

river and ascending by two locks to the level of what was called the "deep cut." The level of the canal was higher than that of lake Erie, as the water supply was obtained from the Grand river, carried by a wooden aqueduct over the Welland river.

In 1830 an application was made to the legislature that the stock should be increased to \$300,000, and a loan of \$100,000 granted. The opposition in the legislature was very great. On one occasion it was moved that the second reading of the bill should be that day three months. The votes were even, 24 for and against. The speaker, afterwards judge McLean, voted in the negative. The bill was carried. Although the connection with lake Erie had been gained by the opening of the route by the Welland river, the communication was regarded as "tardy and circuitous," and it was determined to effect a direct communication with lake Erie. With this view application was again made to both houses of the legislature. On the 14th of March, 1831, the act was passed authorising the receiver-general to issue \$200,000 of the debentures as a further loan. It was much opposed, 25 voting for, 21 against. In 1832 no aid was asked. In 1833 \$30,000 was voted to subscribe for the unsold stock. In 1834 fresh legislation was called for. Representations were made that the means of the company were exhausted, that the canal was \$100,000 in debt, and that \$100,000 was required to put the canal into a complete state for use. During the next session, so unpopular was the proposition of further assistance that the committee to whom the petition was referred made no direct recommendation, but confined themselves to the hope that something might be done to place the canal in a situation beneficial to the public interest. Nevertheless, owing to the energy of the members interested, stock to the amount of \$200,000 was taken, the money necessary for its payment being obtained by debentures; and the stock was raised by enactment to a million of dollars.

An act was also passed that the affairs of the company should be under the control of four directors, three of whom should be named by the assembly. In 1835 there was no demand for money, but the lieutenant-governor, sir John Colborne, laid before the house a despatch from Mr. Spring Rice, the colonial minister, that he could not recommend to the imperial government to cancel the loan of £50,000 sterling, in accordance with the vote of the assembly, which had asked this concession. Messrs. Thorburn, Duncombe, and Mackenzie were the directors appointed.

We are indebted to their labours that the history of the construction of the work has been preserved. There was a feeling of general dissatisfaction regarding the undertaking. On all sides, its completion was regarded as indispensable to the well-being of the province. On the other hand, there was a want of confidence in the management. There had been a continual call for assistance from the public chest. The canal had been constantly represented to be on the eve of completion, but it had never been finished. The committee reported in 1836 that the amount of subscriptions proved that the work had been commenced literally with an empty exchequer. The following concise statement of the property in the canal, as it was held by individuals and the public, was appended to the report :