

far as Lake St. Peter in the same time that the sewage of London would occupy in going over two miles.

Besides, in our case, observations extending over several years shew us that the river does not fall more than two feet per mile between Montreal and Longue Pointe, when the least possible grade required for a main sewer is five feet per mile, it is easy to see that any extension eastwards can only be got *below the level of the river*, which would give us practically an elongated cesspool, whose contents could only be displaced by further supplies of sewage forcing it out until equilibrium was restored, when the sewer would have no *capacity for discharge at all*. When this will have been discovered, how will the citizens regard a project for ripping up the Craig street tunnel a *second time* to carry out measures which might have been acted on from the first?

Furthermore, the injurious effects produced upon the river water by town drainage is not nearly so formidable as most people are apt to imagine. The Thames receives about 156 millions of gallons of sewage independent of the rainfall every twenty-four hours, while the total quantity of water discharged by the river is about 1,560 millions of gallons; the liquid is therefore at the outlet composed of one-tenth sewage, which is considered sufficiently diluted to be harmless.

We discharge six millions of gallons of sewage into the St. Lawrence, which hurries seaward about 78,000 millions of gallons every twenty-four hours when at its lowest level, so that one gallon of our sewage, which is not by any means so dirty as is commonly supposed, has about 13,000 times its volume of clean water to carry it off.

Is it worth while to spend \$200,000 to get, say 20,000 gallons to mix a gallon of sewage with?

These are one or two of the many points which are worth considering on this all important question.

I am,

Yours, &c.,

JOSEPH SMITH, C.E.