

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE PROGRESS OF THE LONDON to CAMBRIDGE CANAL

Part 4

Source unknown

9th July 1811

Advertisement re the London and Cambridge Junction Canal

“Meeting held 6th July 1811 for considering bringing a bill into the next session.

Committee

Earl of Hardwicke (in the chair)

Sir W Curtis, Bart M.P.

Sir Daniel Williams

Lieut-Col Duckett M.P.

Rev. W Leworthy

Rev. George Jenyns

R Greaves Townley Esq

James Searle Esq

George Rush Esq”

(Biographies of above:

Philip Yorke, 3rd Earl of Hardwicke KG, PC, FRS: (31 May 1757 – 18 November 1834), known as Philip Yorke until 1790, was a British politician. Born in Cambridge, he was the eldest son of Charles Yorke, Lord Chancellor, by his first wife, Catherine Freman. He was educated at Harrow and Queens' College, Cambridge. Hardwicke was Member of Parliament for Cambridgeshire from 1780 to 1790, following the Whig traditions of his family, but after his succession to the earldom in 1790 he supported William Pitt The Younger, and took office in 1801 as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1801–1806), where he supported Catholic emancipation. He was sworn of the Privy Council in 1801, created a Knight of the Garter in 1803, and was a fellow of the Royal Society. Lord Hardwicke died in November 1834, aged 77, and was buried St Andrew's Church in Wimpole, Cambridgeshire.

Sir W Curtis: 1752-1829 Banker; Lord Mayor of London; Business at Wanstead; His father and grandfather had been owners of a business in sea biscuits at Wapping; Friend of George IV; Bank Roberts, Curtis, Ware & Co., later Roberts Lubbock & Co

Sir Daniel Williams:

Lieut-Col Duckett MP: 1777 –1856. Son of Sir George Duckett, proprietor of the Stort Navigation; Banker

Rev W Leworthy; 1788-1837 Born in Devonshire; Vicar of Harston, Cambs 1797-1837

Rev George Jenyns; 1763-1848 Vicar of Swaffham Prior, Cambs; Prebendary of Ely 1802-1848; of Bottisham Hall and Anglesey Abbey, Cambs; Chairman of the Board of Agriculture in London; Chairman of Bedford Levels Corporation, 1830; Buried at Botterham. (see Leonard Jenyns”Chapters in my Life, 10)

R Greaves Townley 16.11.1751-15.2.1823. Son of Col. R Townley of Rochdale; Inherited Fulbourne Manor, Cambs 1788. J.P. and D.L. for Cambridgeshire.

James Searle:

George Rush; 1785 -1851; of Elsenham Hall. Magistrate and Deputy Lieutenant of Essex)

Google Books

The Monthly Magazine, No 26 Vol 32

1st August 1811

The committee for promoting a bill, intended to be brought forward in the ensuing session of parliament, for making a London and Cambridge junction canal; consisting of the earl of Hardwicke, Sir Daniel Williams, and Messrs. Hanbury, Leeworthy, Duckett, Jenyns, and Searle, inform the public that they have received the report and estimate of Mr. Rennie, by which it appears that there will be a most ample supply of water, and the parks and pleasure grounds upon the line, and the Nine Wells, near Cambridge, will be completely avoided by the plan of the engineer. The canal will extend from Bishops Stortford through Saffron Walden and the parish of Shelford, and, passing from thence through Cherry-Hinton, Fenny-Ditton, and Horningsea, will unite with the river Cam at a point near Clay-hithe Sluice, the length of which will be 32 miles. It is further intended to have a western branch leading from a point in the parish of Sawston to Whaddon, within a very short distance from the North Road; the length of which cut will be eight miles, upon a dead level without a single lock. The estimate for the canal amounts to £523,000 and for the branch to Whaddon to £44,000. The maximum of toll to be taken upon the canal will not exceed 3d. per ton per mile. A barge of 90 tons, such as will pass upon the canal, with the tackle, sacks, &c costs at the utmost £300 whilst the expence of eight waggons and 64 horses, which will be required to convey an equal quantity of tonnage, cannot be less than £4,000. Let any one only calculate upon the immense traffic which is now in existence; upon that which passing along the Cam and the Ouse finds its vent and supply at Wisbech and at Lynn, and from thence by a precarious and circuitous voyage to London; upon that which is conveyed from the eastward of Cambridge, partly by land carriage, partly by the rivers Lee and Stort, upon the immense quantities of grain of every description: the seeds, butter, chalk, lime-stone, oziars, billet wood, sedge, wares, groceries, fruits, vegetables, cattle, timber, deals, planks, coals, &c. &c. which are all its constant land circulation; upon the present dearness and scarcity of fuel; upon the lucrative connection which this canal will inevitably produce; not only with Cambridge-shire, but with the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Herts, and Huntingdon; and lastly, upon its leading directly into the best trading quarter of the metropolis, uniting the ports of Lynn and London, by a cut of 32 miles, conveying goods above 100 and thus opening the fairest prospect for Baltic produce, and there can be but little doubt that a canal of this nature will amply remunerate the subscribers and prove highly beneficial to the public.

