - -	2,328,410	} 8,926,078
	{ New engine	705,255	
- 1807	- - - - -	1,968,017	} 10,083,524
	{ Old ditto	1,697,328	
- 1808	Water wheel repaired	1,978,722	} 10,944,673
	{ Old ditto	2,006,255	
- 1809	- - - - -	1,976,766	} 10,035,664
	{ Old ditto	1,624,292	

N. B.—No allowance has been made in this calculation for the air admitted into the pumps, which is generally considered to be equal to one seventh.

William Chadwell Mylne.

February 1821.

(7.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the number and description of the Shares into which the Capital Joint Stock of the New River Company is divided.

Appendix,
(C.)

New River
Waterworks.

THE Joint Stock of the New River Company is divided into two moieties, each of them consisting of thirty-six shares; one of these is denominated the Adventurers Moiety, and the other the King's Moiety.

The property is freehold, and the shares are capable of subdivisions, and are in fact, at present, subdivided in various proportions, as underneath.

MOIETIES.	Whole Shares.	1/2	1/3	1/4	1/5	1/6	1/8	1/10	1/32	TOTAL in Shares.
Adventurers - -	30	4	6	2	2	3	4	1	- -	36.
King's - - -	27	13	- -	5	- -	- -	8	- -	8	36
TOTAL -	57	17	6	7	2	3	12	1	8	72

New River Office, }
19 February 1821. }

J. P. Rowe, Secy.

(8.)—ANSWERS, in further explanation, to Questions put to W. C. Mylne, Esq. in his Examination on the 16th February 1821.

Question 1.—DETAIL of waterworks in days, weeks and months in 1810?—

Answer.—NO detailed account can possibly be given, none having been kept excepting as to the working of the engine, which is already before the Committee.

2.—Difference of supply between 1810 and 1820?—

The town consumed the whole of the water in 1810, and even complained in the higher districts of not having a sufficiency. In 1811 the quantity of water delivered by the New River was ascertained to be 78,110,000 hogsheads per year, out of which it appears 10,035,664 hogsheads were raised for that portion of the western districts described in the plan annexed.

The supply given to the town in 1820 is about 67,000,000 hogsheads.

3.—The quantity of water raised by the expenditure of 400 chaldrons of coals?—

The quantity of water raised to the various heights (as the New River company's tenants are situated) by the expenditure of 400 chaldrons of coals, is about 9,516,736 hogsheads.

N. B. The whole of this quantity is for a high supply, in situations where no high service existed in 1810.

4.—The number of houses farmed and the number of tenants?—

The number of tenants are 38,535; the number of houses supplied is 52,082; the number of houses farmed is the difference between the one number and the other, namely, 13,547.

The quantity of coals purchased for the New River engine,

	Chaldrons.		Chaldrons.
In 1810 - - -	535	In 1816 - - -	1,020
- 1811 - - -	751	- 1817 - - -	800
- 1812 - - -	514	- 1818 - - -	853
- 1813 - - -	1,281	- 1819 - - -	400
- 1814 - - -	978	- 1820 - - -	400
- 1815 - - -	1,534		

The consumption of the coals will not give any idea of the quantity of water raised; for although a much larger quantity of water was required to be sent westward into the disputed districts, I never recommended the enlargement of the mains or any expenditure of capital for that object, being confident that an abandonment of some portion of the town must ultimately take place; for as the expenditure in coals would terminate with the supply, it was better to carry on the contest at a loss of ten or twelve per cent. than to expend a capital which could not be transferred to any other situation under a loss of fifty per cent.

Appendix
(C.)
New River
Waterworks.

5.—Comparison of original expense between an iron and wooden pipe of any given diameter, and estimate of expense of probable repairs of each in the course of thirty years?—

The price of a four-inch iron pipe, as contracted for by the New River company in 1814, when laid down complete, was 11 s. 3 d. per yard.

The price of a wooden pipe of the same diameter, and at the same period, put down complete, was 5 s. 2 d. per yard, which is less than half the amount of iron.

There is a saving, however, on the larger pipes, from the circumstance of pipes being made in iron of any diameter, while it is impossible to obtain them in wood of a larger diameter than seven inches.

It may therefore be considered, that the capital required to be expended in executing the pipes of a waterwork in iron, will be double the amount required for establishing one with wooden pipes.

The durability of wood in a waterwork depends materially on the nature of the supply to be afforded.

In 1810, the New River company had about 400 miles of wooden pipes in the streets of London, and they put down, on an average, 20 miles a year in repairs, at which period they did not profess to supply higher than the basement story, and none of their pipes were affected by machinery, the mains being all supplied from reservoirs.

February 1821.

William Chadwell Mylne.

(9.)—PAPER showing the Average Dividends of the New River Company for Five Years, from 1806 to 1810, and the Deficiency of Dividends from 1811 to 1820.

Dividends.	£.	s.	d.
1806 - - - - -	450	2	10 $\frac{3}{4}$
1807 - - - - -	440	13	2
1808 - - - - -	472	—	11 $\frac{3}{4}$
1809 - - - - -	472	5	8 $\frac{3}{4}$
1810 - - - - -	465	—	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
	<u>£. 2,300</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3 $\frac{1}{2}$</u>

Average of five years - - - - -	£. 460	—	8
Income tax - - - - -	46	—	—
	<u>£. 506</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>8</u>

- - - say £. 500.

YEARS.	DIVIDENDS.			INCOME TAX, 10 per Cent.			TOTAL.			DEFICIENCY.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1811 - - -	282	12	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	28	5	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	310	18	— $\frac{3}{4}$	189	1	11 $\frac{3}{4}$
1812 - - -	220	13	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	22	1	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	242	14	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	257	5	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
1813 - - -	113	18	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	11	7	10 $\frac{1}{4}$	125	6	5 $\frac{3}{4}$	374	13	6 $\frac{1}{2}$
1814 - - -	23	2	7 $\frac{1}{2}$	2	6	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	25	8	10 $\frac{3}{4}$	474	11	1 $\frac{1}{4}$
1815 - - -	60	2	11 $\frac{3}{4}$	3	—	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	63	3	3	436	16	9
1816 - - -	85	—	—	—	—	—	85	—	—	415	—	—
1817 - - -	120	2	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	—	—	—	120	2	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	379	17	5 $\frac{1}{2}$
1818 - - -	159	4	9 $\frac{3}{4}$	—	—	—	159	4	9 $\frac{3}{4}$	340	15	2 $\frac{1}{4}$
1819 - - -	199	10	11 $\frac{1}{4}$	—	—	—	199	10	11 $\frac{1}{4}$	300	9	— $\frac{3}{4}$
1820 - - -	266	3	8	—	—	—	266	3	8	233	16	4
							£.			3,402	6	10 $\frac{1}{4}$
										1,350	—	—
							£.			4,752	6	10 $\frac{1}{4}$

The whole debt at present is £. 97,445. 12 s. 1 d. giving a proportion to each share of £. 1,353. 8 s. 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. - - - say - - - - -

(10).—AN ESTIMATE of the Capital engaged in the Works of the New River Company, taken A. D. 1815; also, a further Estimate to Christmas A. D. 1820.

Appendix,
(C)

New River
Waterworks.

	£.	s.	d.
FOR the original purchase of the springs of Chadwell and Amwell, the remuneration to the millers upon the river of Lea, the purchase of the land for the formation of the river, the excavation of the ground, the levelling and puddling of banks, timber and brick wharfing at various places on the banks of 80 miles in length, the embankment of various vallies, and the tunneling in two instances at £. 5. 5 s. per yard, run on 40 miles in length	369,600	—	—
To the erection of 157 brick, timber and iron bridges, at £. 100 each	15,700	—	—
Protecting fences where the river runs parallel with the roads, and cross fences where the river is at right angles with the division of lands	15,000	—	—
To making 58 proper culverts for taking away the rain water, at £. 140 each	8,120	—	—
To making three flashes	7,500	—	—
To making five wastegates	3,500	—	—
To making two stopgates, with walksmen's houses thereto	9,000	—	—
The value paid by act of parliament in 1734, for an additional portion of the river Lea	3,250	—	—
To the purchase of Ware mill, as necessary for the government of the water	9,000	—	—
Formation of balance engine	7,000	—	—
Erection of marble gauge, and two other stone gauges and tumbling bays	6,500	—	—
Ditto stopgate, and cut into New River			
The purchase of 60 acres of land adjoining the river at various places	6,000	—	—
The formation of reservoir, for the reception of the water when brought to London	12,000	—	—
The purchase of land for the original circular pond, excavation, wharfing, stopgate, &c.			
Ditto - - the outer head	16,000	—	—
Ditto - - the high pond	12,500	—	—
Ditto - - the pond at Tottenham-court-road	16,000	—	—
Ditto - - the reservoir in St. John-street	5,000	—	—
Ditto - - the west pond in Hanging-field	2,000	—	—
The formation of cisterns for the filtering of water previous to its passing into London	£. 8,000	—	—
Waterhouse cistern, and dwelling thereon	3,000	—	—
Middle - - d° - and house			
Out - - d° - - d°	2,500	—	—
West - - d° - - d°	2,000	—	—
Duck - - d° - - - -	500	—	—
Green Man's d° - - d° - with another small cistern adjoining	2,000	—	—
Three high pond cisterns and two houses	1,500	—	—
Two cisterns in Pipe-yard, and house and sewer thereto	1,000	—	—
Dalby's cistern and house	1,000	—	—
Bullock d° - - d°	2,000	—	—
Two west pond cisterns and house	750	—	—
Two cisterns at Newington-lane, and one in Hopping-lane	750	—	—
To the various sewers from the above eighteen cisterns	1,800	—	—
	26,800	—	—
Machines necessary for the improved mode of supply as now required:			
To the erection of three engine-houses, and engine workers houses, &c.	£. 15,000	—	—
To various tunnels under ground, and wells for the pumps			
To the purchase of two large steam engines, and fitting up the same complete	9,500	—	—
To a large water-wheel fixed in a house of brick, and brick cistern	4,500	—	—
To the formation of a large brick sewer, from the tail of the same to a considerable distance into Clerkenwell	2,800	—	—
	31,800	—	—
To the purchase of various iron pipes, and the cost of laying down the same	125,715	8	—
Two mains for connecting the high pond with the steam engine, 16 and 17 in.			
Another, connecting the west pond with the out head, 24 in.			
Ditto - - - the steam engine with Tottenham-court reservoir, and into town, 20, 18, 16, 15, and 14 in.			
Ditto - - - the steam-engine with Tottenham-court-road, 18, 16, 14 and 12 in.			
Ditto - from the New River head to St. Giles's, 18 in. all the way			
Ditto - - - d° - - - to Clerkenwell, 10 in.			
Ditto - from the reservoir in St. John's-street-road to Clerkenwell, 14 and 12 in.			
Ditto - - - d° - - - d° - to Goswell-street, 22 in.			
Ditto - - - d° - - - d° - to Shoreditch church, 19, 18, 17, 16, and 15 in.			
Ditto - from the Bullock cistern to Old-street-road, 12 in. and three others from ditto, a short distance			
Ditto - from the west pond to Gray's-inn-lane			
Ditto - from Tottenham-court-road reservoir to Oxford-street, 12 in.			
For other 10, 9, 8, 7, and 6 in. mains in iron, and for service-pipes in iron of 5, 4, 3, and 2 in.			
For cocks of various sizes, as above mentioned			

		<i>in. bore. yards.</i>	£. s. d.
Appendix, (C.) New River Waterworks.	To the cost of 257 miles of wooden mains and services, now in the ground, which has been estimated at £. 200,000 in iron and wood, at the following prices	}	113,654 19 —
		3 -- 141,554 at 4s.	
		4 -- 129,853 at 5s.	
		5 -- 28,966 at 6s.	
		6 -- 41,884 at 8s.	
		7 -- 54,875 at 10s.	
		}	
To the cost of the various cocks for the before-mentioned mains and services			15,000 — —
Monies expended in the purchase of grants to lay pipes through private property			5,000 — —
Ditto - - - for the repairs of sewers in laying the above pipes			5,000 — —
Ditto - - - for various sums expended in obtaining the necessary parliamentary powers			— — —
			£. 846,640 7 —

(signed) *Wm Chadwell Mylne.*
Wm Murdoch.

The above is a true copy,
J. P. Rowe, Sec^r.

24 February 1821.

Further ESTIMATE of the Capital engaged in the Works of the New River Company, from the Year 1815 to Christmas 1820.

		£. s. d.
THE Capital employed in the New River works was estimated in 1815, at	-	846,640 7 —
Since which there has been expended the following Sums:		
Amount paid Fereday & Co. for iron since 1815	-	127,918 — —
Pipe-laying account - - - - since 1815	-	52,994 — —
Value paid for cocks - - - - since 1815	-	3,849 19 —
Expenditure in machinery and buildings requisite for carrying on the works since 1815	-	9,019 — —
Value of pipes purchased of other companies when they abandoned the supply of the district now served by the New River company - £. 102,042 6 3½	-	
The portion of the above stated capital sold to various companies where the New River company abandoned the most distant districts	} 58,940 — 3	43,102 6 —½
		£. 1,083,523 12 —½
In the amount here stated (£. 1,083,523. 12 s. 0½ d.) there exists the value of the wooden pipes in use in 1815, which have been rendered of no value by the substitution of iron, to which the company was driven during the contest: it amounts to - - - - - £. 113,654 19 —		
Also brass cocks sold - - - - -	15,000 — —	128,654 19 —
		£. 954,868 13 —½
York Buildings - - - - -	32,000 — —	922,868 13 —½
		£. 922,868 13 —½

March 28th, 1821.

William C. Mylne.

(114.)—ESTIMATE of Dividend that will be produced to the New River Company, by the Rates of 1810.

		£. s. d.
Water Rents in 1820	-	64,034 14 6
Deduct High services	-	309 4 6
		£. 63,725 10 —
Add, To raise the rents at the west end of the district to 1810:		
On £. 23,720. 15 s. 6 d.	-	£. 3,633 1 6
On £. 4,111, New houses	-	630 — —
		4,263 1 6
Deduct Empty houses, &c. 5 per cent.	-	213 1 6
		4,050 — —
Rents for lands, &c.	-	67,775 10 —
		3,240 7 10
High services	-	71,015 17 10
		309 4 6
		71,325 2 4
Deduct Expenses	-	£. 26,000
Pipe and machinery capital, £. 372,098. 13 s. }	-	3,700
at 1 per cent. - - - - -	}	29,700 — —
		£. 41,625 2 4
		£. 578 2 6
		Making a dividend of - - - - -

About 4 per cent. on £. 14,000.

(11^b).—ESTIMATE of Dividend that will be produced to the New River Company, by an Increase of 10 per cent. on the Rates of 1810.

Appendix,
(C.)
New River
Waterworks.

	£.	s.	d.
Water Rents, 1820 - - - - -	64,034	14	6
Deduct High services - - - - -	309	4	6
	£.	63,725	10 -
Add, To raise the rents at the west end of the district to 1810:			
On £. 23,720. 15 s. 6 d. - - - - -	£. 3,633	1	6
On £. 4,111, New houses - - - - -	630	-	-
	4,263	1	6
Deduct Empty houses, 5 per cent. - - - - -	213	1	6
		4,050	- -
Rents for lands - - - - -	67,775	10	-
	3,240	7	10
	71,015	17	10
Add 10 per cent. on £. 67,775. 10 s. - - - - -	6,777	11	-
	77,793	8	10
Deduct Expenses - - - - -	£. 26,000		
Pipe and machinery capital, £. 372,098. 13 s. } at 1 per cent. - - - - -	3,700		
	29,700	-	-
High services - - - - -	48,093	8	10
	309	4	6
	£.	48,402	13 4
Making a dividend of - - - - -	£.	672	5 2

About 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on £. 14,000.

