

that looking at it from a technical point of view, we consider the height of the wharves, within reasonable limits, as of really small importance. No fixed height can suit all conditions; the water fluctuates ten feet during summer; ships vary greatly in their height, and the same ship varies between her loaded and light lines. Modern freight handling appliances can be easily adapted to meet these varying conditions, and such appliances are of course to be reckoned upon in considering plans for new wharves and permanent freight sheds. The one serious objection to a scheme with high level wharves is the necessarily heavy cost of the works, and it is at least questionable whether the manifest advantages are a sufficient offset.

Scheme 5 is obviously a combination of 2 and 4 and its cost is, we think, out of all proportion to its advantages.

Scheme 6 has, we think, the chief merits of all the other projects with a saving in cost which outweighs its defects. The width of wharf and street which it gives between McGill and St. Peter Streets are both less than desirable, but yet all that appears to be needed at that particular place; in any case the benefit to be had from greater breadth cannot be considered worth the cost of obtaining it. The breadth of Commissioners Street and the other part of Common Street is not as liberal as in the other schemes, but taken in connection with the high level wharves we think it would be ample. Traffic of all sorts could circulate freely between them, and any strain upon one would always be relieved by the other.

After carefully considering the questions submitted to us we are of opinion that scheme 6 answers all necessary conditions, and that in proportion to its cost it better suits the combined interests of the Harbour and the City than any other scheme of which we have knowledge, and we therefore recommend the adoption of its main features