Essex Herald – 10th and 17th September 1811

Advertisement: by Wright, Pickering and Yatman, Solicitors giving notice of application to Parliament on 6th September 1811

British Library
ADD 35689 fol 82

Letter from George Maxwell

Fletton nr Stilton, November 6th 1811

My Lord,

Lord Eardley has a numerous tenantry who will undoubtedly benefit if the present Monopoly at Cambridge should be destroyed by the intended canal and if you will be so good as to order a packet of the printed papers to be sent directed as above by the mail coach I will distribute them at the next rent day which will be soon after Christmas in hopes of procuring some subscriptions.

I have etc

Geo. Maxwell

British Library
ADD 35689 fol 102

Printed circular re London and Cambridge Junction Canal

Committee for promoting the Bill.

Earl of Hardwicke, Hon Richard Neville, MP, Rev George Jenyns, Rev William Leworthy, Rev James Geldart, Sir Daniel Williams, Montague Burgoyne, Esq, James Searle, George Duckett, Esq M.P., Sampson Hanbury, Esq.

Branch to Whaddon from Sawston and an end on junction with a proposed canal to Grand Junction with a branch to Bedford. Terminates near Newport Pagnell, north of Stoney Stratford

Capital required £524,000

Lowest Estimate of tonnage from the forming of the canal 120,000 to 159,000 tons.

Length Bishops Stortford to Clayhithe Sluice, 32 miles

100,000 tons at 3d per ton upon only $\frac{3}{4}$ of the line = £30,000 p.a.

Solicitors Wright, Pickering and Yatman, 1 Tanfield Court, Temple

Noted in MS Assents 137 Dissents 35 Neuters 55

British Library
ADD 35689 fol 172)

Browne of the University opposed to canal in his capacity as inhabitant of Cambridge and not as spokesman of the university.

Institute of Civil Engineers.
Vol 6 fol 384)

John Rennie Snr. Correspondence

October 11th 1811 Rennie wrote a letter to Lord Hardwicke listing at length the divergences from the original plan designed to remove the difficulties with land- and mill owners. He also makes a suggestion about the branch to Shefford.

Chelmsford Chronicle – 8th November 1811

p3 col 2

Intended London to Cambridge Junction Canal ; three-quarters of a column devoted to this.

Essex Herald – 19th November 1811

Advertisement: Intended London - Cambridge Canal. It having been erroneously stated that the above canal will be subject to the control or impediment of the proprietor of the Stort Navigation and that certain pecuniary conditions having been made or proposed in order to obtain the consent of the proprietor for entering the Navigation. We are authorised to declare that the Act of 6 Geo.III for making the Stort navigable completely precludes the proprietor from offering any impediments to the right of navigation or of exacting any tolls beyond those specified in the Act.

Wright, Pickering and Yatman, Solicitors

Temple, London 12.11.1811

NOTE: William Yatman was the Chief Clerk and Secretary to the Company.

Institute of Civil Engineers.

Vol 6 fol 384

John Rennie Snr. Correspondence

November 26th 1811 Rennie replies to Lord Hardwicke to a query about barges navigating from Lynn to London and vice-versa. “Lee and Stort barges are very long, flat and of great capacity for stowage and draw from 2 feet to 2 ½ feet water. These barges are too slender a make to bear the swells of water which frequently takes place at Lynn or to lye aground on the uneven bottom of the channel there. Consequently such barges are not suited to a through navigation between London and Lynn; they would navigate with perfect safety from London to Denver Sluices or even to St Germans. But although the R Lee barges cannot navigate to Lynn except in fine weather when the water is smooth yet those Lynn to Cambridge could with safety go from Lynn to London.” Rennie envisages transhipment of cargoes.

Institute of Civil Engineers.

Vol 6 fol 384

John Rennie Snr. Correspondence

December 18th 1811 a further alternative scheme is proposed from the Stort/Cam to Bedford.

Essex Records Office

D/DBy 04

Undated but circa 1812

London and Cambridge Junction Canal.