(11^c).—ESTIMATE of Dividend that will be produced to the New River Company, by an Increase of 15 per cent. on the Rates of 1810.

	£.	s.	d.
Water Rents in 1820 - - - - -	64,034	14	6
Deduct High services - - - - -	309	4	6
	£.	63,725	10 -
Add, To raise the rents at the west end of the district to 1810:			
On £. 23,720. 15 s. 6 d. - - - - -	£. 3,633	1	6
On £. 4,111, New houses - - - - -	630	-	-
	4,263	1	6
Deduct Empty houses, 5 per cent. - - - - -	213	1	6
		4,050	- -
Rents for lands, &c. - - - - -	67,775	10	-
	3,240	7	10
	71,015	17	10
Add 15 per cent. on £. 67,775. 10 s. - - - - -	10,166	6	6
	81,182	4	4
Deduct Expenses - - - - -	£. 26,000		
Pipe and machinery capital, £. 372,098. 13 s. } at 1 per cent. - - - - -	3,700		
	29,700	-	-
High services - - - - -	51,482	4	4
	309	4	6
	£.	51,791	8 10
Making a dividend of - - - - -	£.	719	6 6

About 5 per cent. on £. 14,000.

Appendix,
(C.)New River
Waterworks.(11^d).—ESTIMATE of Dividend that will be produced to the New River Company, by an
Increase of 25 per cent. on the Rates of 1810.

	£.	s.	d.
Water Rents in 1820	64,034	14	6
Deduct High services	309	4	6
	£.	63,725	10 —
Add, To raise the rents at the west end of the district to 1810:			
On £. 23,720. 15s. 6d.	£. 3,633	1	6
On £. 4,111, New houses	630	—	—
	4,263	1	6
Deduct Empty houses, 5 per cent.	213	1	6
	4,050	—	—
Rents for lands	67,775	10	—
	3,240	7	10
Add 25 per cent. on £. 67,775. 10s.	71,315	17	10
	16,943	17	6
Deduct Expenses	£. 26,000		
Pipe and machinery capital, £. 372,098. 13s. } at 1 per cent.	3,700		
	29,700	—	—
High services	58,259	15	4
	309	4	6
	£.	58,568	19 10
Making a dividend of	£.	813	9 1

About $5\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. on £. 14,000.

March 28th, 1821.

J. P. Rowe, Secy.

(12.)—One Year's EXPENDITURE of the New River Company in 1820.

Poundage	£.	3,300
Salaries	2,300	
Street expenses	2,500	
Pipe-yard	500	
Water-house	2,400	
River	3,500	
Engine	300	
Coals	900	
Stable	150	
Paving	1,600	
Plumbers	300	
Stationery, Printing, &c.	250	
Rents, &c.	3,500	
Taxes	4,500	
Committee	500	
Incidents, including Law	500	
	£. 27,000	
Reserve	3,700	
	£. 30,700	
Deduct, on Paving and some other articles, which may be reduced	1,000	
	£. 29,700	

(13.)—PAPER containing Mr. Mylne's Answer in respect to the Durability of Cast Iron Pipes,
(inserted at p. 47 of the Minutes.)

Appendix, (D.)
CHELSEA WATERWORKS.

Appendix;
(D.)
Chelsea
Waterworks.

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Secretary to the *Chelsea Waterworks Company*.

(1).—ABSTRACT of an Account showing the Number of Dwelling Houses and other Buildings supplied with Water by the Chelsea Waterworks Company in each of the Years 1804, 1809, 1814 and 1819, arranged in distinct Classes, according to the amount of the Water Rates then charged thereon respectively; and distinguishing the several Parishes in which the same were situated.

1804. RATES, SHILLINGS PER HOUSE PER ANNUM.

PARISHES.	Under 10/	10/ & under 20/	20/ & under 30/	30/ & under 40/	40/ & under 50/	50/ & under 60/	60/ & under 70/	70/ & under 80/	80/ & under 90/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	66	238	217	167	34	24	9	5	2
St. Margaret and Saint John's	608	1,200	861	163	69	32	37	4	34
St. James's - - - -	20	46	224	43	17	6	22	1	6
St. George Hanover-square -	93	509	1,650	266	171	54	116	27	127
St. Mary Kensington - - -	42	52	177	103	7	3	2	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - -	-	2	38	10	6	2	2	-	1
St. Mary-le-bone - - - -	3	35	340	61	49	12	29	8	22
Number of Houses -	832	2,082	3,507	813	353	133	217	45	192

PARISHES—(repeated.)

	100/ & under 110/	120/ & under 130/	140/ & under 150/	150/ & under 160/	160/ & under 170/	180/ & under 190/	210/ & under 220/	250/ & under 260/	310/ & under 320/
St. Luke Chelsea - - - -	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Margaret and St. John's -	5	6	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
St. James's - - - - -	6	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
St. George Hanover-square -	79	20	7	1	3	1	6	3	-
St. Mary Kensington - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields -	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
St. Mary-le-bone - - - -	1	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Number of Houses -	93	33	8	1	6	2	6	4	1

PARISHES—(repeated.)

	320/ & under 330/	Number of Dwellings.	Other Buildings.	TOTAL.
St. Luke Chelsea - - - -	-	764	5	769
St. Margaret and St. John's -	-	3,021	36	3,057
St. James's - - - - -	1	398	8	406
St. George Hanover-square -	1	3,134	37	3,171
St. Mary Kensington - - -	-	386	1	387
St. Martin-in-the-Fields -	-	63	4	67
St. Mary-le-bone - - - -	-	564	3	567
Number of Houses -	2	8,330	94	8,424

(continued)

(1.)—Number of Houses supplied with Water by the Chelsea Company—*continued.*Appendix,
(D.)
Chelsea
Waterworks.

1809.

RATES, SHILLINGS PER HOUSE PER ANNUM,

PARISHES.	Under 10/	10/ & under 20/	20/ & under 30/	30/ & under 40/	40/ & under 50/	50/ & under 60/	60/ & under 70/	70/ & under 80/	80/ & under 90/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	41	404	338	251	77	44	9	8	8
St. Margaret and St. John's - -	557	1,168	823	234	52	35	26	15	16
St. James's - - -	32	33	149	96	18	12	4	11	8
St. George Hanover-square - -	81	391	1,367	623	179	77	88	32	97
St. Mary Kensington - - -	8	95	101	189	8	4	2	2	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - - -	-	-	41	19	2	3	4	1	1
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	-	156	438	314	72	32	21	31	12
Paddington - - -	6	4	7	10	8	1	-	-	-
Number of Houses -	725	2,251	3,264	1,736	416	208	154	100	142

PARISHES—(repeated.)	90/ & under 100/	100/ & under 110/	110/ & under 120/	120/ & under 130/	130/ & under 140/	140/ & under 150/	160/ & under 170/	180/ & under 190/	200/ & under 210/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
St. Margaret and St. John's - -	26	1	1	6	1	-	2	-	-
St. James's - - -	-	4	-	8	-	4	-	-	-
St. George Hanover-square - -	22	112	4	62	2	20	11	3	1
St. Mary Kensington - - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - - -	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	11	12	-	9	-	-	-	-	-
Paddington - - -	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
Number of Houses -	60	133	5	88	3	25	13	3	1

PARISHES—(repeated.)	210/ & under 220/	230/ & under 240/	240/ & under 250/	250/ & under 260/	290/ & under 300/	320/ & under 330/	330/ & under 340/	360/ & under 370/	370/ & under 380/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Margaret and St. John's - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. James's - - -	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	-
St. George Hanover-square - -	6	1	2	-	1	1	1	1	2
St. Mary Kensington - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Paddington - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number of Houses -	8	1	2	2	3	2	1	1	2

PARISHES—(repeated.)	400/ & under 410/	420/	Number of Dwellings.	Other Buildings.	TOTAL.
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	-	-	1,182	6	1,188
St. Margaret and St. John's - -	-	-	2,963	50	3,013
St. James's - - -	1	1	384	9	393
St. George Hanover-square - -	-	-	3,187	46	3,233
St. Mary Kensington - - -	-	-	410	1	411
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - - -	-	-	75	6	81
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	-	-	1,110	8	1,118
Paddington - - -	-	-	40	-	40
Number of Houses -	1	1	9,351	126	9,477

(1.)—Number of Houses supplied with Water by the Chelsea Company—*continued.*

Appendix,
(D.)
Chelsea
Waterworks.

1814.

RATES, SHILLINGS PER HOUSE PER ANNUM.

PARISHES.	Under 10/	10/ & under 20/	20/ & under 30/	30/ & under 40/	40/ & under 50/	50/ & under 60/	60/ & under 70/	70/ & under 80/	80/ & under 90/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	98	732	491	288	84	52	14	8	5
St. Margaret and St. John's -	566	1,366	911	243	57	38	29	13	16
St. James's - - -	38	10	137	73	21	10	6	8	4
St. George Hanover-square	48	337	1,956	489	151	69	65	24	88
St. Mary Kensington - - -	43	60	81	188	8	3	3	3	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - -	-	-	34	19	2	4	3	1	2
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	2	283	616	149	54	37	16	18	4
Paddington - - -	10	88	24	18	1	1	2	-	1
Number of Houses -	805	2,876	3,350	1,467	378	214	138	75	120

PARISHES—(repeated.)	90/ & under 100/	100/ & under 110/	110/ & under 120/	120/ & under 130/	130/ & under 140/	140/ & under 150/	160/ & under 170/	180/ & under 190/	200/ & under 210/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
St. Margaret and St. John's -	22	3	1	4	1	-	2	-	-
St. James's - - -	-	3	-	8	-	4	-	-	-
St. George Hanover-square -	18	110	4	49	1	16	18	2	1
St. Mary Kensington - - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - -	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	13	7	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Paddington - - -	2	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number of Houses -	56	126	9	63	2	21	20	2	1

PARISHES—(repeated.)	210/ & under 220/	230/ & under 240/	240/ & under 250/	250/ & under 260/	290/ & under 300/	320/ & under 330/	330/ & under 340/	360/ & under 370/	370/ & under 380/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Margaret and St. John's -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. James's - - -	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	-
St. George Hanover-square -	7	-	1	2	-	1	2	2	1
St. Mary Kensington - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - -	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paddington - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Number of Houses -	9	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	1

PARISHES—(repeated.)	400/ & under 410/	420/	Number of Dwellings.	Other Buildings.	TOTAL.
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	-	-	1,774	6	1,780
St. Margaret and St. John's -	-	-	3,272	52	3,324
St. James's - - -	1	1	327	7	334
St. George Hanover-square -	-	-	2,562	38	2,600
St. Mary Kensington - - -	-	-	399	1	391
St. Martin-in-the-Fields - -	-	-	69	6	75
St. Mary-le-bone - - -	-	-	1,201	5	1,206
Paddington - - -	-	-	152	-	152
Number of Houses -	1	1	9,747	115	9,862

Appendix,
(D.)Chelsea
Waterworks.(1).—Number of Houses supplied with Water by the Chelsea Company—*continued.*

1819.		RATES, SHILLINGS PER HOUSE PER ANNUM.					
PARISHES.	Under 10/	10/ & under 20/	20/ & under 30/	30/ & under 40/	40/ & under 50/	50/ & under 60/	60/ & under 70/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	83	659	845	445	275	78	77
St. Margaret and St. John's -	233	1,719	1,067	752	146	49	48
St. James's - - - - -	-	-	8	29	9	3	3
St. George Hanover-square -	11	214	335	366	116	27	38
St. Mary Kensington - -	34	19	56	173	127	7	5
St. Martin-in-the-Fields -	-	-	45	96	32	13	27
Number of Houses -	361	2,611	2,356	1,861	705	177	198

PARISHES—(repeated.)	70/ & under 80/	80/ & under 90/	90/ & under 100/	100/ & under 110/	110/ & under 120/	120/ & under 130/	130/ & under 140/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	9	11	3	8	-	1	-
St. Margaret and St. John's -	31	25	6	15	24	5	1
St. James's - - - - -	2	3	3	3	1	-	1
St. George Hanover-square -	1	5	1	14	-	-	17
St. Mary Kensington - -	4	1	2	1	-	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields -	9	7	5	7	-	5	1
Number of Houses -	56	52	20	48	25	11	20

PARISHES—(repeated.)	140/ & under 150/	150/ & under 160/	160/ & under 170/	180/ & under 190/	200/ & under 210/	210/ & under 220/	250/ & under 260/
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
St. Margaret and St. John's -	2	7	1	-	1	2	-
St. James's - - - - -	-	3	-	1	1	-	-
St. George Hanover-square -	-	3	-	-	-	1	1
St. Mary Kensington - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
St. Martin-in-the-Fields -	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
Number of Houses -	2	13	2	1	3	4	1

PARISHES—(repeated.)	260/ & under 270/	300/ & under 310/	310/ & under 320/	630/	Number of Dwellings.	Other Buildings.	TOTAL.
St. Luke Chelsea - - -	-	-	-	-	2,495	6	2,501
St. Margaret and St. John's -	-	1	-	-	4,135	70	4,205
St. James's - - - - -	-	-	-	1	71	3	74
St. George Hanover-square -	1	-	1	-	1,152	7	1,159
St. Mary Kensington - -	-	-	-	-	429	1	430
St. Martin-in-the-Fields -	-	-	-	-	249	14	263
Number of Houses -	1	1	1	1	8,531	101	8,632

Office of Chelsea Waterworks, }
16th March 1821.J. G. Lynde,
Secretary.

(2.)—COPIES of all Royal Charters, Statutes and other Authorities, by virtue of which the Chelsea Waterworks Company is authorized to supply the Metropolis, or any part thereof, with Water.

8 Geo. I. c. 26.—An Act for better supplying the city and liberties of Westminster, and parts adjacent, with Water.

9 Geo. I. 8 March.—The Charter of the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks.

11 Geo. I. 29 July.—Warrant to the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, to convert into and use for reservoirs two ponds in St. James's Park.

12 Geo. I. 9 September.—Warrant to the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, for making a reservoir in the Walnut Tree Walk, in Hyde Park.

2 Geo. II. 9 June.—Warrant to the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, for enlarging the reservoir in St. James's Park.

31 May 1733.—Warrant allowing £.150 per annum to the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, for supplying the reservoir in the Paddock at Kensington, and Palace there, with Water.

18 January 1733-4.—Warrant to the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, for taking off the waste water from the Great Canal or Serpentine River in Hyde Park.

7 Geo. II. October 11.—Power for increasing the joint stock of the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks.

21 August 1735.—Warrant allowing £.50 per annum to the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, for supplying with water the new Treasury, and houses, offices and stables belonging thereto.

9 Geo. II. 14 September 1735.—His Majesty's Letters Patent, giving and granting to the Company license and authority to discharge their bond debts, by taking in subscriptions for new shares from the members of the Corporation only, at any rate or price under £.20 per share.

10 Geo. II. 17 June.—Warrant to the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, for enlarging their reservoir and other works in Hyde Park.

