

Most of this opposition is based on fears that are groundless and those campaigning against the project overlook the fact that it is impossible to upbuild one section of the country without upbuilding the whole country. Neither Canada nor the United States would be justified in spending money on a project that will not be of real benefit to the country.

New York City and New York State have taken a prominent part in opposing the project and it is quite proper that they should protect their own interests, they have a perfect right to do so provided that in so doing injury is not done to the country at large. In this particular case the interests of New York State cannot be permitted to stand in the way of an economic necessity that will be of benefit to the entire country; the greatest good for the greatest number should be the main consideration. Besides, New York City will not decline as a world harbor because ocean vessels reach the head of the lakes; the increased volume of production obtained because of the ability of the West and North-West to market its produce will inevitably result in making conditions better even for New York.

Some of the statements made in opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence are simply ludicrous but, because the people generally are not well informed on the subject, are likely to have an influence in moulding public opinion. A dispatch sent from Washington to the press of the country under date of April 14th, read: "Construction by the government at this time of a ship canal to connect Lakes Erie and Ontario is disapproved in a report sent to Congress to-day by the engineer corps. The report said the canal would not justify the expense until an outlet for deep sea ships through the St. Lawrence had been provided."

Canada is now constructing this canal and there is no one in this country that has publicly disapproved of their action in so doing, but the Washington dispatch seeks to make the people of the United States believe that they will have to pay for this work. It is rather unlikely that the engineer corps of the United States made a report such as that referred to and the probabilities are that the story was manufactured for the purpose of creating opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence river.

Speaking before the Kiwanis Club in Buffalo recently, Congressman Wallace Dempsey of Lockport, N.Y., said: in part:

"It is not practical economically for the ocean vessel, expensive to construct and maintain, to navigate the lakes, much less rivers and canals. This is particularly true of the expensive type of vessels that must be constructed for the St. Lawrence route to be proof against the icebergs that beset that northern route the year round. The lower St. Lawrence too, is subject to fogs which make navigation impossible."

Mr. Dempsey's statements regarding the St. Lawrence route show a lamentable ignorance of facts. It may be interesting to him to learn that the value of the imports and exports by way of Montreal are second only to those of the city of New York on this side of the Atlantic and, if he were to take a trip to Europe by the St. Lawrence route he will find, from first hand knowledge, that the icebergs and fogs of which he speaks exist largely in his own imagination.

Another sample of the kind of statements made to delay the deepening of the St. Lawrence is contained in an address made by Mr. William Fitzsimmons of Albany, N.Y., before the Atlantic Deeper Waterways convention at Atlantic City on the 8th. inst., he is reported to have said:

"If the United States Government lends its financial aid to the plan of creating the St. Lawrence river into a deeper channel to the sea, there will have been created a Dardanelles problem in the United States,