THE
DIRECTORS OF THIS COMPANY
ARE

The Earl of HARDWICKE, K. G.

Hon. RICHARD NEVILLE, M. P.	Lieut. Col. DUCKETT, M. P.
JOHN JULIUS ANGERSTEIN, Esq.	SAMPSON HANBURY, Esq.
The Rev. GEORGE JENYNS.	The Rev. JAMES GELDART.
JAMES SEARLE, Esq.	Mr. ATKINSON FRANCIS GIBSON.

THIS Canal will connect the entire eastern-side of England (South of Peterborough) with London, forming the great trunk, or confluence of navigable branches, cuts, and streams, now in existence, whose aggregate length amounts to one thousand miles, and of other navigable cuts, hereafter to be made accessory to it. It will be the conduit to London of the whole surplus produce of the Fen Countries, the richest portion of five of the finest counties in the island, which have long been the granary of the capital, at one-third of the present price, by land carriage.

The counties of Huntingdon, Bedford, Cambridge, Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, Lincolnshire, and the Port of Lynn, (in addition to the Fen Districts) will, by its means, find various markets for their produce, and trade, and become for the first time directly connected with the metropolis - they will also, by this Canal, receive that large and cheap supply of coal which the present limited and expensive land-carriage renders impossible to the poorer, and most burdensome to the richer inhabitants of these large districts.

The existing tonnage (sic) on the line, proved before a Committee of the House of Commons, by evidence grounded on the most accurate averaged returns of the keepers of the Toll-Gates, and of a Weighing Machine, amounts to 184,920 tons, per annum, which at 3d. per ton, per mile, on two thirds only of the length of the Canal, will yield to the Company an interest of more than £9 per cent. on the capital expended. Such is the amount of the tonnage at the present moment, restricted as the trade is proved before the Legislature to be, by various monopolies and impediments, and a land-carriage avowedly insufficient. That it will increase to an extent to which it is impossible to set a limit, must of necessity follow, when the entire eastern-side of the kingdom, (South of Peterborough) by the means of the Canal, will for the first time communicate immediately with the metropolis, and its produce be conveyed *in bulk*, at one-third of the present charge of the waggons, with a saving of £5 per cent. on the whole amount of many of the most valuable commodities, which now incur losses to this averaged extent, by the chafage, spoliations, and depredations, attached to that inadequate and injurious mode of conveyance.

It was proved, on oath, by a Trustee of the Great North road, that without such a relief as this Navigation will afford, their roads cannot be kept up.

This Canal, therefore, will be of the utmost advantage to the City of London, and to another large and important portion of the kingdom. Its remuneration to the Subscriber will immediately be ample. At no distant period it must be very great.

Printed by the Philanthropic Society, St. George's Fields.

It is a Joint Stock Company. The Shares are £100 each. The Proprietors have a vote in respect of every Five Shares. Ten Shares are a qualification for a Director of the Company. A deposit of £1 per Share is paid at the Bankers on Subscription.

An Interest of £5 per cent will be allowed on all instalments paid. No call can exceed £10 per cent. and the utmost that is likely to be required, previous to the commencement of the Canal, will be £3 per cent including the one per cent paid on Subscription.

A full Abstract, in print, of the Evidence given before the Committee of the House of Commons, illustrative of the advantages of this undertaking to the Public and the Subscriber, may be seen at each Bankers.

Subscriptions will (until further public notice) continue to be received at the Houses of Messrs. Smith, Payne, and Smiths, George-street, Mansion House, (the Company's Treasurers); of Messrs. Morland, Ransom, and Co. Pall Mall, Bankers, in London; and at Bankers in the following Provincial Cities and Towns, viz.-

Baldock,	Ely,	Royston,
Bedford,	Huntingdon,	Saffron Walden,
Boston,	Lynn,	St. Ives,
Bury,	Norwich,	Stamford,
Cambridge,	Newmarket,	Thetford,
Clare,	Peterborough,	Wisbeach.

*Wm. YATMAN Chief Clerk and Secretary
to the Company.*



House of Commons Journal

24th January 1812

Petition by Owners and Occupiers of Lands, Merchants, Tradesmen and others, inhabitants of the City of London and City of Cambridge. For the making and maintaining a Canal from the end of the Stort at or near Bishops Stortford to join and communicate with the Cam below or near Clayhithe Sluice with a branch near Great Shelford to Whaddon.

House of Commons Journal. 29th January 1812

Leave to bring in bill.

House of Commons Journal. 4th February 1812

Read first time

House of Commons Journal 20th February 1812

Petition against bill by the Mayor, Bailiffs and Bargemen of Cambridge.