49 Geo. III. c. 157.—An Act for amending an Act for better supplying the city and liberties of Westminster, and parts adjacent, with Water, and for enlarging the powers thereof.

No other Charters, Statutes or regular Warrants appear in the Office, but some Treasury Letters have been issued from time to time, of which a return (if required) will be made as soon as possible.

(3.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the number and description of Shares into which the Capital Joint Stock of the Chelsea Waterworks Company is divided; and the nominal Value of such Shares.

2,000 Shares, of £.20 each, raised by Charter, bearing date the 8th day of March 1723	£.	s.	d.
	40,000	—	—
2,000 Shares, of £.10 each, raised by His Majesty's Letters Patent, bearing date the 11th day of October 1734		20,000	—
<u>4,000 Shares</u>	<u>£.</u>	<u>60,000</u>	<u>—</u>

Explanation:—The Chelsea Waterworks were erected in 1723. The proprietors expended in the first instance a capital of £.60,000 in establishing their works, which for the first thirteen years paid no dividend, and for the next four years, (from 1737 to 1740) £.1,600 per annum. The dividend was then suspended till 1753, the Company's concern during that time barely defraying their current expenses. From 1753 to 1771 they divided £.1,200 per annum; from 1771 to 1797 they divided £.1,600 per annum; from 1797 to 1807, £.2,000 per annum, and from that time to the present £.2,400 per annum.

Thus:—The original subscription expended	£.	s.	d.
Interest at 5 per cent. from their establishment in the year 1723 to 1820, being 97 years	60,000	—	—
Deduct the dividends paid to the proprietors in that period	£. 291,000	—	—
	—	118,400	—
		<u>172,600</u>	<u>—</u>
Deduct the present estimated value of freehold, engines, mains, reservoirs, &c.	£.	232,600	—
		50,000	—
Difference to the proprietors between the dividends received, and 5 per cent. on the original subscription	£.	<u>182,600</u>	<u>—</u>

Appendix,
(D.)
Chelsea
Waterworks.

(4.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Sums paid in Dividends to the Proprietors of the Chelsea Waterworks Company, in each Year from 1789 to the latest period to which the same can be made up; specifying the Rates of the Dividends, and whether the payments were made discharged of Property Tax.

1789	- -	Eight Shillings per Share, on 4,000 Shares	- - -	£. 1,600	— —
1790	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,600	— —
1791	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,600	— —
1792	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,600	— —
1793	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,600	— —
1794	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,600	— —
1795	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,600	— —
1796	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,600	— —
1797	- -	Nine Shillings - d° - - - d°	- - -	1,800	— —
1798	- -	Ten Shillings - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1799	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1800	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1801	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1802	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1803	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1804	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1805	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1806	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1807	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,000	— —
1808	- -	Eleven Shillings - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,200	— —
1809	- -	Twelve Shillings - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1810	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1811	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1812	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1813	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1814	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1815	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1816	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1817	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1818	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1819	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —
1820	- -	d° - - - d° - - - d°	- - -	2,400	— —

All the payments were made to the proprietors discharged of property tax, and upon a capital of £. 60,000. the original sum subscribed.

(5.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Gross Income of the Chelsea Waterworks Company, in each Year from the Year 1800 to the latest period to which the same can be made up; distinguishing therein the amount of the Sums received respectively for Water supplied for Domestic Purposes, for Water supplied to Public Buildings, and for the purposes of Trade and Manufactures, and for Water used in watering Roads or Streets, from the Income derived from other sources.

YEARS	INCOME From Water supplied for Domestic Purposes.			INCOME From Water supplied to Public Buildings.			INCOME From Water supplied for Trades and Manufactures.			INCOME From Water supplied for Watering Streets, &c.			INCOME Derived from other Sources. <i>Vide Note *</i>			GROSS INCOME.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1800	9,563	6	6	796	—	—	239	16	—	nil.	—	—	1,637	19	4	12,237	1	10
1801	9,771	9	—	795	—	—	270	10	—	nil.	—	—	1,969	18	11	12,806	17	11
1802	9,837	1	7	785	12	—	268	8	—	nil.	—	—	2,330	13	10	13,221	15	5
1803	9,990	15	1	788	2	—	270	19	—	nil.	—	—	2,042	4	8	13,092	—	9
1804	10,028	3	6	907	16	—	234	7	—	nil.	—	—	2,479	14	6	13,700	1	—
1805	10,431	5	—	916	7	—	365	11	—	nil.	—	—	1,895	13	10	13,608	16	10
1806	11,820	10	9	1,018	14	—	390	10	—	50	—	—	1,942	5	3	15,221	10	—
1807	12,078	11	3	1,030	15	—	392	7	—	72	1	—	1,922	11	1	15,496	5	4
1808	12,513	—	—	1,053	9	—	410	3	—	137	5	—	1,975	2	—	16,088	19	—
1809	13,069	1	3	1,059	9	—	411	5	—	162	10	—	2,129	5	5	16,831	10	8
1810	13,626	5	6	1,090	11	—	456	—	6	336	13	—	2,117	6	2	17,626	15	2
1811	13,388	16	3	1,208	13	—	463	—	—	362	5	—	1,760	11	10	17,183	6	1
1812	12,890	15	—	1,208	9	—	430	5	6	274	3	6	1,398	2	2	16,201	15	2
1813	12,831	5	10	1,216	1	—	457	—	—	70	18	—	1,267	9	11	15,842	14	9
1814	11,574	7	2	1,212	3	—	375	17	—	92	12	—	1,208	15	5	14,463	14	7
1815	10,437	9	6	1,372	10	—	347	8	—	52	11	—	1,327	19	7	13,537	18	1
1816	11,191	—	6	1,230	14	—	298	10	—	181	12	—	1,737	12	10	14,639	9	4
1817	10,840	11	2	1,239	13	—	306	18	—	545	16	—	1,439	—	7	14,371	18	9
1818	9,920	14	10	1,026	17	—	285	12	—	468	8	—	1,383	3	1	13,084	14	11
1819	11,556	17	6	1,027	13	—	431	19	—	569	8	—	1,985	17	11	15,571	15	5
1820	11,682	19	9	1,015	18	—	452	19	—	596	18	—	1,401	13	2	15,150	7	11

* This source of income arises from lands, wharfs and warehouses hired by the Company on a lease, which expires at Lady-day 1823, underlet to others; money at times laid up for repairs and improvement of the works, which has been wholly expended therein; £.80 per annum for freehold land, and £.24. 11s. 10d. interest upon Old South Sea Annuity Stock.

(6.)—COPIES of all Deeds, Contracts, Undertakings and other Instruments in Writing, touching the supply of any part of the Metropolis with Water, made and entered into by and between or on behalf of the Chelsea Waterworks Company, since 1st of January 1815.

Appendix,
(D.)
Chelsea
Waterworks.

ARTICLES of agreement between the Commissioners of His Majesty's Woods, Forests and Land Revenues and the Governor and Company of Chelsea Waterworks, for erecting stand-pipes and watering the roads in the Green Park, St. James's and Hyde Parks - - - - - £.460 per annum.

No other deeds, contracts, undertakings, or other instruments, touching the supply of water to any part of the metropolis appear in the office since the 1st of January 1815.

Office of Chelsea Waterworks, }
22d February 1821.

J. G. Lynde, Secretary.

(7.)—DETAIL of Waterworks in Days, Weeks and Months, in 1810.—Difference of Supply between 1810 and 1820.

A GENERAL account can be rendered, as under, of the quantity of water supplied by the Chelsea Waterworks, but not of the quantity delivered to every particular house in each day or month;

For the service of the upper district, including Paddington, part of the parish of St. Mary-le-bone, the upper part of the parish of St. George Hanover-square, and part of the parishes of St. Martin-in-the-Fields and St. James's Westminster:

For the service of the lower district, including Knightsbridge, Brompton and Hans-Town, Chelsea and Pimlico, the parishes of St. John and St. Margaret Westminster, and part of the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields.

QUANTITY OF WATER SUPPLIED IN THE YEARS,				
	1804:	1809:	1814:	1820:
	Hogsheads.	Hogsheads.	Hogsheads.	Hogsheads.
Upper district - -	4,092,710	4,615,540	7,193,510	—
Lower district - -	4,318,030	4,605,550	5,729,440	7,533,900
TOTAL - - -	8,410,740	9,221,090	12,922,950	7,533,900

Tho^s Simpson, Inspector General.

February 28th 1821.

(8.)—QUANTITY of WATER capable of being supplied by the Chelsea Waterworks Company; also, the Number of Services.

17,630,960 hogsheads per annum, with their present engines.

25,202,520 hogsheads per annum will be enabled to supply, when the new engine, about to be erected, is completed.

IN the district at present supplied by the Chelsea Waterworks Company, there are 55 services, part of which are supplied three times, part four, five, six, and part seven times per week. Previous to the year 1810, some of the above services were only supplied twice, and none more than three times per week.

March 6th 1821.

Tho^s Simpson, Inspector General.

Appendix,
(D.)
Chelsea
Waterworks.

(9.)—ESTIMATE of the annual Expense of Repairs of the Establishment of Chelsea Waterworks, for the next Twenty Years; as far as it can be calculated.

THE Engineer of the Chelsea Waterworks submits, with great deference to the Committee, that it is impossible to give the estimate required by the Order of the 26th ultimo; as within the period therein mentioned, the lease granted to the Governor and Company in 1723 will expire, and very extensive premises and works will be given up to Lord Grosvenor, and it has been, in consequence, already determined by the court, to erect a new steam engine on their freehold property, and that the variation in the probable price of labour and materials, the necessary charges in the works, and the chance of casualties, are incapable of calculation.

By order of the Court of Directors,
Thos Simpson, Inspector General.

March 6th 1821.

(10.)—RETURN to an Order, for The Rental and Rate of Interest on the Capital of the Chelsea Waterworks.

WHAT interest would the rental of 1817, at the rate of 1810, afford, after paying the annual expense?—

	£.	s.	d.
Expense in the year 1817 - - - - -	11,011	12	10
Rental of 1817 without increase - - - - -	10,084	17	11
Rather more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. minus, without providing for a dividend.	£. 926	14	11

No allowance has been made for extraordinary repairs, and ultimate renewal of certain parts of the works, beyond the amount provided in the ordinary expenses of the establishment.

What interest would the increased rate yield upon the first capital of £.60,000, after paying expenses and funding the sum necessary for extraordinary repairs?—

	£.	s.	d.
Rental of 1820 increased 25 per cent. on 1810 - - - - -	13,748	11	9
Expense, average of three years, as per Account N ^o 12 - - - - -	12,255	—	11
Nearly $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on £.60,000.	£. 1,493	10	10

No allowance has been made for extraordinary repairs and ultimate renewal of certain parts of the works, beyond the amount provided in the ordinary expenses of the establishment.

What interest would the increased rate yield upon the increased capital of £. 138,648, after paying expenses and funding the sum necessary for extraordinary repairs?—

Rather more than one per cent. surplus as above - - - - - £. 1,493. 10. 10.

No allowance has been made for extraordinary repairs, and ultimate renewal of certain parts of the works, beyond the amount provided in the ordinary expenses of the establishment.

(11.)—AMOUNT of the Sum necessary to be funded annually for extraordinary Repairs and ultimate Renewal of certain parts of the Chelsea Waterworks, beyond the Amount provided in the Ordinary Expenses of the Establishment.

THIS Return having engaged the serious attention of the court of directors, they have ordered that it be submitted to the Committee of the House of Commons, that it is utterly impossible for them to estimate with any accuracy what may be necessary to lay up for the above purpose, viewing the expiration of their lease with Lord Grosvenor, which must necessarily produce great expenses in the removal of their works and otherwise, and the various casualties to which the undertaking is subject.

(12.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Expense of the Chelsea Waterworks for Three Years, from 1818 to 1820, both Years inclusive, with an Average thereof.

	1818.	1819.	1820.	TOTAL.	AVERAGE.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Directors Appearances - -	262 9 2	314 19 —	239 19 3	817 7 5	272 9 1
Land, Rent and Taxes - -	630 1 1	711 19 4	687 6 4	2,029 6 9	676 8 11
Salaries and Poundage - -	989 12 2	1,078 10 2	1,151 7 5	3,219 9 9	1,073 3 3
Office Expenses and Contingencies - - - -	969 5 3	786 2 6	1,060 18 1	2,816 5 10	938 15 3
Coals for the Steam Engines -	1,435 16 9	820 14 8	949 12 8	3,206 4 1	1,068 14 8
Carpenters and Labourers for Day-work - - - -	732 6 —	469 16 11	395 16 10	1,597 19 9	532 13 3
Pipes and Pipe Hoops (capital) -	692 18 7	1,041 17 6	661 12 3	2,396 8 4	798 16 1
Paviors and Plumbers Work, and repairing and driving Pipes -	2,497 19 7	2,953 17 7	2,431 — 5	7,882 17 7	2,627 12 6
Watering the Parks - - -	275 — —	275 — —	275 — —	825 — —	275 — —
Engines, Mains, Cuts and Reservoirs - - - -	1,790 18 11	1,312 — 1	1,328 19 1	4,431 18 1	1,477 6 —
Willows for weeding, draining, cutting and planting - -	146 14 4	131 8 6	105 9 3	383 12 1	127 17 4
Iron Pipes for Street-work -	677 10 4	6,196 1 7	285 1 11	7,158 13 10	2,386 4 7
£.	11,100 12 2	16,092 7 10	9,572 3 6	36,765 3 6	12,255 — 11

(13.)—ABSTRACTED VALUATION of certain parts of the Chelsea Waterworks, erected since the Year 1734, now in use, and actually necessary for the supply of the Tenants.

ENGINES AND BUILDINGS :			
Steam Engine erected in 1803 and 1804, including the Fixing, Boiler, &c. - - - -	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	
Building, including Foundation, Well and Brickwork - - -	4,537 12 5		
	1,000 — —	5,537 12 5	
Steam Engine erected 1809 and 1812, including the Fixing, Boiler, Wells and Suction, and the provision for the second Engine - - - -	9,131 12 11		
Building, including Excavation, Foundation and Brickwork -	15,033 10 6	24,165 3 5	
IRON MAINS AND SERVICES :			
Amount of Iron Pipes in use in present district, laid since 1734 - - - -	29,975 — 11		
Eighteen-Inch Main from New Engine to Pimlico laid in 1811 - - - -	5,690 15 8	35,665 16 7	
WOODEN MAINS AND SERVICES :			
Amount of Wooden Pipes, being the extension of Mains and Services beyond what were in the whole works in the year 1734 - - - -		6,000 — —	
COCKS AND VALVES :			
Amount of Cocks beyond what were in the whole works in the year 1734 -		4,100 — —	
Freehold purchased in the year 1793, cost - - - -		3,179 9 4	
First Subscriptions, not included in the above - - - -		60,000 — —	
£.		138,648 1 9	

Office of Chelsea Waterworks, }
March 30, 1821.

J. G. Lynde, Secretary.

Appendix,
(D.)
Chelsea
Waterworks.

- (14.)—RETURN to an Order, *for* A COPY of the RULES acted upon by the Chelsea Waterworks Company, in respect of the distinction between High Services and Low, Extra Services and Ordinary ; and also a List of the Trades which are considered as subject to an Extra Charge in respect of their Consumption of Water, or in any other respects ; and the Periods during which these Rules have been acted upon ; as far as it can be ascertained.

