

would then assume a character which it has not at present, and the Caughnawaga Canal would be a definite link of it. The necessity of the construction of this work could then be urged. But it can scarcely be hoped that the New York Legislature would desire to encourage an improvement which would create a formidable opposition to the only great state work which it has to protect by legislation. The Saint Lawrence has already proved a formidable rival to the New York Canal system, and it seems there is no interest, particular or local, which would be powerful enough to carry any measure at all injurious to the Erie Canal. Besides, in estimating the chances of realizing any project, we must consider the outlay it involves; and certainly to increase the sixty-seven miles of the New York Canal to the size of the proposed improvement of the Saint Lawrence Canals would exact an expenditure of from twelve to fifteen millions of dollars.

"It is convenient to state in this place the opposite view. The advocates of the construction of the Caughnawaga Canal totally independent of the improvement of the Whitehall navigation, argue in its favour with much ability. They contend that it would at once take the Western grain trade both for the Eastern States and for New York.

"The New England States form the great mart for Western produce, which now finds its way through the Erie Canal by Buffalo and Oswego, to New York; whence it generally passes by water to Boston and other ports on the north-east coast. What is not taken by water is distributed by railway. It is argued that the imperfections of this route are such, that were facilities given to reach Lake Champlain, that route would be followed to Burlington—a distance by railway from Boston 248 miles—at which point a transshipment would be made to the rail of the cargo or cereals; the propeller at once obtaining return freight of New England manufacturers for the west. A comparison of time is made in order to shew that the 20,000 bushels of wheat or 6,000 barrels of flower would be at Boston long before it had even passed through the Erie Canal; and under one phase the favorable estimate is not to be disputed. But the element of time in this instance is of secondary consideration. Yet are we so sure if a heavy railway traffic of flour and grain passed over the railway there would be no delay? If the transfer were direct from the propeller to the wheat car there would be a certain guarantee of immediate transmission; it would however scarcely be possible to count upon that connection, and it is a legitimate inference that the natural period of the route would be much prolonged by circumstances. On the other hand the present mode of traffic warrants the opinion, that the forwarder of Western produce will cling to the water as long as he is able, unless compelled to abandon it under extremely unfavorable circumstances. But should he desire to transfer to the railway car his freight of breadstuffs for New England; would it not be profitable for him to do so at Ogdensburg—distant from Burlington by railway 158 miles? This line was built with Boston capital to gain that traffic, but it has not done so. It is true that the distance by the Caughnawaga Canal to the same point would be very little in excess of the railway, 220 miles, of which 69 will be by canal. I at once admit that of the two routes to Burlington the latter would be the best and cheapest; and taking in view the necessity of transshipment, the quickest. But I do not think that the comparison can be allowed to remain in this limit. From Burlington to Boston, *via* Vermont Central Railway,