Herts Record Office

D/P 21 29/32

Newspaper cutting 20th February 1812

At a meeting of the Committee for promoting the Intended LONDON and CAMBRIDGE CANAL, held at the Earl of Hardwicke's in St James's Square on Thursday 20th Feb. 1812.

The EARL of HARDWICKE in the chair:

Resolved, that the additional information received by this Committee has more fully convinced them of the utility of undertaking, and also of the very handsome remuneration which will accrue to the subscribers.

Resolved, that a more specific clause be inserted in the Bill before Parliament, viz that a sum of £393,000, equal to three-fourths of the estimate for completing this undertaking, shall be actually subscribed, for previous to the commencement of any works whatsoever; and in such case three fourths shall not be actually subscribed for, on or before the first day of January 1816, then the intended Act to be ipso facto repealed.

Resolved, that for the purpose of reconciling as far as possible the views of the several parties concerned, a Deputation be appointed from this Committee, consisting of

The EARL of HARDWICKE

The Rev WILLIAM LEWORTHY – The Rev GEORGE JENYNS – and the Rev JAMES GELDART.

who shall and they are hereby authorized to make arrangements with the heads of such of the Colleges, and such other persons in or near Cambridge as may be interested in this undertaking

Resolved that proper clauses be prepared and inserted in the Bill, to protect the rights of the Corporation of the Bedford Level, and the Conservators of the River Cam.

Resolved, that proper clauses be in like manner prepared and inserted for the preservation of the Nine Wells and Hobson's Conduit.

Resolved, that more specific clauses be in like manner prepared and inserted for the satisfaction of the Trustees of Turnpike and other Roads, and the Owners and Occupiers of Lands, in respect to the necessary bridges of communication, where any such roads or lands shall be intersected or divided by the intended Canal.

(signed) HARDWICKE

House of Commons Journal 25th February 1812

Four petitions against bill from Saffron Walden area

Bill read second time following a division of 84 Yeas and 30 Noes

House of Commons Journal. 9th March 1812

Petition against bill by Merchants, etc., of Kings Lynn

House of Commons Journal. 13th March 1812

Petition against bill by Merchants of Essex and Hertford

House of Commons Journal. 16th March 1812

Petition for bill by owners and occupiers of land at Royston.

Two petitions against bill by owners and occupiers of estates.

House of Commons Journal 17th March 1812

Petition against bill by George Rush, Elsenham Hall.

House of Commons Journal 20th March 1812

Petition against the bill by Ebenezer Fuller Maitland.

House of Commons Journal 7th April 1812

Petitions against Bill. Proprietors of Mills on the Stort

In Saffron Walden Museum

PRINTED PAMPHLET 9th April 1812

LONDON AND CAMBRIDGE CANAL.

Facts and Observations in support of the plan for making a canal from Bishops Stortford in Herts to the Brandon River in Norfolk.

Evidence before the Committee for the Stort-Cam Navigation.

George Duckett in his evidence said:

In 1791 the trade on the Stort was between 18,000 and 19,000 tons. By 1811 it had risen to 40,000 tons.

Flour sent to London.

1791 19,500 sacks

1811 50,000 "

Malt.

1791 97,000 quarters.

1811 203,000 "

The river had been opened about 43 years and the disinclination on the part of the country to quit their former factors, the necessity on the part of the proprietors to build warehouses for the reception of grain and the expense of barges with a view to establish a regular freightage had not made it for the first 20 years an advantageous concern. Manure on the Stort paid no toll as back carriage and 500 chaldrons of cinders and soap ashes had passed during the first 11 weeks of this year, in the same way 200 tons of shop goods; and the week preceding that in which he gave evidence 29 tons of deal.

The navigation of the Stort he declared to be in good order and mentioned as a proof that one barge containing 390 quarters of barley had passed upstream that winter for Bishops Stortford. The water was always plentiful except when drawn down by the neglect or inadvertence of the millers.

It was his opinion Bishops Stortford would be seriously benefitted by the canal as its situation would render it an admirable depot for all kinds of grain for the London market. The maltsters would be able to obtain their barley upon easier terms for during the last winter alone about 20,000 quarters of barley bought at Norwich had been sent round by sea to Bishops Stortford to be made into malt. The united tolls of the Lee and Stort might be averaged at 5/- per ton for 35 miles from Bishops Stortford to London Bridge.

