

all tended towards firming values in foreign markets, and the American and Winnipeg markets responded.

It is considered that the previous nervous feeling in our markets will now give way, and that the trade will settle down with more confidence to the new season's business, with prices remaining steady for some time to come. The best authorities still estimate our yield of 1908 at 110 million bushels. The old crop has practically disappeared, stocks at Fort William being only one-half million bushels as against a supply of 7 million a year ago. American Visible supply is only 16¾ million against 51½ million last year. The eyes of all markets are now turned on the ultimate result of the American and Canadian yield, and looking to the unsatisfactory condition of the European crops it is practically certain that foreign markets will be more than ever dependent upon America for supplies.

HARBOR DEVELOPMENT FOR MONTREAL.

Impressions and Conclusions of Messrs. Stephens and Cowie—A Future Policy.

Messrs. George W. Stephens, president of the Montreal Harbour Commission, and Frederick W. Cowie, M. Inst. C.E., Chief Engineer St. Lawrence Ship Canal, have recorded the results of their three months' tour in Europe in a blue book of some hundred pages. This has just been issued, and afford most interesting reading.

The object of the trip made by these gentlemen was to make careful and comprehensive study of foreign ports for the purpose of preparing a well defined scheme of development for the port of Montreal, such that would ensure the retention of Canadian business through Canadian channels. Within the next few years Canada will possess three trans-continental lines from ocean to ocean, while if only one quarter of the available wheat areas are cultivated, she will produce annually eight hundred million bushels of wheat. Thus, "it would seem to be a national duty," write the Commissioners, "to equip Canadian sea terminals in keeping with the railway and commercial growth of the country in order to preserve the national prestige of handling Canadian business through Canadian seaports."

Some General Impression.

During the course of their tour, the Commissioners visited and inspected the following British and continental harbours: London, Liverpool, Glasgow, Bristol, Manchester, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Cardiff, Hamburg, Antwerp, Havre and Marseilles. Upon each of these they devote considerable space. Their general impressions are that.

1. The ports that are doing the biggest business and doing it the most efficiently, are the ports that have kept their facilities ahead of actual requirements.
2. The ports that have remained stationary or lost in prestige have been those who neglected to provide facilities before business was forced to seek elsewhere the same facilities provided by rival terminals. Business follows the facilities.
3. Unity of authority, concentration of business, depth of water areas, and facilities for despatch of business are the prominent characteristics of successful port administration.
4. The necessity of providing large and convenient storage areas where cargo may be collected and cared for.
5. The lowest cost of handling cargo from the hold of the ship to consignee and vice versa, was found to be in a port where one authority controlled the entire operation, and where the transit sheds were three to five storeys high.
6. That special facilities for the care of Canadian perishable products have been provided in British ports on a large and complete scale.
7. That equal facilities should be provided at Canadian terminals.

Expansion of Trade.

8. That the legitimate expansion of Canadian trade demands the immediate development of Canadian sea terminals if Canadian business is to be handled by Canadians.

9. That neglect to provide immediately these necessary facilities in Canada will have for effect the establishment of trade routes over which no control can be exerted by Canadians.

10. Great port development has invariably been followed by increase of trade and population.

11. Montreal has the power, through her commanding position and great natural advantages, of affording the best terminal facilities at a less cost than any European port of importance, and this advantage can hardly be equalled by any port on the North American Continent.

In order to utilize to the full these great advantages, the Commissioners recommend that they be supplemented without loss of time,

1. By making the most of our present accommodation through its proper equipment.

2. By doing everything in our power to attract shipping by securing absolute safety of approach.

3. By laying down a general plan of future development with a view of providing at Montreal a port equipment equal to that of Hamburg or Liverpool.

4. By encouraging the railways serving the port of Montreal to develop more intimate traffic relations with the railways serving the British and Continental ports.

5. By developing and equipping a modern winter port providing ample accommodation to take care of the trade developed through Montreal during the season of navigation.

6. By incorporating in the future a general plan of expansion a free port district after the model of Hamburg; and so inaugurate a port development on Canadian soil which, by its prestige of position and strategical trade value, will command not only Canadian business, but a large part of the Western export and import business of the North American Continent.

In Common With Montreal.

Hamburg, which the Commissioners suggest as the model, has many features in common with Montreal. Situated on a tidal river, 76 miles from its mouth, the port forms the furthest inland ocean navigation point on the River Elbe. Meeting this ocean traffic is a canal and river system of water distribution. Main lines of railway running throughout the German Empire also converge there. The Hamburg-American Company, one of the largest and most influential shipping concerns in the world, finds its headquarters there and occupies a considerable part of the harbour exclusively for its own business.

The number of vessels entering the port has increased from 13,000 to 15,000 in five years, and the tonnage in the same time from 8,000,000 to 11,000,000 tons. In addition to this, the inland trade amounts to 8,500,000 tons a year, and the tonnage of the vessels discharging at the mooring buoys in the stream is said to be two-thirds of that discharged at the quays.

The ownership of the port, so far as the wharves, transit sheds, and terminals are concerned, is vested in the State of Hamburg, which is also the authority for the dredging and maintenance of the navigable channel, the annual cost of which within and without the docks, including the expenses of maintaining the dredging machinery and plant, amounts to \$225,000.

Two Features of Success.

In the opinion of the Commissioners, the two main features in the success of the port are that the State owns the harbor outright, and that its customs harbor, or bonded warehouse district, is free. Vessels discharge their cargoes into the warehouses and these may be remanufactured and re-shipped out again to foreign countries without the application of a customs tariff, or may remain in store until wanted within the German empire, and upon which the duty is only paid when delivery out of the customs district is made. In the case of reshipment inland by canal or river barge, this customs duty is paid at the point of destination. Ships may be extensively repaired within this free district, employing home-made material and home labour without the exercise of the German customs tariff. This has made it possible for Hamburg to become a collecting port for distribution of large cargoes all over Europe, and the advantage of being able to store whole cargoes and redeliver in small parcels to suit customers and destination has created a very valuable additional harbor business.

Cost of Modern Harbors.

So far, the port of Hamburg, with its auxiliary Cuxhaven, has cost the State nearly \$100,000,000. The dues collected do not nearly pay the expenses, the deficiency being covered from other sources out of the general revenue of the State. The amount of money represented by modern port development elsewhere is as follows:—

London	\$186,700,000
Liverpool	125,000,000
Manchester	90,000,000
Glasgow	40,000,000
Newcastle	80,000,000
Bristol	30,000,000
Cardiff	30,000,000
Antwerp	45,000,000
Rotterdam	33,000,000
Marseilles	29,500,000
Havre	24,000,000
Montreal	10,000,000

Types of Administrative Methods.

The Commissioners found a great variety in administrative methods, the most frequent being:—

1. Where the chief authority is vested in the State, as at Hamburg and Devonport.
2. In the municipality, subject to State control, as at Antwerp and Bristol.

(Continued on page 413).