The distinction between High Services and Low.

- In private dwellings hitherto, no distinction has been made ; the company, till lately, not professing to give high service.
In brewhouses one penny per barrel is charged if delivered into a low situation, and two pence per barrel if the water be delivered from twenty to thirty feet high.
In manufactories, distilleries, &c. if delivered into a cistern below ten feet, one halfpenny per barrel ; above ten feet and not exceeding twenty feet, one penny per barrel.

The distinction between Extra Services and Ordinary.

- If the supply be given to any house from the main, or be kept on longer than necessary for the general service of the street, or be given through lead pipes of more than the usual bore of three quarters of an inch, or by more lead service-pipes than one, or to water-closets, gardens, fish-ponds or fountains, or if the water be used for other than common domestic purposes.

N. B.—Water-closets were charged, before the establishment of the new companies, 12 s. per annum each, without regard to high or low service ; but from that period to the present time they have not been charged as an extra service.

A List of the Trades which are considered as subject to an Extra Charge in respect of their Consumption of Water, or in any other respects.

Taverns, hotels, public-houses, watering-houses, wine-merchants, stable-keepers, brewers, vinegar brewers, distillers, dyers, paper-stainers, tanners, soap-makers, bottle-dealers, schools, fishmongers, cook-shops, tripe-boilers, cow-keepers, large potatoe merchants, laundresses hiring women to work, bricklayers and plasterers yards, basket-makers yards, coach-makers, slaughter-houses, bone-boilers, gas lights, operative chemists, baths.

These rules have been acted upon with such variations from time to time as occasional circumstances may have required, during the whole period the present inspector general has had the duty of rating houses, which is about thirty years.

Office of Chelsea Waterworks, }
March 26th 1821. }

J. G. Lynde, Secretary.

- (15.)—PARTICULARS of the Method of rating the Tenants of the Chelsea Waterworks Company in the year 1810 :—(inserted in the Minutes, p. 48.)

- (16.)—COMPARISON of original Expense between an Iron and Wooden Pipe of Four Inches diameter :—(inserted in the Minutes, p. 49.)

- (17.)—REMARKS on the Comparison of the original Expense between an Iron and Wooden Pipe of Four Inches diameter, and Expense of probable Repairs of each, during the course of Thirty Years :—(inserted in the Minutes, p. 49.)

Appendix (E.)

YORK BUILDINGS WATERWORKS.

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Secretary to the *York Buildings Company*.

(1)—AN ACCOUNT of the Gross Rental of the York Buildings Waterworks Company, and the Sum received for Water supplied from the Year 1800 to 1818.

Appendix
(E.)
York Buildings
Waterworks.

Years.	RENTAL.			Years.	RECEIVED.		
	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
1800	3,100	4	6	1800	2,604	6	6
1801	3,200	9	—	1801	2,993	4	3
1802	3,150	18	—	1802	2,801	8	6
1803	3,001	2	—	1803	2,887	19	—
1804	3,000	6	—	1804	2,898	7	6
1805	3,200	8	—	1805	2,748	14	—
1806	3,209	19	—	1806	2,881	1	3
1807	3,258	12	—	1807	2,898	18	—
1808	3,264	9	3	1808	3,137	17	—
1809	3,405	5	6	1809	3,002	15	—
1810	3,437	9	—	1810	2,894	16	—
1811	3,417	3	9	1811	2,903	3	—
1812	3,458	9	—	1812	3,000	6	—
1813	4,071	3	—	1813	3,110	3	7
1814	4,303	—	—	1814	3,523	5	6
1815	4,289	5	7	1815	4,190	3	9
1816	4,149	14	6	1816	3,933	17	3
1817	3,922	10	2	1817	3,186	9	3
1818	3,813	4	9	1818	4,111	2	9

(2)—AN ACCOUNT of the Number of Tenants supplied by the York Buildings Waterworks Company, in the following Years.

1804	2,089.
1809	2,217.
1814	2,740.
1818	2,636.

(3)—QUANTITY of Water thrown by the Steam Engine of the York Buildings Waterworks.

In the Year 1810	330 Hogsheads per hour.
	3,300 - - - per day.
	19,800 - - - per week.
	1,029,600 - - - per year.

N. B.—One seventh of the whole quantity having been deducted for the air admitted into the pumps, shortness of the stroke, &c.

In the year 1818	1,412 Hogsheads per hour.
	14,122 - - - per day.
	84,734 - - - per week.
	4,406,168 - - - per year.

N. B.—One seventh deducted as above.

5th March 1821.

Appendix,
(E.)
York Buildings
Waterworks.

(4.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Dividends paid to the Proprietors of the York Buildings Waterworks Company, clear of Property Tax, from the Year 1789 to 1812.

1789	- -	at £.10 per share.	1801	- -	at £.8 per share.
1790	- -	£.7. 10s. per d°.	1802	- -	- - -
1791	- -	- - -	1803	- -	- - -
1792	- -	at £.8 per share.	1804	- -	at £.4 per share.
1793	- -	£.9 per d°.	1805	- -	None.
1794	- -	£.8 per d°.	1806	- -	- - -
1795	- -	- - -	1807	- -	- - -
1796	- -	- - -	1809	- -	- - -
1797	- -	- - -	1810	- -	at £.1 per share, out of capital.
1798	- -	- - -	1811	- -	None.
1799	- -	- - -	1812	- -	at £.1 per share, out of capital.
1800	- -	- - -			None since.

(5.)—THE York Buildings Waterworks Company's CHARGES for supplying Water.

16s. to 20s. per annum for houses of the smallest class in poor neighbourhoods, for the ordinary supply on the basements, three times each week.

24s. to 36s. per annum for houses, for the ordinary supply in the yard and the first floor, three times each week.

40s. to 60s. per annum for a regular daily supply to houses of gentlemen and tradesmen requiring the water up stairs; say first and second floors.

4gs. to 5gs. per annum for the first-rate houses, requiring water in various parts of the house, daily supply.

N. B.—These rules have been acted upon for these twenty years.

Villicrs-street,
20th March 1821. }

Jas Dupin, Secretary.

Appendix (F.)

EAST LONDON WATERWORKS.

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Secretary to the *East London* Waterworks Company.

Appendix,
(F.)
East London
Waterworks.

(1.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Number and Description of Shares into which the Capital Joint Stock of the East London Waterworks Company is divided; the Nominal Value of such Shares, and the Net Amount of the Subscriptions paid thereon, and received by the said Company; distinguishing the Amount received in each Year from the first establishment of the Company.

THE capital joint stock is divided into three thousand eight hundred shares of one hundred pounds each.

The net amount of the subscriptions paid thereon, and received by the company is as follows; viz.

		£.	s.	d.
In the year	1806	-	-	-
	1807	-	-	-
	1808	-	-	-
	1809	-	-	-
	1810	-	-	-
	1811	-	-	-
	1812	-	-	-
	1815	-	-	-
		£.	375,158	2 2
		£.		s. d.
By Amount expended beyond capital to Christmas 1820	-	47,100	-	-
- Debts due for loans and interest thereon	-	24,200	9	10
- Ditto - for iron pipes	-	7,139	14	9
			78,440	4 7
		£.	453,598	6 9
- Interest on capital from commencement at five per cent.	197,683	-	-	-
- Paid in dividends (see Account No. 2.)	94,850	-	-	-
			102,833	- -
		£.	556,431	6 9

(2.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Sums paid in Dividends to the Proprietors of the East London Waterworks, from the first establishment thereof to the latest period to which the same can be made up, specifying the Dates and Rates of such Dividends, and whether the same were paid discharged of the Property Tax.

DATES.		RATES.	CAPITAL.	DIVIDENDS.
			£. s. d.	£. s. d.
1809	10th January	1 per cent. on	190,000 — —	1,900 — —
	10th July	2 - d°	190,000 — —	3,800 — —
1810	10th January	2 - d°	237,500 — —	4,750 — —
	10th July	2 - d°	237,500 — —	4,750 — —
1811	10th January	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ - d°	320,000 — —	8,000 — —
	10th July	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ - d°	320,000 — —	8,000 — —
1812	10th January	1 - d°	380,000 — —	3,800 — —
	10th July	1 - d°	- - D° - -	3,800 — —
1813	10th January	No dividend.	—	—
	10th July	- - D°.	—	—
1814	10th January	- - D°.	—	—
	10th July	- - D°.	—	—
1815	10th January	1 per cent. on	- - D° - -	3,800 — —
	10th July	1 - d°	- - D° - -	3,800 — —
1816	10th January	1 - d°	- - D° - -	3,800 — —
	10th July	1 - d°	- - D° - -	3,800 — —
1817	10th January	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ - d°	- - D° - -	4,750 — —
	10th July	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ - d°	- - D° - -	4,750 — —
1818	10th January	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ - d°	- - D° - -	5,700 — —
	10th July	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ - d°	- - D° - -	5,700 — —
1819	10th January	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ - d°	- - D° - -	6,650 — —
	10th July	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ - d°	- - D° - -	6,650 — —
1820	10th February	1 $\frac{3}{4}$ - d°	- - D° - -	6,650 — —
	10th August	No dividend.	—	—
1821	10th February	- - D°.	—	—
Discharged of the property tax.			£.	94,850 — —

East London Waterworks Office, }
17th March 1821.

Tho' Nelson Pickering,
Chief Clerk and Secy.

(3.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Gross Income of the East London Waterworks Company, in each Year from the first establishment of the said Company to the latest period to which the same can be made up.

DATE.	RENTS.	ARREARS.	Gross Amount received.
	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
From August 1808 to Michaelmas 1809	- - -	- - -	9,465 18 9
- - Michaelmas 1809 to Michaelmas 1810	The Rents and Arrears are not distinguished in these years in the Company's ledger.		9,755 3 4
- - Michaelmas 1810 to Michaelmas 1811			12,790 2 11
- - Michaelmas 1811 to Michaelmas 1812			15,910 10 6
- - Michaelmas 1812 to Michaelmas 1813			16,289 2 1
- - Michaelmas 1813 to Michaelmas 1814	15,185 19 4	2,226 3 1	17,412 2 5
- - Michaelmas 1814 to Michaelmas 1815	15,714 14 9	3,685 17 1	19,400 11 10
- - Michaelmas 1815 to Michaelmas 1816	16,843 6 11	3,690 14 11	20,534 1 10
- - Michaelmas 1816 to Christmas 1817, } (5 quarters)	24,212 12 9	5,304 8 10	29,517 1 7
- - Christmas 1817 to Christmas 1818	21,874 4 —	3,827 16 3	25,702 — 3
- - Christmas 1818 to Christmas 1819	27,117 6 9	6,408 9 9	33,525 16 6
- - Christmas 1819 to Christmas 1820	30,203 14 7	3,147 3 7	33,350 18 2
£.	151,151 19 1	28,290 13 6	243,653 10 2

East London Waterworks Office, }
21st March 1821.

Tho' Nelson Pickering,
Chief Clerk and Secy.

Appendix,
(F.)
East London
Waterworks.

(4).—AN ACCOUNT showing the Number of Dwelling Houses and other Buildings supplied with Water by the East London Waterworks Company, in each of the Years 1809, 1812, 1814, 1816 and 1819, with the average Rate charged thereon.

YEARS.	HOUSES.	Average Rate per House, including large Consumers.	GROSS ANNUAL CHARGE.		
			£.	s.	d.
1809 - - -	10,739	18 8 $\frac{1}{2}$	10,051	11	—
1812 - - -	18,975	18 9 $\frac{1}{2}$	17,840	2	1
1814 - - -	23,250	17 6	20,360	2	6
1816 - - -	27,731	17 4 $\frac{1}{2}$	24,107	8	5
1819 - - -	29,926	22 11 $\frac{1}{2}$	34,370	4	9

A SUPPLEMENT, showing the Charge made by the East London Waterworks Company for Premises supplied in the Year 1820, distinguishing the Charge for Water supplied for Domestic Purposes, for Public Buildings, and for Trade and Manufacture.

HOUSES.		GROSS CHARGE.
32,071.	—	£. 35,358. 14. 9.
1,044 - - -	Trade and Manufacture - - - -	£. 5,125 — —
45 - - -	Public Buildings - - - -	397 12 —
30,982 - - -	{ Private houses, of which 11,887 are at or under the yearly rate of 14 s. per house - - - - }	29,836 2 9
32,071 - - -	- - - - - - - - - - - -	£. 35,358 14 9

(5).—AN ACCOUNT showing the yearly Amount of the Rates charged on Premises supplied with Water by the East London Waterworks Company, in the Year 1820; and the yearly Amount of the Water Rates charged for the Year ending at Christmas 1817.

Charge at Christmas 1820 - - - - -	£.	s.	d.
D ^o - - - - - d ^o - - - - - 1817 - - - - -	35,358	14	9
	25,859	8	8
Making an increase of - - - - -	£.	9,499	6 1
Which increase is accounted for in the following manner; viz.			
By new tenants from Christmas 1817 to Christmas 1820 - - - - -	£.	2,705	— —
By persons discovered to be taking the water without paying for it, during the same period - - - - -		651	9 6
And by the general advance which took place in the year 1818, including the equalization, being about 24 $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. - - - - -		6,142	16 7
	£.	9,499	6 1

East London Waterworks Office, }
17 March 1821.

Tho' Nelson Pickering,
Chief Clerk and Sec^y.

(6).—QUANTITY of Water raised, number of Tenants supplied, and the amount of Rental, in the Shadwell and West Ham Districts, in the Year 1809.

10,372 hogsheads per diem; equal to 3,785,700 hogsheads per annum.

Quantity of water raised per diem - - - 15,558 barrels, or 10,372 hogsheads.

Number of houses supplied - - - - - 10,739.

Amount of rental - - - - - £. 10,051. 11 s.

Average supply per house (manufactories included) 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ barrel, or one hogshead of 54 gallons, per day.

Average rate per house (manufactories included) 18 s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per ann.

East London Waterworks, Old Ford, }
12 March 1821.

Jos. Stevens, Engineer.

(7.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Amount of the Sums paid by the East London Waterworks, for relaying or repairing the Public Pavements in London, from the Year 1807 to the latest period to which the same can be made up; distinguishing the Amount paid in each Year.

Appendix,
(F.)
East London
Waterworks.

DATE.		ANNUAL AMOUNT.		
		£.	s.	d.
From Midsummer	1808 to 1809	205	1	4
—	1809 to 1810	285	14	7
—	1810 to 1811	818	7	11
—	1811 to 1812	757	17	8
—	1812 to 1813	1,278	7	9
—	1813 to 1814	445	9	8
—	1814 to 1815	655	5	11
—	1815 to 1816	487	17	4
—	1816 to 1817	1,074	2	—
—	1817 to 1818	705	5	5
—	1818 to 1819	856	3	2
—	1819 to 1820	800	5	7
—	to Christmas 1820	760	—	10
		£.	9,129	19 2
N. B.—In addition to the above the company have expended in gravel, rubbish and ballast, on twenty six miles of roads			2,449	— —
		£.	11,578	19 2

East London Waterworks Office,
17 March 1821.

Tho^s Nelson Pickering,
Chief Clerk and Sec^y.

(8.)—AN ACCOUNT of the rate of Interest which would be produced on the Capital of the East London Waterworks Company, by their Water Rates of 1817.

