

twenty feet at low water will prove a great auxiliary to the same end.

The advantages of this Canal has been so frequently adverted to by the Board of Trade, that it seems almost superfluous to say another word about them, but yet as our Government does not seem fully alive to them; it may not be amiss again to refer to them. This Canal will be a rival to the Erie Canal, and would have many advantages over it. It would enable vessels (supposing the Welland Canal enlarged) capable of carrying 7,000 brls. to leave any port in Canada or the United States, situated on Lake Ontario, Erie, Huron, Michigan and Superior, to deposit their cargoes in Burlington, in the State of Vermont, or Whitehall, in the State of New York, *without once breaking bulk*; while on the other hand, such a quantity of flour would have to be divided among five boats on the Erie Canal, even with that work enlarged, before it reached Albany. The mere mention of these facts must be sufficient to shew the great superiority of the proposed Canadian route over the Erie Canal, even when enlarged—a superiority which would be still greater if the Canal between the Hudson and Lake Champlain were also made a Ship Canal, thus connecting the Hudson with the Western Lakes by Ship Navigation, and avoiding any transshipment. In the next place, the movement of property on the Erie Canal amounts already to four millions of tons per annum; the revenue is \$4,000,000 per annum; while the movement on the St. Lawrence and Welland Canals is insignificant. As a question of revenue, therefore, it would seem worthy of the immediate attention of Government; while on the other hand, to the country at large as well as to Montreal in particular, its more important consequences would be found in its tendency to increase commerce and add to the value of Canadian productions.” This report was unanimously adopted at a meeting where sixty were present, (Mr. Allan was President of the Board,) among whom, were Mr. Hugh Fraser, (who seconded Mr. Allan’s resolutions), Mr. Jas. Hutton, Mr. Louis Marchand, and others who at the late meeting, voted *against* the necessity of the Canal, and the very reverse of what they asserted at the General Meeting of the Board in 1855.

The Report of the Survey by Mr. Jarvis was made known in 1856. Mr. Jarvis confirmed, in almost every respect, the survey