

provinces of Quebec and Ontario. I must not forget to mention that interested admirers of the present condition of affairs on the Grand Trunk, are to be found alleging that this same through traffic actually pays, by supporting a large share of the total working expenses, the result of which local customers have the benefit of,—that in fact, it is more economical to work with a large, than a small, traffic, even if unremunerative. Until, however, I can obtain exact statistics exhibiting the separate returns from local and through traffic, as well as the estimated expense of the local Canadian traffic by itself, I may be allowed to remain sceptical on the subject of through traffic being remunerative, especially since, if I err, I do so in company with Mr. Treasurer Church, of the Province of Quebec, and other authorities of standing, whose views have often been expressed both in public and in private. It seems probable also, that notwithstanding the opinion of Sir Francis Hincks, the existence of a much larger amount of through traffic on the water-line of the St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario, through the operation of the Caughnawaga Canal, would necessarily give the Grand Trunk much more to do at Brockville, Prescott, and Cornwall, and the calling places on the north shore of Ontario, if even railway business did not so far follow the superior water route as to require “several double tracks on the St. Lawrence,” as the Hon. J. Young seems to expect. The arguments, at any rate, both of Grand Trunk representatives, who are against the Caughnawaga Canal, unless connected by water with New York, and of Montreal barge forwarders who condemn the scheme *in toto*, stand in the same category,—they will not hold water, when submitted to the ordinary tests of free discussion.

Some interesting facts respecting the prejudice of certain Montreal capitalists may be derived from the national and individual aspects of this great question