Amount of capital subscribed, as per Account N ^o 1	- - - - -	£.	375,158	2 2
Expended, above capital, to Christmas 1817	- - - - -		4,275	12 4
Amount of capital to Christmas 1817 (without interest)	- - - - -	£.	379,433	14 6
Interest on capital subscribed, calculated to Christmas 1817,	at £. 5 per cent. per annum	£.	141,411	— —
From which deduct:		£.		s. d.
Amount expended beyond capital to Christmas 1817	to } 4,275 12 4			
Ditto - received on dividends to Christmas 1817	to } 58,750 — —			
			63,025	12 4
Amount of capital to Christmas 1817 (with interest)	- - - - -	£.	457,819	2 2
Gross charge for water rates, one year to Christmas 1817	- - - - -	£.	25,859	8 8
Deducted for empty houses, &c. &c.	- - - - -		1,350	1 10
		£.	24,509	6 10
Poundage to collectors	- - - - -	£.	1,225	9 4
Permanent expenses, one year to Christmas 1817	- - - - -		12,096	4 9
			13,321	14 1
		£.	11,187	12 9

Being £. 2. 18 s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per cent. on £. 379,433. 14 s. 6 d.
And - £. 2. 8 s. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. - - - on £. 457,819. 2 s. 2 d.

N. B.—In this Account no deduction is made for the annual extension of the works for the supply of new tenants, for keeping the works in repair, or other contingencies.

Appendix,
(F.)
East London
Waterworks.

(9.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Rate of Interest which would be produced on the Capital of the Company by their increased Water Rates in 1818.

	£.	s.	d.
Amount of capital subscribed, as per Account N ^o 1	375,158	2	2
Expended above capital to Christmas 1818	26,669	—	—
Loans	10,125	—	—
Iron Pipes	7,328	—	—
	44,122	—	—
Amount of capital to Christmas 1818 (without Interest)	419,280	2	2
Interest on Capital subscribed, calculated to Christmas 1818, at £. 5 per cent. per annum	160,168	18	1
From which deduct:			
Amount expended beyond capital to Christmas 1818	26,669	—	—
Ditto - received in dividends to Christmas 1818	69,200	—	—
	95,869	—	—
Amount of Capital to Christmas 1818 (with Interest)	483,580	—	3
Gross charge for water rates, one year to Christmas 1818	32,002	5	3
Deduct for empty houses, &c. &c.	1,812	3	5
	30,190	1	10
Poundage to collectors	1,509	10	1
Permanent expenses, one year to Christmas 1818	11,326	17	5
	12,836	7	6
	17,353	14	4

Being £. 4. 2 s. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per cent. on £. 419,280. 2 s. 2 d.
And - £. 3. 11 s. 8 d. - - - on £. 483,580. 0 s. 3 d.

N. B.—In this Account no deduction is made for the annual extension of the works for the supply of new tenants, for keeping the works in repair, or other contingencies.

(10.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Rate of Interest which would be produced on the Capital of the Company by their Water Rates in the Year 1820.

	£.	s.	d.
Amount of capital subscribed, as per Account N ^o 1	375,158	2	2
Expended above capital to Christmas 1820	47,100	—	—
Loans	24,200	9	10
Iron pipes	7,139	14	9
	78,440	4	7
Amount of capital to Christmas 1820 (without interest)	453,598	6	9
Interest on capital subscribed, calculated to Christmas 1820 at £. 5 per cent. per annum	197,683	—	—
From which deduct:			
Amount expended beyond capital to Christmas 1820	47,100	—	—
Ditto - received in dividends to Christmas 1820	94,850	—	—
	141,950	—	—
Amount of capital to Christmas 1820 (with interest)	509,331	6	9
Gross charge for water rates, one year to Christmas 1820	35,358	14	9
Deducted for empty houses, &c.	3,332	4	4
	32,026	10	5
Poundage to collectors	1,601	6	6
Permanent expenses, one year to Christmas 1820	11,402	10	2
	13,003	16	8
	19,002	13	9

Being £. 4. 3 s. 11 d. per cent. on £. 453,598. 6 s. 9 d.
And - £. 3. 14 s. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. - - - on £. 509,331. 6 s. 9 d.

N. B.—In this Account no deduction is made for the annual extension of the works for the supply of new tenants, for keeping the works in repair, or other contingencies.

East London Waterworks Office,
30 March 1821.

Tho^s Nelson Pickering,
Chief Clerk and Sec^y.

(11.)—SCALE of Rates of the East London Waterworks Company for the Year 1818 ;—also, a List of Trades subject to extra Charge for consumption of Water.

Kitchens and Washhouses rated as Rooms.

Houses of the smallest description, and others, supplied by common cock or tank :

If cabins or single rooms, 5 s. per annum each				} To be farmed, or contracted for, full or empty.
two rooms	-	-	8 s.	
three d° small	-	-	12 s.	
three d° large	-	-	15 s.	

Houses of two small rooms				} Generally farmed.
—	two large d°	-	10 s.	
—	three small d°	-	12 s.	
—	three large d°	-	14 s.	

Houses of four rooms in first rate situations :			
If small	-	-	22 s.
farmed	-	-	20 s.
large rooms	-	-	24 s.
farmed	-	-	22 s.

Houses of four rooms in second rate situations :			
If small	-	-	20 s.
farmed	-	-	18 s.
large rooms	-	-	22 s.
farmed	-	-	20 s.

Houses of five rooms in first rate situations :			
If small	-	-	25 s.
farmed	-	-	23 s.
large rooms	-	-	27 s.
farmed	-	-	25 s.

Houses of five rooms in second rate situations :			
If small	-	-	23 s.
farmed	-	-	21 s.
large rooms	-	-	25 s.
farmed	-	-	23 s.

Houses of six rooms in first rate situations :			
If small	-	-	28 s.
farmed	-	-	26 s.
large rooms	-	-	30 s.
farmed	-	-	28 s.

Houses of six rooms in second rate situations :			
If small	-	-	26 s.
farmed	-	-	24 s.
large rooms	-	-	28 s.
farmed	-	-	26 s.

Houses of seven rooms in first rate situations :			
If paid by the occupier	-	-	33 s.
farmed	-	-	31 s.

Houses of seven rooms in second rate situations :			
If paid by the occupier	-	-	30 s.
farmed	-	-	28 s.

Houses of eight rooms in first rate situations :			
If paid by the occupier	-	-	38 s.

Houses of eight rooms in second rate situations :			
If small	-	-	32 s.
farmed	-	-	30 s.
large	-	-	34 s.
farmed	-	-	32 s.

Houses of ten rooms, two to three guineas per annum. And for every room above ten, 5 s. per room.

Public-houses :	£.	s.	d.
First rate	-	-	4 —
Second ditto	-	-	3 —
Third ditto	-	-	2 10 —
Fourth ditto	-	-	2 —

Watering-houses, extra, according to consumption :	£.	s.	d.
First rate	-	-	6 —
Second ditto	-	-	4 —
Third ditto	-	-	3 —
Fourth ditto	-	-	2 —

Sugar houses :	£.	s.	d.	
If one pan	-	-	7 7	per ann.
two pans	-	-	12 12	ditto.
three and four pans	-	-	5 5	per pan per ann.
five six and seven pans	-	-	4 14 6	ditto - - ditto.
eight and upwards	-	-	4 4	ditto - - ditto.

Houses with stables, gardens, &c. according to consumption.

Butchers and bakers, £.25 per cent. extra.

Manufacturers, and large consumers of water, on special agreement, according to consumption.

Subject in all cases to alterations, upon appeal to the court of directors, according to situation, consumption, and other circumstances.

A LIST of the Trades which are considered as subject to an Extra Charge, in respect of their Consumption of Water.

Baker, basket-maker, brewer, butcher, chemist, cow-keeper, currier, colour-manufactory, distiller, dyer, fellmonger, fishmonger, gardener, gas works, large laundress, livery stables, orchil manufactory, potatoe-dealer and washer, public-house, ditto watering-house, scowerer, soap-boiler, slaughter-house, sugar-house, steam-engines, tripe-boiler, and others requiring a supply of water beyond the ordinary supply to private houses.

East London Waterworks Office, }
March 21, 1821.

Tho' Nelson Pickering,
Chief Clerk and Secretary.

Appendix,
(E.)
East London
Waterworks.

Appendix (G.)

WEST MIDDLESEX WATERWORKS.

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Secretary to the *West Middlesex* Company.

Appendix
(G.)

West Middlesex
Waterworks.

(1.)—RETURNS to Orders of the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the past and present supply of Water to the Metropolis; so far as the same have yet been made out.

1st. The company of proprietors of the West Middlesex waterworks have entered into no deed, contract, undertaking or instrument in writing, with any other public water company, touching the supply of any part of the metropolis with water.

2d. The capital joint stock of the West Middlesex waterworks company is divided into 7,542 shares, all of the nominal value of £. 100 each; of these shares 2,000 were raised at the full sum of £. 100 each, but the remainder were subscribed for at the depreciated value of £. 30 each.

THE following is an Account of the Net Amount of the Subscriptions received by the Company of the several Proprietors; distinguishing the Amount received in each Year from its first establishment, with the Interest due thereon to the 31st March 1819:—

		INTEREST.			TOTAL.					
		£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.			
In 1807	Subscriptions received	19,600	—	—	11 years 10,780	—	—	30,380	—	—
1808	- D° - - d° -	18,798	—	—	10 - - 9,399	—	—	28,197	—	—
1809	- D° - - d° -	16,228	—	—	9 - - 7,302	12	—	23,530	12	—
1810	- D° - - d° -	52,293	—	—	8 - - 20,917	4	—	73,210	4	—
1811	- D° - - d° -	44,061	—	—	7 - - 15,421	7	—	59,482	7	—
1812	- D° - - d° -	68,411	—	—	6 - - 20,523	6	—	88,934	6	—
1813	- D° - - d° -	23,704	—	—	5 - - 5,926	—	—	29,630	—	—
1814	- D° - - d° -	45,517	—	—	4 - - 9,103	8	—	54,620	8	—
1815	- D° - - d° -	25,989	—	—	3 - - 3,898	7	—	29,887	7	—
1816	- D° - - d° -	15,774	—	—	2 - - 1,577	8	—	17,351	8	—
1817	- D° - - d° -	10,191	6	9	1 - - 509	11	—	10,700	17	9
		£. 340,566	6	9	£. 105,358	3	—	£. 445,924	9	9
	Interest on the above capital of £. 340,566 one half year } from 30th September 1818 to 31st March 1819 - - }				8,514	3	—	8,514	3	—
					£. 113,872	6	—	£. 454,438	12	9

3d. An Account of Dividends paid to the proprietors of the West Middlesex Waterworks to 5th January 1821.

WHEN DECLARED..	WHEN PAID.	AMOUNT per Share.	TOTAL AMOUNT OF DIVIDEND.
			£. s. d.
27 July - - 1819 - -	10 October 1819 - -	15/	5,656 10 —
2 November — - -	5 January 1820 - -	20/	7,542 — —
2 May - - 1820 - -	5 July - - - -	20/	7,542 — —
7 Novmeber — - -	5 January 1821 - -	20/	7,542 — —
			£. 28,282 10 —

Note:—In 1810 and 1811 dividends to the amount of £. 12,410 were paid to the proprietors on estimated profits, but these profits not having been realized, the amount was in fact taken out of the subscriptions; that sum has consequently been deducted in the above Account from the money actually received from the proprietors.

(2.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Amount of the Sums paid by the West Middlesex Waterworks Company, for relaying or repairing the Public Pavements in London, from the Year 1809 to the latest period to which the same can be made up; distinguishing the Amount paid in each Year.

Appendix,
(G.)
West Middlesex
Waterworks.

				£.	s.	d.					£.	s.	d.
In 1809	-	-	-	193	13	—	In 1816	-	-	-	211	14	11
1810	-	-	-	413	14	10	1817	-	-	-	206	19	9
1811	-	-	-	834	3	5	1818	-	-	-	792	1	3
1812	-	-	-	2,651	—	7	1819	-	-	-	540	6	7
1813	-	-	-	1,238	12	2	1820	-	-	-	130	19	10
1814	-	-	-	1,003	12	5							
1815	-	-	-	571	1	10							
											£. 8,788	—	7

IT is impossible to distinguish the amount paid for relaying the pavement over the pipe-trenches from the expense incurred by the repair of leaks, and the change of houses from one company to another; but I estimate the former to be at least four-fifths of the whole.

23d February 1821.

M. K. Knight, Secy.

(3.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Hours which the Engines of the West Middlesex Company have worked, and of the quantity of Water raised, in the last Seven Years; distinguishing the Quantity raised in each Year.

				Engine worked.				Quantity of Water raised.			
				Hours.				Hogsheads.			
In 1814	-	-	-	4,917	-	-	-	6,392,100			
1815	-	-	-	4,863	-	-	-	6,321,900			
1816	-	-	-	4,790	-	-	-	6,227,000			
1817	-	-	-	6,137	-	-	-	7,978,100			
1818	-	-	-	9,246	-	-	-	12,019,800			
1819	-	-	-	8,953	-	-	-	11,633,900			
1820	-	-	-	9,361	-	-	-	12,169,300			

February 23, 1821.

Wm Tierney Clark, Engineer.

(4.)—AN ACCOUNT of Hours Work and Coals consumed by the West Middlesex Waterworks, from 20th January 1820 to the 15th January 1821.

1820:			1821:			1820:			1821:		
—	Hours work of the Engine.	Bushels of Coal consumed.	—	Hours work of the Engine.	Bushels of Coal consumed.	—	Hours work of the Engine.	Bushels of Coals consumed.	—	Hours work of the Engine.	Bushels of Coals consumed.
January 20	158	909	June - 1	172	870	October 9	167	852	January 1	217	1,136
— 27	162	909	— 8	181	894	— 16	160	817	— 8	175 ½	939
February 3	208 ½	1,110	— 15	183	908	— 23	151	745	— 15	176	913
— 10	203 ½	1,030	— 22	178	910	— 30	141 ½	747			
— 17	188	961	— 29	199	980	November 6	140	670			
— 24	183	939	July - 6	190 ½	988	— 13	153 ½	773			
March - 2	190	986	— 10	105 ½	527	— 20	139 ½	708			
— 9	176 ½	910	— 17	187 ½	931	— 27	152 ½	811			
— 16	180	920	— 24	194 ½	999	December 4	162 ½	853			
— 23	171 ½	868	— 31	194 ½	1,032	— 11	171	885			
— 30	188	935	August 7	188	1,021	— 18	160	858			
April - 6	183	927	— 14	189	1,026	— 25	162	840			
— 13	181	928	— 21	174	1,014						
— 20	175	882	— 28	177	990	1821:					
— 27	192 ½	928	September 4	179 ½	972	January 1	217	1,136			
May - 4	184	915	— 11	180	960	— 8	175 ½	939			
— 11	194	974	— 18	184	948	— 15	176	913			
— 18	190	956	— 25	175	906						
— 25	193	956	October 2	181	948						
									9,343		48,314

THE above Account gives the following result as to the Quantity of Water raised by the engines of the West Middlesex Waterworks company and supplied to their Tenants in the Year 1820;—viz.

Power of Engines.	Number of Hours worked.	Quantity raised per Hour.	Total Quantity raised in the Year.
Two seventy-horse.	9,343.	Hogsheads. 1,300.	Hogsheads. 12,145,900

Hammersmith,
February 21st 1821.

Wm. Tierney Clark,
Engineer.

