

*official printed assertion of Mr. Young himself*, that the very kind of improvement which I recommended, and which I still strongly recommend, was too expensive to be entertained, and constituted a strong argument in favor of going below Victoria Pier. How are we to reconcile statements so discordant, and yet emanating from the same source? In the very next paragraph, Mr. Young takes exceptions to two other improvements suggested in my report; but, inasmuch as he has not stated the grounds on which his objections are based, I can form no opinion as to their validity. My advice, not to enter upon any scheme of Docks *at this time*, appears to constitute another objectionable feature in my report, in Mr. Young's estimation. It is alluded to more than once. On page 61, Mr. Young says, "If we adopt Mr. Trautwine's policy, and wait till trade increases, without attempting to make our position more attractive for trade than it is, I fear we shall have to wait a long time," &c. To this, I have merely, to observe, that it would have been difficult to condense into so short a sentence, words conveying a more erroneous idea of my views respecting the commerce of Montreal; or, of the general purport of my report. I have not only not advised to wait any longer, but have urged that no cause should prevent the immediate adaptation of the port of Montreal to the increase of trade, which has already attended the opening of a ship channel to her very doors; and which is, beyond all question, destined to experience a rapid augmentation. But what does Mr. Young think, and say, on this very important point? Does he entertain as well grounded expectations and hopes for the future prosperity of Montreal as I do? I think not; for, on page 53, he says, "It will be seen from my previous remarks, that *it is through and by this Caughnawaga project ALONE, that I expect the trade of Montreal to increase.*" Now, I leave it for Mr. Young himself, basing his reply upon his own argument, to say whether the construction of the Caughnawaga Canal is involved in so little uncertainty as to justify the citizens of Montreal in entering upon an "*expensive system of Docks at this time,*" in anticipation of it; or whether it would not be more advisable to wait, as I have advised, "until future developements of commerce bring about a posture of affairs different from that which now exists; and one which shall change the unpropitious aspect which the project now wears." Mr. Young's remarks respecting my plan and estimates for Docks, are dictated in the same view as the other portions of his pamphlet; they abound in inconsistencies. There is something exceedingly unfair in such imputations as this, "Mr. Trautwine estimates for 11 piers," (in the Point St. Charles project) "4 only are necessary at present." Now, any one who will take the trouble to refer to my report, will see that I not only estimated for 11 piers, (which was the number shown in the plan sanctioned by Mr. Young,) but also on the supposition that they *all* should be dispensed with for the present. Again, I am accused of introducing the cost of "graving Docks" into my estimate for the Point St. Charles project, and omitting it in the others; when, in fact, the most direct reference is made to the effect on the estimates incident upon the adoption or rejection of graving Docks in all the projects. It is *especially* alluded to in my estimate for the Point St. Charles project. It is really almost a waste of time to reply to such allegations; and I will, therefore, not trespass much longer on the patience of the reader. One or two more points, and I shall