

riere, in Belgium, at La Fontenettes in France, and more recently, on the Manchester canal, in England. They lock boats of tons with one-fortieth the amount of water necessary to use in the type of lock now used in this state.

It must be born in mind that Canada has not realized the advantages of her great expenditure, because her canal system is not complete. The strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link; the capacity of a navigation system is measured at its point of least capacity. The weak link in the Canadian water route is the Beauharnois canal, with only nine feet of water.

But this weak link will soon be replaced by a strong one, namely, the Soulanges canal, with 14 feet of water over the lock sills, and 17 feet in the stretches. This canal will be finished within three years, and then the Canadian 14-foot system will be in full working order from Lake Superior to Montreal. There will be no weak links in the chain then, and we will feel it pinch.

No: are these energetic northern neighbors satisfied with what they have done and are doing. They are considering a canal and navigation from Montreal to Georgian Bay, via the Ottawa and Mattawa rivers, Lake Nipissing, and the French river. This is the shortest possible route from the seaboard into lakes Michigan and Superior, and it is entirely within Canadian territory, and removed from our interference.

Both commercial and military reasons are urged in its behalf as an interior and short line. It is only 1,037 miles from Montreal to Duluth, as against 1,354 miles by the St. Lawrence route, being 317 miles shorter. It is 400 miles and 480 miles shorter from Duluth to tidewater than the New York state routes, and it is 650 and 730 miles shorter from Duluth to Liverpool than the New York routes.

The Canadians are also considering the introduction of very high, quick-acting lifts in their canals. They have chartered a company which proposes to make the descent from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario with two lifts, each 160 feet, in lieu of the 25 locks now in use, and to descend the total difference in altitude between Lake Erie and Montreal harbor with only six lifts, in lieu of the 53 now in use.

Thus will be effected a saving in time between Lake Erie and Montreal of at least 20 hours, which, translated into cents, means a saving of 20 cents per ton, or over half a cent a bushel on Canadian commerce, and a handicap of that amount on our commerce.

It is also the avowed intention of the Canadian Government to make the St. Lawrence river and canals free, thus reducing the cost of freight to Montreal 10 cents per ton, or 2-3 mills per bushel. The struggle for supremacy in the carrying trade within this continent will begin in earnest when Canada opens the Soulanges canal.

We have lost the ocean carrying trade. We once carried a large trade for other nations and the bulk of our own exports and imports in our own vessels. But our shipping has dwindled both actually and relatively, compared to that of other nations, until we now depend almost entirely on foreign ships.

Since 1858 the proportion of our foreign trade carried in our own vessels has dwindled from 73 7-10 per cent. to

12 3-10 per cent., or five-sixths. Shall we wait supinely and lose our lake and coast shipping also?

The city and the state of New York have a greater interest at stake than any other city or state in the union. The United States customs district of New York collected during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, nearly 70 per cent. of the total duty collected on imported merchandise of the United States, and here also was shipped over 40 per cent. of our total exports for the same year.

New York has 28 1-10 per cent. of the total tonnage, 38 per cent. of the Atlantic and Gulf coast tonnage, 23 per cent. of the lake tonnage, 27 7-10 per cent. of the total steam tonnage, 46 5/8 per cent. of the steam tonnage on the Atlantic and Gulf coast, and 19 1-3 per cent. of the steam tonnage on the lakes. New York has 3 1-6 times as much tonnage as Michigan, more tonnage than floats on the great lakes, and almost as much as any other four states.

This ascendancy in shipping is due to the great advantages of the port of New York and the good and cheap rail and canal transportation between New York and the great lakes. It is threatened by the improvements now being completed by the Canadians, whose port of Montreal will, in 1897, have 30 feet of water, be fully protected from the ice shoves, can be equipped with the most modern facilities for handling freights, and will have deep water communication with Duluth and Chicago, and an advantage in freights over New York of \$1.32 a ton, or 3.53 cents a bushel.

When the Canadian canals are made free, Montreal's advantage will be \$1.42 a ton, or 3 8-10 cents a bushel, and when all the improvements now projected are completed, \$1.63 a ton, or 4 1-3 cents a bushel.

The cost of handling grain in New York harbor is 1 1/2 cents a bushel; freights and insurance to London are 3 1-4 cents a bushel; a total of 4 3-4 cents a bushel.

You see that in the near future it will cost less than half a cent, or no more, taking into account the shrinkage, to send a bushel of grain to London via Montreal than to send it to New York via Buffalo. In view of these facts, how can New York hope to keep her ascendancy in foreign trade and shipping? New York cannot keep her place without an effort.

In order to meet the requirements of American commerce, we must have the best possible internal connections and the cheapest possible freight rates between the great lakes and New York city, and to get such freight rates we must have adequate waterways between the Hudson and the great lakes.

Mr. O'Brien concluded by recounting the other great canal building and waterway enterprises now on foot and completed in various parts of the world, and declares that New York is apathetic in this matter. Without intending it, he has furnished one of the most convincing vindications that could be given of the Canadian Government's canal policy, and the effect the 14-foot channel is going to have on the freight rates to the European markets on our farmers' products.

INDIAN IMPORT DUTY.

When the Manchester, Eng., Textile Mercury learned that the Indian Government had determined to impose a