Appendix,
(G.)
West Middlesex
Waterworks.

(5)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Income of the West Middlesex Waterworks Company, in each Year from the first establishment of the said Company to the latest period to which the same can be made up.

In	Gross Amount of Rates, including Special Cases.			Bad Debts and Empty Houses.			Net Rental.			REMARKS.
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	
1811 -	371	4	3	35	10	7	335	13	8	The expense of collection was 1s. in the pound, which must be deducted from this rental.
1812 -	1,987	—	8	330	15	11	1,656	4	9	
1813 -	4,041	19	1	638	12	10	3,403	6	3	
1814 -	7,910	10	8	2,106	10	—	5,804	—	8	
1815 -	9,555	8	2	2,134	10	7	7,420	17	7	
1816 -	10,389	4	2	1,934	1	2	8,455	3	—	
1817 -	10,829	19	1	1,091	10	4	9,738	8	9	
1818 -	15,770	4	2	825	4	1	14,945	—	1	Up to this period the amount of the <i>ordinary annual</i> expenses of carrying on the concern considerably exceeded the amount of the rental.
1819 -	23,609	15	2	1,052	19	7	22,556	15	7	Increased rental, including £.603. 5s. 6d. for water supplied to <i>new</i> buildings since Michaelmas 1817, which are not included in the preceding year.
1820 -	24,252	6	10	1,462	13	2	22,789	13	8	Rental diminished by reduction on the appeals, but increased by <i>new</i> buildings, <i>first supplied this year</i> , to the amount of £.303. 11s.

THIS rental includes all the supplies afforded by the company for domestic purposes and for public buildings, together with all the charges for water supplied for the purposes of trade and manufacture, so far as the same have been discovered and assessed; but the survey of the district, to ascertain the nature and value of the whole of this class of supply, is a work of considerable difficulty, and is still in progress.

The income derived from watering streets is very inconsiderable, the average receipt of the last two years being about £.700, out of which the company have to pay the contractors for doing the work, which leaves little or no profit to the concern.

To the income for the last year, however, is to be added a charge for 805 high services, amounting to £.1,663. 5s. 6d. but of this sum only £.832 have yet been received; and there is also a very considerable amount of water rents in arrear, the receipt of which has been anticipated, but many may be lost to the company.

(6)—ACCOUNT of the Number of Houses supplied by the West Middlesex Company in the Year 1820, in the several Divisions of their District; distinguishing the Number and Charge for High Services.

DIVISION.	Number of Houses supplied by the West Middlesex Waterworks Company, arranged in distinct Classes, according to the amount of the Water Rates charged thereon respectively.								HIGH SERVICES.		REMARKS.
	20/ & under.	20/ to 30/	30/ to 40/	40/ to 50/	50/ to 70/	70/ to 100/	above 100/	Total.	N ^o	Amount.	
Kensington, which includes Bayswater, Hammersmith, &c.	81	428	98	95	86	26	26	840	--	£. s. d. - - -	No separate charge.
Upper Mary-le-bone, including Paddington	405	488	993	453	253	302	104	2,998	473	856 10 —	Of these only 123 have paid, amounting to } £. s. d. 249 19 —
Middle Mary-le-bone	120	240	1,094	615	290	269	207	2,835	271	650 11 6	Of these only 217 have paid, amounting to } 514 7 —
Lower Mary-le-bone, including Pancras	210	604	1,622	978	142	100	21	3,677	61	116 4 —	Of these only 38 have paid, amounting to } 67 14 —
	816	1,760	3,807	2,141	771	697	358	10,350	805	1,663 5 6	£.832 — —

I do not possess the means of distinguishing the several parishes in which the houses are situated.

Appendix,
(G.)
West Middlesex.
Waterworks.

(7.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the yearly Amount of the Rates charged on Premises supplied with Water by the West Middlesex Company, in the Year 1818; and the yearly Amount of Water Rates charged on the same Premises in the Year ending at Midsummer 1820.

<p>1818:</p> <p>Rental, stated in Account, N^o 5, } p. 234 - - - - - } £. 14,945 — 1</p>	<p>1820:</p> <p>Rental, stated in Account, N^o 5, } p. 234 - - - - - } £. 22,789 13 8</p> <p>Deduct new buildings, first sup- } plied since Michaelmas 1817 - } 908 16 6</p> <hr/> <p>Rental, in 1820, of the pre- } mises supplied in 1818 - } £. 21,880 17 2</p>
---	---

IT is necessary to observe, that no separate account has hitherto been kept of the charges made for the supply of public buildings, or for trades or manufactories, though such an account was, and is still, contemplated. The rental above-mentioned, however, is the amount charged in both years for the supply of the whole district, excepting the high services, the number of which is stated in the Account N^o 6, p. 234, to be eight hundred and five, and the amount £.1,663. 5s. 6d.

9th March 1821. M. K. Knight, Secretary.

(8.)—RETURN to an Order, for An Account of the Number of Six Months Notices served.

DIVISION OF DISTRICT in which Notices were served.	PERIOD when NOTICES expired.	
	Michaelmas 1820. Number of Notices served.	Christinas 1820. Number of Notices served.
Upper Mary-le-bone - - - - -	177	48
Middle D ^o - - - - -	1	120
Lower D ^o - - - - -	-	54
	178	222

TOTAL Six Months Notices served - - - 400

20 March 1821.

M. K. Knight, Secretary.

(9.)—RETURN to an Order, for An Account of the Rate of Interest which would be produced on the Capital of the West Middlesex Company by their increased Rates, and also of the Rate of Interest which would be produced on their Capital by their Rate of 1810.

Capital of the company, &c. - - - - -	£. 454,438.
Money capital - - - - -	£. 340,566.

	Present Rates. (1820.)	At Rates of (1810.)
Income of the company - - - - -	£. 24,000	£. 18,000
Deduct estimated annual ex- } penses of the company - } Ordinary £. 8,500	Extra - £. 500	Ordinary £. 8,200 Extra - £. 500
	9,000	8,700
	Profit - £. 15,000	Profit - £. 9,300

£. 15,000. { the profit yielded by the present rates, produces an interest on }
 the capital, of } £. 454,438; of 3 ²/₈ p. ct.
 - - - - - } on the money capital, of £. 340,566; of 4 ³/₈ —
 £. 9,300. { the profit which would be derived from the rates of 1810, will yield }
 an interest on the capital, of } £. 454,438; of 2 p. ct.
 - - - - - } on the money capital, of £. 340,566; of 2 ⁵/₈ —

THE Committee will be pleased to observe, that in the above calculation no deduction whatever has been made for the establishment of the fund, which it must be obvious will be requisite for the renewal of the machinery, pipes, &c. when the present are worn out or decayed.

26 March 1821. M. K. Knight, Secretary.

(10.)—RETURN to an Order, for An Account of all Shares or Transfers in the West Middlesex Company, from the date of September 1809 to July 1811; distinguishing whether such Transfer was made by a Director or Officer of the Company.

PERIOD.	Number of Transfers Registered.	Number of Individuals who sold.	Number of Shares Transferred.	Premium obtained.	REMARKS.
			800 Old Shares.		
September 1809 to } March 1810 - } 7 months -	117.	46.	236.	£. 10 to £. 45.	{ Of the forty-six individuals who sold within this period, seven were directors, (two of whom sold out entirely,) and the number of shares sold by them was fifty-four.
April to June 1810 } 3 months -	78.	28.	122.	£. 45 to £. 125.	{ Of the twenty-eight individuals here stated, four were directors, who sold eighteen shares.
			Appropriation of 1,200 new shares, being $1\frac{1}{2}$ to each old share, making a total of 2,000 shares.		
July to December } 1810 - - - } 6 months -	103.	36.	300.	£. 45 to £. 20.	{ Of these thirty-six individuals, five were directors, who sold forty-eight shares.
January 1811 to } July 1811 - - } 6 months -	62.	32.	161.	£. 20 to par.	{ Of these thirty-two individuals, four were directors, who sold nineteen shares.

FROM the incorporation of the company in May 1806 to November 1808, the shares were uniformly sold at par; from that period they progressively rose to a premium of from £. 8 to £. 45, which they bore till October 1810, when the depression began: from October 1810 to July 1811 (when this Account ends) they had gradually fallen to par, and they subsequently fell to £. 75 and £. 80 per cent. discount.

14th April 1821.

M. K. Knight, Secretary.

(11.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Annual Expenses of the West Middlesex Waterworks Company.

	1820.	£.
Coals - - - - -	- - - - -	say 2,700
Salaries, Attendance, &c.	- - - - -	2,200
Workmens Wages - - - - -	- - - - -	1,400
Rent and Taxes - - - - -	- - - - -	500
Poundage - - - - -	- - - - -	1,200
Office Disbursements - - - - -	- - - - -	200
Printing, Stationery, and Stamps - - - - -	- - - - -	150
Engine-house Expenses - - - - -	- - - - -	150
Ordinary Expenses - - - - -	- - - - -	£. 8,500
Add <i>extraordinary</i> Expenses; that is, repairs of leaks, plugs, tools, paving, plumbing, and various other incidental charges which invariably occur, but which can only be estimated - - - - -	- - - - -	500
		<u>£. 9,000</u>

(12.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Gross Income of the West Middlesex Waterworks Company, in each Year from the first establishment of the said Company to the latest period to which the same can be made up; distinguishing the Amount of the Sums received respectively for Water supplied for Domestic Purposes, for Public Buildings, and for the purposes of Trade and Manufactures, for High Services, and for Water used in watering Roads or Streets, from the Income derived from other sources.

Appendix,
(G.)
West Middlesex
Waterworks.

PERIOD.	GROSS INCOME for Water supplied for Domestic Purposes, for Public Buildings, and for Trades and Manufactories, so far as the same have been surveyed and assessed.			Gross Income for High Services. — (five quarters.)			Gross Income for Water used in watering Roads or Streets.			Income for Land and Houses.			TOTAL.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Year ending Michaelmas	1811	282	8	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	282	8	4
	1812	791	19	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	791	19	1
	1813	2,058	18	4	-	-	-	71	8	-	45	-	2,175	6	4
	1814	4,693	14	9	-	-	-	148	17	-	22	9	4,865	-	9
	1815	7,041	10	6	-	-	-	127	8	-	26	5	7,195	3	6
	1816	9,894	13	5	-	-	-	151	9	6	54	5	10,100	7	11
	1817	11,454	9	1	-	-	-	151	18	-	55	15	11,662	2	1
3 qrs. to Midsummer	1818	9,001	13	11	-	-	-	360	14	6	58	10	9,420	18	5
Year ending	1819	17,767	11	-	-	-	-	570	4	-	85	4	18,422	19	-
Midsummer	1820	21,300	4	10	1,260	2	3	720	4	-	50	-	23,330	11	1

The West Middlesex waterworks company have not kept a separate account of their charges for the supplies afforded to public buildings, or for the purposes of trade and manufacture, though such an account was and is still contemplated. The repeated obstructions opposed to the company's operations, and the various parliamentary and legal proceedings in which they have been engaged during the last three years, have unavoidably delayed the survey of the district which was begun in order to ascertain the nature and value of this class of the company's supply; but so far as those supplies have been assessed (and this extends to all known cases of magnitude) the rental is included with that of the ordinary supplies. By a special order of the board of directors, however, the supplies to all public buildings for charitable uses supported by voluntary contributions, have been continued at the reduced rates paid in 1817, which are also included in the rental above mentioned.

To prevent mistake, it is proper to add that this account does not show the actual water rental of the company in the several years specified, but the first column contains the gross receipts in each particular year, on account of water rental; a considerable portion of which is the arrears of the preceding years:—for example, the

Arrears at Christmas 1818 amounted to £. 950. 5s. 11d. of which was paid before Midsummer 1819 £. 654. 11s. 5d.
- - - Midsummer 1819 - - - £. 3,441. 15s. 10d. - - - - - Christmas 1819 £. 1,555. 18s. 10d.
and so on.

The sum stated to be received for watering roads and streets is subject to very considerable reduction, for money paid the contractors for cartage and labour; this branch of the company's supply being attended with little or no profit.

20 March 1821.

M. K. Knight, Secretary.

(13.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Expenditure of the Capital of the West Middlesex Waterworks, stated in the Account, p. 234; as given in Evidence before the House of Lords, July 1819.

By Estates purchased	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,280	12	10	
Engineering and surveying	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,830	15	9	
Parliamentary and law charges	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,142	16	-	
Buildings, engines and reservoirs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	55,184	10	11	
Mains, service-pipes, fire-pipes, cocks, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	228,479	2	6	
Lead and plumbing	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,182	15	7	
Balance of interest paid on money borrowed, and accounts over due	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,124	9	9	
Commission paid to agents	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,420	9	9	
Repairs and expenses for carrying on the works for eleven years; viz.													
Coals for the engines	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	£.16,796	-	11		
Engine-house expenses, and other expenses relating to the works	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,014	14	1		
Engine-workers, turncocks, labourers, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,583	2	3 1/2		
Printing and stationery	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,861	16	5		
Rent and taxes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,666	2	7 1/2		
Salaries, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14,589	2	3		
Disbursements for office, for stamps, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,630	18	10		
										£.71,141	17	5	
Deduct													
Water rents received	-	£.48,599	14	1									
Fines and fees	-	-	528	15									
Profits on shares sold	-	-	282	10	6								
										49,410	19	7	
Interest due to proprietors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21,730	17	10	
Balance at the bankers, 31st March 1819	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	113,872	6	-	
										3,189	15	10	
										£.	454,438	12	9

22 March 1821.

M. K. Knight, Secretary.

Appendix,
(G.)
West Middlesex
Waterworks.

(14.)—RETURN to an Order, for The Rules, if any, which the Companies act upon in respect of the distinction between High Service and Low, Extra Service and Ordinary; and also a List of the Trades which are considered as subject to an Extra Charge in respect of their Consumption of Water, or in any other respect; and the Periods during which these Rules have been acted upon, as far as it can be ascertained.

THE rule of charge, in respect to high service, in addition to the charge of twenty-five per cent. on the rate for the low service in 1810, is as under; viz.

For every cistern or receptacle into which water is delivered, higher than six feet six inches from the level of the street in which the house is situated, an extra charge, according to the particular nature of the supply required, and of the class of houses to which it is afforded, of from 15s. to 30s. per annum.

For every cistern on the *first* floor of any house, from 20s. to 50s. according to circumstances, as above.

For every cistern on or above the *second* floor of any house, from 40s. to 60s.

And this rule has been strictly adhered to since Lady-day 1819, when high services first came into charge, excepting in very special cases; such as for trades, baths, &c. requiring a very unusual quantity of water.

In respect to *extra* services (by which is meant supplies to public buildings, or for the purposes of trade or manufacture), it seems to me to be impossible to lay down any specific scale; the quantum of water, and the convenience afforded to the party in such cases, being always the basis of charge for extra supplies.

The following is a list of the trades and premises which occur to me at this moment as having been considered subject to an extra charge in respect to their consumption of water; viz.—brewers, distillers, steam engines, dyers and scowerers, fishmongers, nurscrymen, watering-houses, cow-houses, stables, milkmen, baths, potatoe-warehouses, taverns and hotels, laundresses, bakers, slaughtermen, publicans, wine-merchants, hat-manufacturers, curriers, &c. &c.

29th March 1821.

M. K. Knight, Secy.

Appendix, (H.)

GRAND JUNCTION WATERWORKS.

