

“imperishable. Judging from all the information obtainable, we are of the opinion that the repairs of a timber dock of good quality, of good materials and well built, would be insignificant for a period of say twenty years, when it would probably be found necessary to renew all the wood work above high water level, and the face timber above half tide level. The relative average yearly cost of repairs of these docks—as now constructed—and the ordinary stone docks, in our opinion would be in favor of the timber docks, especially in latitudes above the frost line. The manner and cost of operating does not appear to differ materially from other kinds of well-constructed excavated docks.”

The question of the action of sea or ship worms upon the wood work of a timber dock does not appear to have been alluded to in the above-mentioned report, and the probable reason was that these worms have never been known to attack the wood work of any of these docks. It is easy to account for this, as all sea worms require a constant supply of salt water to keep them alive.

The *Teredo* lives almost entirely under water, below tide level, (and this species of worm exists only to a limited extent and does not thrive in the Harbour of Halifax,) while the little *Limnoria*, our greatest pest, commits his ravages between low and high water mark, and when deprived of a return of tide he dies. As vessels often remain in dock for days together, the *Limnoriae* of necessity cannot live, and consequently the wood-work, even in the oldest stone docks (the original wooden keel blocks) never shows signs of having been affected by sea worms.

While entertaining a high opinion of the value of timber docks, in suitable localities, and under circumstances favourable to their construction and maintenance, I cannot wholly concur in the conclusions at which the United States Board of Inspectors arrived. They seem to me to be based upon insufficient data, and the fact that the wood work of No. 2 Dock at Boston had to be entirely renewed after twenty years' service appears to have required more notice and searching investigation than it received, at least so far as can be gleaned from the report.

One of the chief advantages of a well-constructed timber dock is said to be that the interior is left perfectly dry after the water has been pumped out, and, as was before stated, a ship often remains in dock for many days, it follows that the face is left alternately wet and dry, and there is no condition which hastens more speedily the decay of wood than this. Our cheapest native timbers are hemlock and spruce, and each should be chemically treated to make it serviceable for the face of a wooden dock. Any process adopted to preserve these timbers from decay will be found expensive, and the result would