191,224

\$843,230

either of them

ion, be a wise th, when it can cumstances, in and reclaimed

from its value ning.

o you that preferable to this manner d. The dock undred feet in f cribs, a disight, to admit

likely to visit ave the dock should exceed an easy matter first, with the

of the waste e lower end of prefer the in-will be about undred and se-

nates for this s as fol'ows: ure is used e whole work

o. 3--the cost

ure is used completed, acwill be \$473.-

mates has the been added-entire cost of enty-five fect

erstructure on

\$526,427 70 530,426 20 78,458 50

81,135,312 40 rstructure on

\$482,330 00 473,665 95 78,458 50

1,034,454 45 two of \$100,-

whole of the 18 Company, pany which e, and ascerable to the been stated taining wall, cont walls of s into them oprietors or

g in the 1st

instance the cheaper of the two, the wooden superstructure-Estimated total \$ 1,034,454

Section No. 1-Cost of \$38,220

retaining walls, -Do. Bridges into warehouser, 41,676 Section No. 2-Cost of

retaining wall, -Do. Bridges into 73,125 warehouses, 38,203

Balance to be borne by

the Company,
Now suppose the Har-bour Commissioners build the front cribbing and wharf floor for which they will collect the harbor dues on vessels entering the dock, the above amount will be reduced still further

as follows :-Section -- North side, \$76,565.70 South side, 75,661.95

Section 2-North side, 96,520.50 95,616.75-344,364.90 South side,

Leaving amount of expenditure to be incurred by Company, -- \$498,865

If the Harbor Commissioners should decide on building the dock wall on the north side first, and leave that on the south side for a future period or whenever required by the trade, the first expenditure will be reduced to \$173,-086; or if they would build the cribs to the level of lew water in the first instance, and afterwards add the superstructure as called for, a further reduction can be made to \$115,724. In other words the dock can be made available for the moderate outlay of \$614,589 to the com-pany and the Harbor Commissioners, but as the subsequent cost of the work would amount to more than if done at the outset, it would be good policy to completed it, at least on the north side, in the first instance. where the total cost would be \$671,951 to the same parties.

We will now take up the more expensive plan and treat it in the same manner.

Deduct from this sum, the following amounts: Sec. 1.--Retaining walls,..... \$38,220 59,520

Bridges into warehouses
Sec. 2.—Retaining walls..... 73,125 Bridges into warehouses 54,560

Amount of company's expenditure.... \$909,887 If the Harbor Commissioners build the front dock wall and wharffloor, the addititional deductions will be as follows:

Sec. 1 .-- North side \$74,465 35

339,617 00

Amount of company's expenditure \$570,270 00

If the Harbor Commissioners should not build the dock wall on the south side until required, the expenditure on their part would be reduced to about \$168,338. And if the mason ry superstructure is build only as required, their amount may still further be reduced to \$115,7.4 or admitting of the dock being brought into operation for \$685,994. Sound policy would, however, construct the north dock wall completely in the first instance, when the total amount for Company and Harbor Commissioners will be \$738,608, or at a cost of \$66,657 more than the same extent of facilities could be furnished by its more perishable compeditor with the wooden superstructure.

As a last resource, should neither the Harber Commissioners or the Company be in a posi tion to meet any of the expenditure on the dock wall proper, I would still urge the importance of excavating the channel, and using the ma-terial for making up the embankments, instead of bringing it from a distance for that purpose, being assured that on the erection of warehouses the dock walls in front of each will follow as a necessary consequence, even if they have to be built by the respective proprietors. This course will insure deep water frontage, without which the value of the land reclaimed would bear but a small per centage to that which it otherwise would, whereas on the oth-er hand, should the attempt be made to construct the railway embankment first as proposed by some gentlemen, by means of material from a distance, and allow the dock with deep water frontage to follow whenever required, the cost would be more than doubled, if indeed the work would be practicable for any amount, of which I have grave doubts, and consequently the long sought union of the rail and harbor would be as distant in the far off future as ever.

Before leaving the subject of construction, it may be well to refer briefly to another point of some importance in connection with the dock, viz. the approach to its entrance from the present harbor.

You are probably aware that the existing channel leading up in front of the city from the long wharf to the foot of the Lachine Canal, is an artificial one, dredged about three hundred feet in width, to twenty feet in depth—the water on the outside of the channel in its entire length is comparatively shallow, to within a short distance of the upper end, where it suddenly deepens and runs out in the form of an arm at right angles with the line of the harbor, for a considerable distance, forming a natural channel or great depth, to the very entrance of the proposed dock—this outlet can be greatly improved by dredging off the lower point of the shoat, which the Harbor Commissioners would probably do for a sum not exceeding twelve thousand dollars

With the foregoing remarks on the character of the plan, the mode of accomplishing the work, and its cost, we now come to the consideration of a question, second to none of them in its important bearing on the whole project, namely, will the enterprise pay when carried out, and is it a thing in which capitalists may