The following PAPERS were delivered in by the Secretary to the *Grand Junction Waterworks Company*.

Appendix,
(H.)
Grand Junction
Waterworks.

(1.)—COPIES of all Deeds, Contracts, Undertakings, and other Instruments, in writing, touching the supply of any part of the Metropolis with Water, made and entered into by and between or on behalf of the Grand Junction Waterworks Company, and any other public Water Company, since the 1st January 1815.

THERE are no deeds, contracts, undertakings, or other instruments, in writing, touching the supply of any part of the metropolis with water, made and entered into by and between or on behalf of the Grand Junction Waterworks company, and any other public water company, since the 1st January 1815.

(2.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Number and Description of Shares into which the Capital Joint Stock of the Grand Junction Waterworks Company is divided, the nominal Value of such Shares, and the net Amount of the Subscriptions paid thereon, and received by the said Company; distinguishing the Amount received in each Year from the first establishment of the Company.

Number of Shares.	Nominal Value of each Share.	Issued by the Company at per Share.	TOTAL AMOUNT Received by the Company.
3,000	£. 50	£. 50	£. 150,000
1,500	50	25	37,500
4,500	- - - -	- - - -	£. 187,500

Amount received in each Year, together with Interest thereon, to 31st March 1819.

	PRINCIPAL.	YEARS.	INTEREST.	PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST.
	£.		£. s. d.	£. s. d.
In 1810 - -	3,000	8 $\frac{1}{4}$	1,237 10 —	4,237 10 —
1811 - - -	42,178	7 $\frac{1}{4}$	15,289 10 6	57,467 10 6
1812 - - -	74,074	6 $\frac{1}{4}$	23,148 2 6	97,222 2 6
1813 - - -	30,370	5 $\frac{1}{4}$	7,972 2 6	38,342 2 6
1814 - - -	8,323	4 $\frac{1}{4}$	1,768 12 9	10,091 12 9
1815 - - -	9,327	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	1,515 12 9	10,842 12 9
1816 - - -	9,500	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	1,068 15 —	10,568 15 —
1817 - - -	10,728	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	670 10 —	11,398 10 —
	£. 187,500	- - -	£. 52,670 16 —	£. 240,170 16 —

(3.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Sums paid in Dividends to the Proprietors of the Grand Junction Waterworks, from the first establishment thereof to the latest period to which the same can be made up; specifying the Dates and Rates of such Dividends, and whether the same were paid discharged of the Property Tax.

Amount of Dividend per Share.	When declared.	When payable.	TOTAL AMOUNT of Dividend.
£. s. d.			£. s. d.
1 5 —	1st July - - 1819	10th October - 1819	5,625 — —
— 12 6	1st June - - 1820	17th July - - 1820	2,812 10 —
1 5 —	7th December 1820	15th January - 1821	5,625 — —
		£.	14,062 10 —

THE Committee will observe that the property tax was repealed before any dividend was paid by the company.

(4.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Amount of the Sums paid by the Grand Junction Waterworks Company for relaying or repairing the public Pavements in London, from the year 1808 to the latest period to which the same can be made up; distinguishing the amount paid in each year.

YEARS.										AMOUNTS.		
										£.	s.	d.
1812	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	939	10	3
1813	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,261	8	—
1814	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	855	2	10
1815	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	355	19	2
1816	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	537	12	4
1817	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	537	10	8
1818	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	708	4	5
1819	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	998	17	2
1820	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	426	5	1
										£.	6,620	9 11

(5.)—AN ACCOUNT of the number of Circular Letters or Notices sent to Tenants who refused Payment of the increased Rates, signifying that the Supply would be discontinued unless increased Rates were forthwith paid.

THERE has been no regular account kept of the issue of the circular letters or notices above referred to; there were 300 printed, nearly all of which appear to have been delivered.

(6.)—AN ACCOUNT of the number of Six Months Notices served.

THERE have been 1,496 of the six months notices served.

(7.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the number of Dwelling Houses and other Buildings supplied with Water by the Grand Junction Waterworks Company, in each of the Years 1812, 1814, 1816 and 1819, arranged in distinct Classes according to the amount of the Water Rates then charged thereon respectively; and distinguishing the several Parishes in which the same were situated.

HOUSES.	RATES.	HOUSES.	RATES.
Michaelmas Collection 1814 :			
4	Under - - - - 10s.	1	110s. - and under - 120s.
148	10s. - and under - 20s.	30	120s. - - - - - 130s.
890	20s. - - - - - 30s.	6	140s. - - - - - 150s.
175	30s. - - - - - 40s.	1	150s. - - - - - 160s.
86	40s. - - - - - 50s.	8	160s. - - - - - 170s.
28	50s. - - - - - 60s.	3	180s. - - - - - 190s.
67	60s. - - - - - 70s.	12	200s. and upwards.
14	70s. - - - - - 80s.		
63	80s. - - - - - 90s.	1,558	
3	90s. - - - - - 100s.		
19	100s. - - - - - 110s.		

(continued)

Appendix
(H.)(7.)—ACCOUNT of Dwelling Houses, &c. supplied by the Grand Junction Company,—*continued.*Grand Junction
Waterworks.

HOUSES.	RATES.	HOUSES.	RATES.
Michaelmas Collection 1816 :			
9	Under - - - - 10 s.	3	110 s. - and under - 120 s.
422	10 s. - and under - 20 s.	38	120 s. - - - - - 130 s.
1,423	20 s. - - - - - 30 s.	2	130 s. - - - - - 140 s.
311	30 s. - - - - - 40 s.	12	140 s. - - - - - 150 s.
163	40 s. - - - - - 50 s.	1	150 s. - - - - - 160 s.
57	50 s. - - - - - 60 s.	18	160 s. - - - - - 170 s.
119	60 s. - - - - - 70 s.	3	180 s. - - - - - 190 s.
21	70 s. - - - - - 80 s.	31	200 s. and upwards.
104	80 s. - - - - - 90 s.		
3	90 s. - - - - - 100 s.	2,784	
44	100 s. - - - - - 110 s.		
Michaelmas Collection 1819 :			
3	Under - - - - 10 s.	165	120 s. - and under - 130 s.
224	10 s. - and under - 20 s.	49	130 s. - - - - - 140 s.
682	20 s. - - - - - 30 s.	96	140 s. - - - - - 150 s.
2,829	30 s. - - - - - 40 s.	28	150 s. - - - - - 160 s.
1,009	40 s. - - - - - 50 s.	103	160 s. - - - - - 170 s.
492	50 s. - - - - - 60 s.	6	170 s. - - - - - 180 s.
400	60 s. - - - - - 70 s.	57	180 s. - - - - - 190 s.
217	70 s. - - - - - 80 s.	4	190 s. - - - - - 200 s.
258	80 s. - - - - - 90 s.	201	200 s. and upwards.
108	90 s. - - - - - 100 s.		
201	100 s. - - - - - 110 s.	7,180	
48	110 s. - - - - - 120 s.		

The Company did not supply any houses previous to Michaelmas 1812.

(8.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Application of the Capital actually raised by the Grand Junction Waterworks Company.

	£.	s.	d.
Leaseholds purchased - - - - -	1,575	15	9
Engineering and surveying - - - - -	1,524	15	2
Parliamentary and law charges - - - - -	3,279	3	—
Engine-house and engine - - - - -	18,882	16	2
Reservoirs and feeders - - - - -	28,888	5	9
Mains, service-pipes, stopcocks, &c. - - - - -	115,460	16	4
Lead and plumbers work - - - - -	5,045	3	9
Stone pipes - - - - -	10,812	8	7
Sundry charges, books, stationery, &c. - - - - -	2,030	15	6
	£.	187,500	—

	£.	s.	d.
Capital expended in connection with the Grand Junction Canal company - - - - -	187,500	—	—
Deduct cost of engine-house and engine at Paddington - - - - -	18,882	16	2
	£.	168,617	3
Add capital for new works at Chelsea - - - - -	43,241	8	6
Add capital for land at Paddington - - - - -	8,000	—	—
	£.	219,858	12
Amount capital with the works at the Thames - - - - -	£.	219,858	12

(9.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Gross Income of the Grand Junction Waterworks Company, in each Year from the first establishment of the said Company to the latest period to which the same can be made up; distinguishing therein the Amounts of the Sums received respectively for Water supplied for Domestic Purposes, for Water supplied to Public Buildings, and for the purposes of Trade and Manufacture, and for Water used in watering Roads and Streets, from the Income derived from other Sources.

YEARS.	Income derived from Water supplied for Domestic Purposes, Public Buildings, &c.			Income derived from Street Watering.			Income derived from other Sources; viz. from Sale of Gravel, and Interest on Exchequer Bills.			TOTALS.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
1814 - - -	1,298	3	5	215	16	8	-	-	-	1,514	-	1
1815 - - -	3,012	1	7	204	6	—	869	19	6	4,086	7	1
1816 - - -	4,400	19	4	224	10	—	-	-	-	4,625	9	4
1817 - - -	5,249	15	8	230	5	—	28	14	2	5,508	14	10
1818 - - -	8,684	4	10	490	15	—	33	3	—	9,208	2	10
1819 - - -	12,891	19	—	327	2	—	77	4	2	13,296	5	2
1820 - - -	19,772	17	1	369	9	6	11	5	—	20,153	11	7
£.	55,310	—	11	2,062	4	2	1,020	5	10	58,392	10	11

(10.)—AN ACCOUNT showing the Yearly Amount of the Rates charged on Premises supplied with Water by the Grand Junction Waterworks Company, in the Year 1820, and the Yearly Amount of the Water Rates charged on the same Premises, for the Year ending at Midsummer 1818; distinguishing the Amount of the Water Rates charged thereon, under the respective denominations of High, Extra and Ordinary Services.

Amount of Rates for the year ending at Michaelmas 1818	-	-	-	-	£.	s.	d.
					12,317	4	7
Amount of Rates for the year ending at Michaelmas 1820							
Ordinary service	-	-	-	-	16,990	5	—
High service	-	-	-	-	1,681	9	6
Extra service	-	-	-	-	1,319	12	4
				£.	19,991	6	10

THE company did not make distinct charges for ordinary, high and extra services previous to Michaelmas 1818.

(11.)—THE RULES which the Grand Junction Waterworks Company act upon in respect of the distinction between High Services and Low, Extra Services and Ordinary; and also a List of the Trades which are considered as subject to an Extra Charge, in respect of their consumption of Water, or in any other respect; and the Periods during which these Rules have been acted upon, as far as can be ascertained.

Cisterns the tops of which are above six feet six inches from the ground floor are charged from 15s. to 30s. per annum.

Cisterns on the first floor, from 20s. to 50s. per annum.

Cisterns on or above the second floor, from 40s. to 60s. except in special cases for large supplies for water-closets, baths, and trades, and where the whole supply for domestic purposes is on the first floor and above.

The following are the Trades which the Company consider liable to an extra charge.

Bakers, brewers, dyers and scowerers, chemists and perfumers with stills, carriers, fishmongers, dairymen, butchers, soap-boilers, public and watering-houses, stable-keepers, steam-engines, coach-makers, plasterers, paper-stainers, hotels, taverns and club-houses, baths, tripe-boilers, barracks, cook-shops, workhouses, schools, laundresses, potatoe-washers, hat-manufacturers, nurserymen, distillers.

The high and extra services have been only charged since the notice of 11th August 1818.

Appendix,
(H.)
Grand Junction
Waterworks.

(12.)—GROSS CHARGE of the Grand Junction Waterworks Company, for Water Rates, for the respective periods undermentioned.

	Water Rates.			Street Watering.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Lady-day collection 1818 - - - - -	6,395	13	10	237	13	—
Michaelmas - - ditto - - - - -	6,417	9	9	96	18	—
	£.	12,813	3 7	334	11	—
Lady-day collection 1819 - - - - -	10,344	12	3	415	15	—
Michaelmas - - ditto - - - - -	10,378	3	—	13	10	—
	£.	20,722	15 3	429	5	—
Lady-day collection 1820 - - - - -	10,323	1	11	395	4	6
Michaelmas - - ditto - - - - -	10,263	7	11	13	2	6
	£.	20,586	9 10	408	7	—
Amount of Michaelmas collection 1820 - - -	£.	10,263	7 11	—	—	—

(13.)—AN ACCOUNT of the Rate of Interest which would be produced on the Capital of the Grand Junction Waterworks Company by their increased Rates; and also of the Rate of Interest which would be produced on their Capital by their Rate of 1810.

Rates of 1810, including high services - - - - -		£.	s.	d.
		16,198	1	5
Deduct annual current expenses - - - - -	£.	7,949	18	—
Ditto empty houses and bad debts - - - - -	600	—	—	—
		8,549	18	—
Net rental applicable to a dividend - - - - -	£.	7,648	3	5

Which is equal to $3\frac{3}{8}$ per cent. upon a capital of £.240,000,
and nearly $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon a capital of £.219,858.

Rates of 1810, with an addition of 25 per cent. and high services - - - - -		£.	s.	d.
		20,526	15	10
Deduct annual current expenses, increased by collectors commission - - - - -	8,166	6	—	—
Ditto empty houses and bad debts - - - - -	750	—	—	—
		8,916	6	—
Net rental applicable to a dividend - - - - -	£.	11,610	9	10

Which is equal to $4\frac{3}{8}$ per cent. on a capital of £.240,000,
and $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on a capital of £.219,858.

N. B.—The above calculation is made without providing any reserve fund for repairs and renewal of works, the necessary amount of which being, according to the engineer's estimate, £.3,167; the net rental, with the rates of 1810, applicable to a dividend, will be £.4,481, which is nearly $1\frac{7}{8}$ per cent. upon a capital of £.240,000, and nearly $2\frac{1}{8}$ per cent. upon a capital of £.219,858.

With the deduction for a reserve fund from the increased rates, the net rental applicable to a dividend will be £.8,443, which is equal to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon a capital of £.240,000, and nearly $3\frac{7}{8}$ per cent. upon a capital of £.219,858.

W. M. Coe, Secretary.

The following PAPER was delivered in by Mr. *Barton Greenwood*.

EXTRACT from Grand Junction Waterworks Act, 51 Geo. 3, c. 169, sect. 33.

Appendix,
(H.)
Grand Junction
Waterwoks.

“ Provided also, and be it further enacted, that the said company of proprietors shall and they are hereby required from time to time hereafter to supply the several lessees or tenants of the estate belonging to the see of the Bishop of London, at Paddington aforesaid, with water, at the rate of ten pounds per centum, at the least, below the average rate which shall be demanded and taken by the said company, or by any other company or companies, for supplying with an equal quantity of water the inhabitants of houses of the like magnitude and description, of any other of the districts or streets within the cities of London and Westminster.”

Copy of a LETTER addressed by Mr. Barton Greenwood, solicitor, to the Chairman of the Court of Directors of the Grand Junction Waterworks Company, and of the Answer thereto.

Manchester-street, 23d January 1821.

Sir,—I am instructed by Mr. Charles Ollier, tenant and occupier of the house, No. 6, on the west side Maida-hill, in the parish of Paddington, and parcel of the estate belonging to the see of the Bishop of London, in that parish, to request that you will, as soon as conveniently may be, cause such steps to be taken as shall be necessary towards furnishing him with a regular supply of water at his said house, pursuant to the provision (sect. 33) contained in the act 51 Geo. 3, c. 169, authorizing the establishment of the Grand Junction waterworks; and to state that Mr. Ollier is ready and willing to enter into any proper agreement which the Grand Junction waterworks company may desire, for securing to the company due payment of the rates which shall from time to time become payable in respect of the water so required to be supplied.