House of Commons Journal 9th April 1812

Petition for bill by Trustees for South Division at Royston and Wansford Bridge Turnpike

House of Commons Journal 15th April 1812

Petition against bill by Martha Cranmer, Quendon Hall

Petition against bill by feoffees and trustees of Hobson's Conduit, Cambridge

Herts Record Office

D/P 21 29/32

Letter from John Rawlins in Bedford to J. J. Nash of Bishops Stortford 30th April 1812

Dear Sir

Your letter of the 28th Instant is now before me & for the kind enquiry after the welfare of my Family &c &c (who are all well) I return you my warmest thanks

A survey for cutting a Canal from the River Ouze at Bedford to join the Grand Junction at Woughton near Newport Pagnel has been made by Mr Rennie and laid before Mr Whitbread at a meeting of the Inhabitants of Bedford convened on that business.

The distance from London to Woughton is about 50 miles; from Woughton to Bedford the intended new line about 14 miles and the estimate for doing it is £180,000. If you should think it will be in my power to give any further information at a future period. I beg that you will command me

I am, yours very Respectfully, John Rawlins

British Library

ADD 35689 fol 197

From Lord Braybrook to Lord Hardwicke May ? 1812 - I think it right to tell you that the Duke of Bridgewater has been murmuring right and left and boasts that he shall throw out the Canal Bill. Of course we must be on our guard

House of Commons Journal 4th May 1812

Reported

Herts Record Office

Document reference unknown

Transcription of two pages of a rough draft of a letter apparently to be sent to the Cambridge Chronicle. The author is anonymous.

London Feb 26

Camb & London Junction Canal

Since the Earl Of Hardwick has condescended.....writing, to express his fears that their productions have some weight with the landed interest, and has explained to the country

fully his motives and wishes, it becomes the opposition to make their statement in answer – I am sorry that it has not fallen into abler hands.

The opponents to this matter have no wish to include all the supporters under the charge of interested individuals; some no doubt are influenced by the best, mostmotives others by solely selfish motives.....I give Lord H credit for his assertion that he thinks it will be beneficial to land owners otherwise he would not have given himself the trouble he has; I also give him credit for greatand candour as chairman of the committees but I must beg leave with due deference/submission to his Lordship, to differ very widely from him, as to the beneficial effect of this scheme: I fear I must apologize from bringing force and reasons which have so often been stated before; and which statements I do not consider invalidated by anything which has been published on the other side....are the

But from what cause shall we have this wide difference of opinion in Ld Hardwicke which has taken place in the years 1790 – 1812. At the former date I find recorded in the Came Chronicle a speech said to be delivered in the honble house by the Honble P Yorke from which I quote these few sentences ^^^^ surely these opinions are well calculated to apply to our cause at this moment and we do thus strengthen our hands by the former statement of our now opponents. I do not allow that any adequate good has been demonstrated, to make the landed interest, and those who might intend to embark their money in this hopeless speculation..; that it will really be of that public utility to consider balance the great private injury which must be sustained. We may probably have Turnips, Carrots, Cabbages, such more plentiful, but there are articles that do not require barge conveyance so much as protection from rot, although I have never heard of a want of these things in Coven Garden, yettheyin amongst the rest of the future calculated productions of a certain country; I think a dissertation from Mrbest mode of preserving them from frost. It would be of more use to the consumers of those articles who now have it not in their power to get them.

Mr Leeworthy has made some very civil attacks on the opposition ...I shall notnotice, as he has not condescended to particularize the points; nor shall I credit his assertions so boldly made, without he condescend to do something more, and state in specific, and not general terms, the benefits he so loudly exults upon – he may dream about future cultivation and improvement which I hope will be realized and which has now sufficient inducements without the instance of this canal.

According to Mrwe should have canals all over the country. I really never met with a man so overpowered by advantages; every farmer should have a boat Canal up to his house that he may avoid the expence of keeping horses to cart his corn to market not recollecting that canals will not plow the ground altho in the instant it will take up a great portion of the land he might bytake from the produce in boats. Of course we may destroy our breed of horses, because they eat our corn – what a difference between the arguments of Mr L and the opposers of the Bill to prohibit distillers using corn which led us to conclude that the consumption of Barley was necessary for the encouragement of agriculture even if it was thrown into the Thames.

If it is necessary that a canal should be set from Camb. to B St because Oats, Barley and Coals will be cheaper supplied to the intermediate country (for I do not allow they will get any cheaper to London, (I mean the great bulk) if the expence of the means adopted is greater than the end intended to be accomplished, the measure cannot be said to answer – and canals may be well constructed to every village and farm house, for it is only the speculators who lose the money.

I congratulate the country however on the present general impression with regard to canals – they have been so much cried up have disappointed the expectations relieved the products of so many; that they require a better face that this now means to entice individuals to support them.

