

valuable space and to be climbed up by loaded carts, so long as goods continue to be carted.

A point less important but still worth mention, is that the parapet, in this and all schemes except the first, must always give a shade of the feeling induced by the present dyke; it will be a wall bounding the river side of the street and shutting off something of the river view. But the wide street proposed will give ample room in fact and in feeling; the roadway and outer footpath can be made high enough to allow of seeing over the wall, and the wall itself can be made sightly.

Scheme 3, by encroaching upon the Harbour property avoids the heavy cost of private land and buildings east of St. Peter street, but it is objectionable as taking up more wharf area and affording less wharf frontage than any other of the schemes. In the matter of ramps and flood protection it is substantially the same as Scheme 2, and the same remarks apply to both.

In Scheme 4 the high level of the wharves is by far the most important feature. It does away with all ramps, except one pair at the lower end, and thus not only gives complete freedom for cartage and tramway traffic between the City and wharves, but it saves the space which ramps would occupy and the money they would cost both to build and maintain. In the matter of flood protection the high wharves would contribute towards safety in preventing the ice from ever touching the parapet and gates. For the freight sheds on the wharves the high level would also be of much advantage. It would not keep the sheds above flood level, but it would keep them above the level at which heavy ice forms, and therefore make them less liable to damage from it.

As to the question of the effect of high level wharves upon the convenience with which vessels can be discharged and loaded, a point already discussed by some of those interested and well able to judge, we need only say