I have further to request that you will direct a communication to be made to me, at the period at which the desired supply of water will commence, and the amount of the yearly or other rate chargeable in respect thereof.

I am, &c. &c.

(signed) *Barton Greenwood*.

Grand Junction Waterworks, Union-street, Bond-street, 14th February 1821.

Sir,—Your letter of the 23d ult. has been laid before the court of directors, and I am desired to acquaint you, that the company have not at present any pipes laid upon that part of the estate belonging to the see of the Bishop of London, in which Mr. Ollier resides, and that Mr. Ollier shall be informed when the company are prepared to furnish him with a supply of water.

I am, &c. &c.

B. Greenwood, Esq. Manchester-street,
St. Mary-le-bone.

W. M. Coe, Secretary.

Appendix, (I.)

ESTIMATE of the Fund necessary to provide against the Wear and Tear of Capital for a Waterwork.

Appendix,
(I.)

IF a capital be expended in an undertaking consisting of the following items, they will require renewal in the number of years set opposite the respective sums, and the per-centage for the renewal will be as stated in the third column.

1.	2.	3.	4.
Engine-houses £.5,000	renewed in 60 years, at	£.0 8 5 per cent.	£. 21 — 2
Machinery - - 5,000	- - D° - - 25 - - D°	- - - 2 8 0 $\frac{1}{2}$ —	- - - 120 1 2
Iron pipes $\frac{7}{8}$ of 58,500	- - D° - - 45 - - D°	- - - 0 16 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ —	- - - 48 6 8
Cocks and plugs - 9,000	- - D° - - 10 - - D°	- - - 8 6 8 —	- - - 749 12 2
Pipe laying - - 22,500	- - D° - - 45 - - D°	- - - 0 16 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ —	- - - 185 18 2
Capital - - £. 100,000		Reserve fund for renewal - -	£. 1,124 18 4

William Chadwell Mylne,
Engineer of the New River Company.

Joseph Steevens,
Engineer of the East London Company.

Appendix,
(K, L, M.)

NOTE.

THE following Statements (K, L, M,) were drawn up, by directions of the Committee, from the Evidence before them ; but the Committee feel it necessary to remark, that they involve disputed points, which render it necessary to refer to the Evidence in examining them, particularly in Abstract (M.) in the column headed "Mean Elevation."

ABSTRACT; Showing the RENTALS and DIVIDENDS of the OLD WATER COMPANIES, previously and up to the Year 1810, under the Rates then paid.

	WATER RENTALS.	DIVIDENDS PER SHARE, Discharged of Property Tax.	BUILDINGS SUPPLIED.	REMARKS.
NEW RIVER	<p style="text-align: right;">£. s. d.</p> <p>In the Year - 1800 - - 59,976 17 5 - - - 1801 - - 60,762 14 10 - - - 1802 - - 61,841 19 - - - - 1803 - - 62,230 4 4 - - - 1804 - - 63,678 2 10 - - - 1805 - - 70,462 5 - - - - 1806 - - 75,661 19 2 - - - 1807 - - 77,330 7 7 - - - 1808 - - 79,302 9 3 - - - 1809 - - 80,782 12 - - - - 1810 - - 80,992 4 5</p> <p>Besides the above, there was also a Rental from Lands and Houses;—which amounted, In the Year 1800, to - £. 941 7 4 - 1805, to - 1,153 6 6; and - 1810, to - 1,464 1 3</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">£. s. d.</p> <p>Average of 5 Years, ending 1780 - 329 - - D° - D° - 1795 - 427 - - D° - D° - 1800 - 459 - -</p> <p>In the Year - - 1800 - 463 12 - - - - 1801 - 471 9 - - - - 1802 - 451 4 - - - - 1803 - 445 6 - - - - 1804 - 396 19 - - - - 1805 - 486 - - - - - 1806 - 450 2 - - - - 1807 - 440 13 - - - - 1808 - 472 1 - - - - 1809 - 472 5 - - - - 1810 - 465 - -</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Number.</p> <p>In 1804 - - - 54,681. In 1809 - - - 59,058.</p>	
YORK BUILDINGS	<p style="text-align: right;">£.</p> <p>In the Year - - 1800 - - 3,100, gradually increasing to In the Year - - 1808 - - 3,264. In the Year - - 1810 - - 3,437.</p>	<p>The Capital divided into 84 Shares.</p> <p>In 1790 - - - 150^s/ or £. 630. In 1792 - - - 160^s/ or £. 672.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Number.</p> <p>In 1804 - - Tenants 2,089. In 1809 - - D° - 2,217.</p>	Besides the Dividends, each Company was enabled to appropriate certain Sums out of the Water Rentals, to the improvement of their respective Works, over and above the Sums required to maintain the Works in repair.
CHELSEA	<p>(For Domestic purposes only:)</p> <p>In the Year - - 1800 - £. 9,563. Average 5 Years { 1800 } - 9,838. { 1804 } - D° - - - { 1805 } - 11,982. { 1809 } In the Year - - 1810 - - 13,626.</p> <p>Besides the above, there was a Rental for supplying Water to public Buildings and Manufactories, and for watering Streets; which amounted to, In - - - 1800 - - £. 1,035. In - - - 1810 - - - 1,922; and exclusive of improved Rents of Leaseholds, and dividends of Money in the Funds.</p>	<p>The Capital divided into 4,000 Shares.</p> <p>Previously to 1797, yearly } - 8^s/ or £. 1,600. Dividend - - - }</p> <p>In the Year 1797 - - - 9^s/ or £. 1,800. From - 1797 to 1808 - 10^s/ or £. 2,000. In the Year 1808 - - - 11^s/ or £. 2,200. From - 1809 to 1820 - 12^s/ or £. 2,400.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Number.</p> <p>In 1804 - Buildings supplied - 8,424. In 1809 - - - D° - - 9,477.</p>	Also, to the Dividends paid during the existence of the Property Tax, there should be added the amount of that Tax, to show the real amount of the improvement in the Dividends, which were paid to the Proprietors discharged of the Tax: Thus, if there had been no such Tax paid by the New River Company in the Year 1810, the Dividend would have been - - - £. 516 13 4 Property Tax, 10 p' c ^t - 51 13 4 Net Dividend paid } £. 465 - - to Proprietors - }
LONDON BRIDGE	<p>In the Year - 1801 - - £. 10,723. gradually increasing to In the Year - 1810 - - £. 12,588.</p>	<p>The Capital divided into 1,500 Shares.</p> <p>1790 to 1793 - 60^s/ or £. 4,500. 1794 to 1797 - 40^s/ or £. 3,000. 1798 to 1811 - 60^s/ or £. 4,500.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Number.</p> <p>In 1804 - - - ? In 1810 - - - 10,317.</p>	
SHADWELL AND WEST-HAM	- - - No Return - - -	- - - No Return - - -	<p style="text-align: right;">Number.</p> <p>In - - 1804 - - ? In - - 1810 - - 10,739.</p> <p>N.B.—Between 1804 and 1809, these Companies lost a considerable number of Houses, (about 1,500) by the formation of the London Docks.</p>	

1. 1. 1. 1.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE QUANTITY OF WATER DELIVERED YEARLY TO THE METROPOLIS ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE THAMES, IN THE YEARS 1809 AND 1820, Together with the Number of Tenants and Buildings supplied, and the Gross Water Rental of each Company, at both periods.

Table with columns: QUANTITY OF WATER SUPPLIED (WITHOUT MACHINERY, BY MACHINERY, TOTAL), TENANTS OR HOUSES SUPPLIED, and GROSS WATER RENTAL. Rows include New River, Hampstead, York Buildings, Chelsea, London Bridge, Shadwell & West Ham, Grand Junction, and West Middlesex for both 1809 and 1820.

NOTES.

* It does not appear in the Evidence, that the seventh, for loss of power, &c. has been deducted from the items distinguished by an asterisk.

(a) Previously to 1810, the whole supply was served through wood pipes, and a considerable proportion of it is said to have been lost by leakage. This loss is estimated

Table showing water loss estimates: by Mr. Simpson (16,924,168 Hogsheads), by Mr. Milne (29,617,294 Hogsheads), and net supply (95,198,444 Hogsheads).

(b) The whole supply from the London Bridge Works, and part of the supply from the Chelsea Works, in the year 1820, being still served through wood pipes, were subject to the like loss.

Water Rental computed on Rates of 1810, except in the case of the East London Company - £. 163,896 -

... being one-fifth of £. 59,969 aggregate amount of the gross Rentals of the Chelsea, West Middlesex, and Grand Junction Companies, as the amount of the increased rate of 25 per cent, charged by those Companies.

1 107400

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT, Showing the GROSS EXPENDITURE of the NEW WATER COMPANIES, and the Estimated Value of the OLD WATER WORKS, together with the Yearly Current Expenses of each Company; the Number of Buildings supplied; the Gross Amount of the Water Rentals including the increased Rates charged by the East London, West Middlesex, Grand Junction and Chelsea Companies; the Average Yearly Rates per House or Building, and Charge per Thousand Hogsheads, computed on those Rentals: the Total Quantity of Water annually supplied: the Average Daily Supply for each House or Building, including all Manufactories and extraordinary consumption; and the Elevations at which the same is supplied. Abstracted from Returns to Orders of the Committee of the House of Commons appointed to inquire into the State of the Supply of Water, &c.

COM- PANY.	Limitation of Capitals according to Acts and Charters.	Shares into which the Capitals are divided.	Nominal Value of the Shares.	Nominal Joint Stock Capitals created.	Net Amount of Subscription Monies received.	Average per Share.	EXPENDITURE on Works, beyond Amount of Subscriptions.	GROSS EXPENDITURE.		Average per Share.	Estimated Current Expenditure for the future, (exclusive of Reserve Fund.)	Houses and Buildings supplied.	GROSS RENTAL.	Average Rates, per House, or Building, (including large Con- sumers.)	Total Quantity of Water supplied yearly.	Average Charge per 1000 Hogsheads, computed on Gross Rental.	Average daily supply per House or Building, including Manufactories, &c.	* Mean Elevation at which the Water is supplied.	Highest Elevation at which the Water is supplied.	* quere, defective?
								£.	£. s. d.											
EAST LONDON:	£. 380,000	Number. 3,800 each	£. 100	£. 380,000	£. 375,158	£. s. d. 98 12 —	£. 78,440 Expended. 38,800 { Dividends paid out of Capital. 39,640 { Net Additional Expenditure.	£. 414,798	£. s. d. = 109 3 2	£. 13,003	Number. 32,071	£. 35,358 including the increased rates.— This Company make no distinct charge for high service.	s. about 22/	Hogshead. 29,516,333	s. d. 23/3	135 gallons including manufacto- ries; Mr. Stevens says, if supplied only to pri- vate houses, 135 gall. could not be consumed; that very great waste prevails; and that a greater supply is given by them to manufacto- ries, than by any other Company.	Ft. 120	Ft. 150		
							Deduct £. 60,647, as the consider- ation for the goodwill of Shadwell and West Ham Works, including loss on their old wood pipes, (being part of the sum of £. 130,000, ex- pended in the purchase of those Works); and £. 7,151 value of iron pipes sold to New River Com- pany	£. 67,798												
							Gross Expenditure - - £.	£. 347,000	£. s. d. = 91 6 4											
WEST MIDDLESEX:	£. 400,000	Number. 7,542 each	£. 100	£. 754,200	£. 340,564	£. s. d. 42 5 6	Nil.	£. 318,834	£. s. d. 42 5 6	£. 9,000	Number. 10,350	£. 25,915 including the increased rates.— Of this sum, £. 1,663 is charged for high service.	s. about 50/	Hogsheads. 12,169,300	s. d. 42/7	nearly 174 gallons, but Mr. Clark says, from 200 to 250 gal- lons; that little is al- lowed to run to waste; few supplies from mains, and few ma- nufactories.	Ft. 121 Elevation of Kensington Reservoir.	Ft. 151 including stand pipe.		
					£. 21,730		Expended out of Cap- ital, to carry on the Works, beyond the amount of water rates received up to the 31st March 1819.													
					£. 318,834															
GRAND JUNCTION:	£. 300,000	Number. 4,500 each	£. 50	£. 225,000	£. 187,500	£. s. d. 41 13 4		£. 32,358	£. s. d. 48 17 6	£. 7,950	Number. 7,180	£. 20,468 including the increased rates.— Of this sum, £. 1,681 is charged for high service.	s. about 57/	Hogsheads. 13,104,000	s. d. 31/3	270 gallons. Mr. Anderson says, that there are few manufactories.	Ft. In. 88 9 Elevation of Reservoir.	Ft. In. 150 2 greatest pressure at which engine works.		
							The water rates rather more than defrayed current ex- penses to March 1819.													
							difference in excess between cost of engine and land at Paddington, and the new Works at Chelsea; and which may be considered as a net gain to the Company, by their arrangement with the Regents and Grand Junction Canal Companies.													
CHelsea:	£. 70,000	Number. 2,000 each £. 20 2,000 each £. 10		£. 60,000	£. 60,000	£. s. d. 15 — —		£. 78,648	£. 138,648	£. 9,869	Number. 8,632	£. 13,586 including the increased rates— This Company make no distinct charge for high service. The sum stated is exclusive of a rental of about £. 1,400, from premises, the lease of which will expire at Lady- day 1823.	s. about s. d. 31/3	Hogsheads. 7,533,900	s. 36/	about 130 gallons including upwards of 100 public buildings and manufactories, and the quantity used in watering the parks and streets.	Ft. 80 Elevation of Reservoir.	Ft. 114 including stand-pipe	Mr. Simpson says, that in their present li- mited district, the sup- ply is not required beyond 60 or 70 feet.	
							accumulated savings out of rental, spent on works at different periods since 1734.		Note.—In a return made to an order of the Committee, Mr. Lynde has stated, that the present value of their freehold, reser- voir, engines, pipes, &c. is £. 50,000.											
NEW RIVER:	The whole Joint Stock Capital is divided into	72 equal part shares.						Valuation of Capital in 1820, exclusive of the estimated value of the wood pipes, abandoned and left to rot in the ground.		£. 26,000	Number. 52,082	£. 68,297 including £. 4,263, to raise certain tenants to rates of 1810, and £. 309 for high services; but ex- clusive of £. 3,240 rents of lands and houses.	s. about s. d. 26/3	Hogsheads. 67,000,000	s. d. 20/4 3/4	about 190 gallons. Mr. Milne says, it in- cludes all manufacto- ries, and an immense waste from disuse of cocks, &c. and that in 1811 the average sup- ply was about 216 gallons.	Ft. 84 1/2 Elevation of River Head.	Ft. 145 about one eighth of the whole supplied at this pressure.		
								£. 954,868, equal to about £. 13,262 per 72 part share.												
LONDON BRIDGE:	The whole Joint Stock Capital is divided into	1,500 equal part shares, which sold in 1820 - - £. 50 a share.									Number. 10,417	£. 12,266. This Company make no distinct charge for high services.	s. about s. d. 23/6 1/2				An ordinary service, about 108 gallons a day. See Return from Mr. Till.	Cannot supply higher than two stories in Cornhill.		

1 MAR. 1920



2110

