

“ and pebbles, or whatever can be got. These  
 “ piles, when decayed, may be taken out; and  
 “ new ones may be fixed in their places, without  
 “ injuring the superstructure.

“ THAT if the expence of building stone-foundations be compared with the advantages, it  
 “ will be found to be very inconsiderable. Suppose that a wooden fort was to be built in any  
 “ place in the Bay where stones are to be got: a  
 “ mason in England would get stones, and lay a  
 “ foundation for such a building as York-fort, for  
 “ less than twenty pounds; but allowing for the  
 “ difference of the price of labour in Hudson's-  
 “ Bay, a stone-bottom raised a foot or more above  
 “ the ground would not exceed fifty pounds. Upon  
 “ this the fort might be erected; round which  
 “ I would have pieces two or three inches square  
 “ fastened perpendicularly against the log-wall about  
 “ a foot asunder, their ends resting upon the  
 “ stone-bottom: these should be well lathed and  
 “ rough-cast with good mortar; by which means  
 “ the log-wall would be kept secure from wet, and  
 “ would last as long as the beams or any of the  
 “ timber within: it is evident upon inspecting any  
 “ old building, that timber carefully kept from  
 “ wet will remain sound and serviceable sixty or  
 “ eighty years. Now if the expence of keeping  
 “ a fort strong and fit for service sixty or eighty  
 “ years, be compared with that of rebuilding it  
 “ twice within the same time, there surely can be  
 “ no room for hesitating which method to take;  
 “ especially if it be considered, of what importance  
 “ it is to keep the woods near the  
 “ settlements from being cut away, and how  
 “ great a saving of timber a stone-foundation  
 “ would make every time the fort was rebuilt. I  
 “ remember to have seen rough-cast about the old  
 “ fort upon Hayes's-river: but it was laid on in