The second reading of this Bill is now over and altho a majority voted for its examination in the committee I am fully impressed that the house will not pass a bill which while suspended is so detrimental to the owners of land should they have a wish to this property to so many of their present comforts and so completely neglected and unsupported by the monied interest in the counties thro which it passes that I conclude by affirming that altho some very respectable and honourable men have taken a part in the support, still this measure originates and will be beneficial to such a few individuals, the public utility may be completely answered by the canal from Bedford to the Grand Junction. A railway on the other.....will answer every necessary.....

Herts Record Office

D/P 21 29/32

REASONS

Against the passing of

The Stort and Cam Junction Navigation

BILL,

Respectfully submitted to the Consideration
of Parliament.

MAY 11, 1812.

Luke Hansard & Sons, printers,
near Lincolns-Inn Fields London.

London and Cambridge Junction Canal

THIS Canal (32 miles in length) is intended to be made from the River Cam, 7 miles below the large and populous Town of Cambridge, to its great injury, into the Stort Navigation, which is the sole property of Sir George Duckett, at Bishop Stortford in Hertfordshire. The Estimate, being the highest ever submitted to the Public, amounts to £524,000 or upwards of £16,000 per mile, besides £44,000 for a Cut to Whaddon; and the Canal and Cut are to be wholly dependent on Reservoirs, to be filled by rain, for their supply of water.

This immense Sum is to be expended for making a communication by inland Navigation, between London and the Ports of Lynn and Wisbech. But is the object worthy of such an immense Expenditure? The Farmers in the Isle of Ely have already a much more advantageous method of conveying their surplus produce, which is Oats, to the London Market if they were desirous of sending it there, as it has been proved, before the Committee of the House of Commons, that they can and do send part of it by Sea from the Ports of Lynn and Wisbech after insuring, even during war, against all risks, at an expence of 2*s.* 6*d* per quarter less than the charges by this intended Canal would amount to, and at least as expeditiously; besides which, it appears from the Evidence before the Committee, that the Barges now used upon the Stort cannot navigate from London to Lynn, but the Cargo must be shifted on its passage, which is an operation attended with considerable loss and inconvenience.

But the fact is, the Fen Farmer cannot sell his own Corn at the London Market, and therefore he sells it himself at Cambridge; from whence the Southern part of Cambridgeshire, and such parts of Essex and Herts. as lie between Cambridge and London, are in a great measure supplied, or to the Merchants at Lynn and Wisbech, from whence it is chiefly exported to the North. The quantity of Oats brought to Cambridge, does not on an average amount to 65,000 quarters per year, as appears by the Toll Books of the River Cam; of which scarcely a bushel finds its way to London. It would be quite impossible for the Farmers in the Isle of Ely, sending their Corn by this Canal, to enter into competition with the Boston and Hull Merchants in the London Market, as the latter, owing to the recent great improvements in the Drainage of that part of

the

Printed by Luke Hansard & Sons near Lincoln's-Inn Fields, London

[2]

the country, send ten times the quantity, and convey it by Sea at 2*s.* 6*d* per quarter less than the former.

It appears, therefore, that the Fens already have the London Market open to them in the most beneficial manner. But it is admitted that an inland communication by water with the Western and Northern Counties would be very advantageous to that country and the public: This object might be accomplished at a less expence than the present measure, by

a Canal from the Town of Cambridge to Whaddon, where the intended Cut is to finish, and from thence through Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire to the Grand Junction Canal near Newport Pagnell which would pass through a country having very bad Roads, and which Line has been lately surveyed under the direction of Mr. Rennie, and is approved of by him; or by a Cut of 15 miles from the Ouze at Bedford to the Grand Junction Canal near Newport Pagnell at an expence of £150,000. ; and either of these Lines would open a communication between Lynn and London.

That a Canal upon the proposed plan is not called for by the Counties through which it is to pass is most manifest, from the circumstance of only £45,300: of the Estimate (amounting to £568,000) having been subscribed in those Counties, viz. Hertford, Essex, and Cambridge; and of this sum £21,900 is subscribed by residents at or in the immediate vicinity of Saffron-Walden (the only Town upon the Line which will derive any advantage from the Plan) and £ 10,000 by Sir George Duckett and Colonel Duckett (in consequence of their interest in the Stort Navigation.) Only £13,400 has been subscribed in Cambridgeshire; and in Hertfordshire the Subscription amounts to only £2,000.

