

above Montreal should be deepened so as to afford the passage of vessels of the same tonnage as those which navigate the river, in other words, that the canals should have a depth of 27½ feet. There is really no use in arguing against such an impracticable scheme. Montreal happens to be situated at the foot of the most eastern of the St. Lawrence rapids, and has therefore been found by experience to be the proper point of transshipment between sea-going and interior lake vessels. It has been so found simply "because the larger sea-going vessels can continue their voyage from Quebec to Montreal, one hundred and eighty miles, at less cost per ton than would attend running the smaller interior vessels from Montreal to Quebec." In the year 1857-8 the Harbor Commissioners sought the advice of a Board of Engineers in the United States, who were entirely disinterested, as to the improvement of the harbor of Montreal. We think it may be interesting to state the conclusions at which that Board arrived and which are as follows: 1st. "That the natural advantages of the route between the western interior and the seaboard by way of the St. Lawrence are sufficient to warrant the expenditures which have been made, and also more which are proposed to complete the improvements along the route; and that when thus improved it will present the cheapest mode of communication, not only to the seaboard but also to New England and New York." 2nd. "That the amount of business which will be drawn to the route by the advantages which it will possess when so improved, will be sufficient to warrant the expenditures necessary in making them." 3rd. "That the port of Montreal is the proper place for transferring cargoes from the interior to seagoing vessels; and therefore the Harbor Commissioners are right in their plans for deepening the channel below Montreal, so as to allow vessels drawing 20 feet to come to the latter port." 4th. "That the present harbor facilities of Montreal are entirely inadequate to accommodate the present trade; and that such an increase as may be expected on the completion of the improvements already mentioned will require a large addition thereto." 5th. "That the location of an enlarged harbor at Point St. Charles is the best site that can be found in Montreal; and that the facilities which a harbor at this place upon the plan suggested will amply accommodate the trade in question; and, finally, that in our opinion the improvements in the channel of the

St. Lawrence at and near Montreal, and the construction of the proposed harbor are not local questions, but of national importance, by which the first success of the scheme of Canadian public works will be materially influenced." It is worthy of notice that Montreal is almost the only port the harbor improvements of which have been made without any aid from the public chest, and yet Montreal is the port of all others which might justly claim such appropriation.

The improvement of the channel of the St. Lawrence is for the common benefit of Montreal and of all the ports west of that city, while the necessary result of the improvement of the channel has been to render it necessary to deepen the harbor and to provide additional accommodation for the vessels coming thereto. Those improvements have been made exclusively from local funds, and, although the *Spectator* has referred to votes for Montreal harbor, we cannot imagine that he is ignorant of the fact that the interest on all bonds issued on account of the Montreal harbor has been punctually paid by the Commissioners. We may indeed remind the *Spectator* that the interest on the bonds issued for the improvement of the river has been defrayed out of the revenue obtained by charges on the traffic. What has been contended for of late, in the interest of the Dominion, is that in view of the abolition of canal tolls by the State of New York, there should be an abolition of analogous charges on Canadian water transportation. We have no hope of inducing the *Spectator* to take an enlightened view of this question, but we maintain it is not one in which Montreal is specially interested but that it is a Canadian question.

THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENCY.

We have waited patiently for the result of the Presidential election in the United States, which we presume may now be considered to have been decided in favor of Governor Cleveland. Such controversies are almost invariably conducted in a manner that does little credit to the nation, and that which has just terminated has been no exception to the rule. The forecasts made prior to the election seem on the whole to have been tolerably correct, the doubtful four States having been gained by the Democrats by small majorities. It is claimed that in the State of New York, which may be said to have held the balance, there were secessions from the ranks of both parties, and

hence the uncertainty and the unusually close vote. We are inclined to concur in the opinion expressed by Sir John A. Macdonald to New York reporters, during his short stay in that city, on his way to England, which was that it made little difference to Canada which candidate was elected. The strength of the Democratic party is in the South, and the people of the Southern States have no commercial dealings with Canada, and have never been inclined to assist in procuring reciprocity. The Northern Democrats will have less influence, but we have great doubts as to their supporting any material reduction in their own tariff, and we hazard the assertion that they will take no step in the direction of reciprocity.

The other question of interest to Canadians is that of peace. Fortunately there is no question at present in dispute between the two nations, and after the amicable settlement of the controversies in which they became involved during the civil war, it is most improbable that any question can arise that cannot be disposed of in the same way. There was a general opinion that Mr. Blaine was inclined to quarrel, but his utterances during the Presidential campaign were on the whole satisfactory. It is much to be regretted that personal charges should have been hurled against both candidates during the campaign. Both had occupied high positions in the service of their country. The facts on which the personal charges were made must have been known to the respective committees of nomination, which must have deemed them an insufficient ground for rejection. The man who was elected Governor of the State of New York can hardly be deemed unfit on moral grounds to be President of the United States. It is perhaps fortunate that the English and Canadian press have been on the whole favorable to the candidature of Governor Cleveland, as our neighbors have always been very sensitive in regard to any utterances in opposition to their own views. This feeling was strongly exhibited during the civil war, when there was, as there always will be among a free people, a wide difference of opinion as to the merits of the controversy; but, although there is reason to believe that the majority was favorable to the North, the national indignation was visited on the whole country in retaliation for the sympathy extended to the South. It will be interesting to learn to what extent the policy of Governor Cleveland will differ from that of his Republican predecessors, but we have great confidence that it will be marked by personal integrity.