One of the Reservoirs for supplying this Canal, containing upwards of 43 acres, is to be made within 170 yards of Elsenham Hall, the residence of Mr. Rush; and although the Promoters of this Bill have engaged to pay Mr. Rush a sum of money for rebuilding his house in case the Canal should eventually be made, yet, as they are to have nearly four years to raise the money in, he will be kept in uncertainty and suspense during that time, and prevented from making those improvements about his house and grounds which he had intended. A Feeder is to be carried for a mile through the Park and ornamental Woods of Mr. Fuller Maitland, at Stansted. Upon the Estate of Mrs. Cranmer of Quendon Hall, there is to be a Steam Engine of great power, erected at the distance of less than half a mile from her Mansion House.

The present Scheme holds out such a cheerless and unprofitable prospect to Subscribers, that after the greatest exertions only £121,300 - about one-fifth of the Estimate, has been obtained; and therefore no reason-

able

[3]

able expectation can be entertained that the Money will be raised. The Line of the Canal extends through a country intersected with excellent Roads, and in a high state of cultivation: There will be none of that important Tonnage, which arises from a Manufacturing or Mineral district. Half the Land Owners on the Line positively dissent to the measure; and the Opponents of it look forward with a confident hope, that an enlightened Parliament will not pass this Bill, which would suspend all Improvements of the Landed Property on the Line and materially affect the sale of it for nearly four years, with scarcely a prospect of the Work being at last carried into execution; and which if executed, would completely destroy between 500 and 600 Acres of very valuable Land, and occasion so much injury to Individuals as would completely counterbalance the trifling public benefit it professes to accomplish.

House of Commons Journal. 15th May 1812

Bill engrossed

House of Commons Journal. 22nd May 1812

Attempt to defer bill for 6 months, Defeated 93 – 28

British Library

ADD 35689 folio 200/1

Letter to Colonel Duckett, Wednesday 27th May 1812

Sir

Having heard from the person to whom I promised yesterday to write on the subject of the Cambridge Canal Bill, I find that he does not propose making opposition to the principle of the bill. As far therefore as depends upon him and myself I shall not refuse the second reading taking place on any day which you choose to fix or make an opposition to it unless it should be taken up by others in the house but shall be obliged to you to let me be previously informed of your intention as to the day of the second reading and that of the Committee. I think it but fair for fear of misapprehension to state that what I consider as the principle of the bill above mentioned is confined solely to the connexion of the Cos of Bedford and Cambridge with the Metropolis and which I continue of the opinion might be done at an easier rate or by a better line.

I have, etc
Bridgwater

House of Lords Record Office

Minutes of Evidence: Cambridge Canal Bill 3rd June 1812

John Rennie examined said he had surveyed the line of the London & Cambridge Canal, which was a practicable line opening up a safe and easy communication.

Q. Have you made the estimate upon such a principle that you believe the execution will not exceed it?

A. Yes. The rise to the summit from Bishops Stortford is 72 feet and the length is about $3\frac{3}{4}$ miles, then a summit level of about $4\frac{3}{4}$ miles. The fall to Saffron Walden level of 60 feet in nearly 2 miles. The length of the Saffron Walden level is about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles and then a fall of about 132 feet to the Cam.. The Total length is $32\frac{1}{4}$ miles. Three tunnels are proposed. One on the summit level of 2100 yards, another near Saffron Walden of 418 yards and another beyond Saffron Walden of 704 yards. All would have to be arched.

Rennie stated that he had tried two other lines – one by Barkway to join near WARE where the summit level was 78 ft higher and with a tunnel of $2\frac{1}{4}$ miles. The other through a vale near Hitchin to join the Lea.

He had also looked at a line from near Sawston via Bedford and from thence to the Grand Junction Canal one to join near Soulbury and the other near Woughton, but the object was not to join with London but to form a junction with the N W England. Trials were

made by Shefford to join the Grand Junction Canal nearer to London but the line was very unfavourable because of the lockage near Leighton Buzzard .

Netlam Giles surveyed the line to join the G L C and this would also include a tunnel on the summit level which would have to be supplied by steam engines pumping up a height of 70 to 80 feet. The lockage fall would be 200-300 feet.

Thomas Chapman, miller at Littlebury, sent flour to London. 10,000 sacks sent by land to Stortford and then by Stort Navigation. Land carriage Littlebury to Stort 2/- per sack or 16/- per ton. There was a loss on the flour by chaffage of 6d per sack. Main chaffage on land carriage. Also deperadation by the waggoners up to 5/- per sack. Greater security by barge.

Thomas Chapman said that 1811 cost him about £1200 to Stortford. 2/- per sack from Littlebury and 2/6 per sack from Chesterford – average 2/3. By water it will cost 5d/ton/mile or a difference of 11/4 or 1/5 per sack, which on 1250 tons amounts to a saving of £708..6..0. Even if rates were the same water would still be preferable. Coals obtained from Cambridge – carriage cost to Littlebury 12/1 per ton, to Saffron Walden 14/6. Water carriage from Clayhithe sluice would be 7/6. Poor have difficulty with fuel because coal high price, wood abundant but used for manufacture of malt.

James Searle. Maltster and Ba(n)ker of Saffron Walden said 55000 to 60000 quarters of malt were sent from Saffron Walden to London p.a. Saffron Walden or 6 miles each side supplied with coal mainly from Newcastle via Cambridge and Welsh coal via London. Total 2500 tons, 500 tons Welsh. Lime obtained via Cherry Hinton; stone from Burwell for Church repairs and Audley End. Causes damage to roads. Loss on malt through chaffage about 3000 p.a.

Rev. William Leeworthy, magistrate, living 5 miles south of Trumpington, where weighing machine is, 80,000 tons of goods p.a. Royston road 5000 tons p.a.; Bournbridge road 16,000 tons p.a. and surplus produce S of weighing machine 42,500 tons. State of roads has been bad and have been indicted by Post Office. Not easy to get materials for repairing roads, partly because of inclosures. Canal would enable better materials at cheaper rate and would lower price of fuel.

House of Commons Journal. 8th June 1812

Passed by House of Lords

Coopers Annals of Cambridge 1812

At N.A.

9th June 1812 Act passed to join Cam near Clayhithe Sluice with navigable branch at Sawston to Whaddon. Canal to have weighing machines, etc between Shelford and Cherry Hinton. Compensation to the Corporation of Cambridge

House of Commons Journal. 9th June 1812

Royal Assent

British Library

ADD 35689 folio 238

Letter 24th June 1812 from James Gildart congratulating Earl Hardwick on the success of the bill

British Library

ADD 35689

Noted as read to folio 343

Institute of Civil Engineers.

Vol 6 fol 384

John Rennie Snr. Correspondence

On 20th July 1812 Rennie estimated with labour availability at the present, the work could be completed in 5 years but if there were greater demand for labour, it could take 6 or 7 years

Cambridge City Library

Ref C.34.1

Herts Record Office

D/P 21 29/32

(Cover - Cambridge only)

In Parliament

**INTENDED
LONDON AND CAMBRIDGE
Junction Canal**

**OBSERVATIONS
IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL**

The Bill passed but was never carried into effect (Handwritten note)

INTENDED

**LONDON AND CAMBRIDGE
Junction Canal**



THE advantages of Inland Navigation have been admitted and experienced, in the Centre of the Kingdom. In the more Eastern Parts, they are little known, and less valued. The proposed Plan will enjoy and produce all the advantages attached to Inland Navigation; it will increase the means of export to a rich and productive land; and, by avoiding the circuit and dangers of the sea, will in peace facilitate, in war ensure, commerce.

By joining the Cambridge and Stort Navigations, there will be an easy and certain communication between London and Lynn.

The opponents to it proceed chiefly from Bishop-Stortford, from Cambridge, and from Lynn.

Those from Bishop-Stortford predict an alteration of trade, as if they had a right or vested interest in the Stort Navigation; and admit, by their opposition, what they refuse to others,

the advantages of Water Communication. This would be just, if they had, in the *smallest de ree*, originated or formed the Navigation; but where there has been no risk, there can be no claim; where there has been no loss, there can be no compensation. The Stort was rendered navigable at the sole expense and hazard of an individual, unsupported by the inhabitants of Stortford, who now claim what they never attempted, or acquired.

That Cambridge should dread a contract with London, must, on inspection of the map, appear surprising. But if Cambridge has been benefited by Lynn, must it not be improved by London?

That Lynn should avoid being united with London appears equally inconsistent and strange; but, in these cases, the opposition is from individuals, the benefit is to the community.

The people of Saffron-Walden, and on the proposed Line, are anxious for the junction. And if Saffron-Walden, through which the Canal passes, will be improved, Bishop-Stortford, through which it passes also, cannot be a sufferer.

The arguments against it are those of merchants against trade, of monopoly against commerce.

An enlightened Parliament will, it is humbly but confidently hoped, sanction a great public measure; which, if it succeeds, must be beneficial to the country: if it fails, will be alone injurious to its friends and supporters.

T. BAYLEY, PRINTER, Devonshire Street, Bishopsgate.