

be the same on a barrel of flour whether the price was \$3 or \$6.— The only apprehensions would be a war, dearth or famine, which would put a stop to commerce. But as the earth has been so far permitted to bring forth its fruits, we should place every reliance upon its being continued. The next is the hon. member from Lanark, he states that the transportation on the lakes formerly was as cheap as it is now; and the only advantage the country will derive, is the short distance through which the canal passes. In reply to this argument I will merely remark, that the price heretofore paid for transportation of a barrel of flour from Lake Erie to Ontario was 2s. 6d. The price now paid by way of canal, from any port on Lake Erie to Prescott, including the navigation of both lakes, is only 2s. 2d. Again, that no reduction of price will take place on downward freight on the St. Lawrence canal when made, as produce will continue to descend the river. In reply I will refer the hon. gentleman to my former statement.

Price paid on the Erie canal for transporting one barrel	s.	d.
of flour, 130 miles,	1	3
On the St. Lawrence from Prescott to Montreal, 130 m.	2	1
Making a saving of, per barrel,	0	9
Again, price paid from Cleaveland to Prescott, 500 m.	2	1
At the same rate 130 miles,	7	d.
Add tolls,	7	1-2
	1	2 1-2

Making a saving on present prices of, per barrel, 0 10 1-2

In case the St. Lawrence was finished, it would afford an immediate revenue, as follows:

500,000 barrels of flour, at 7 1-2d,	£15,625
20,000 tons merchandise, at 10s.	10,000

£25,625

Of this navigation, 90 miles is in Upper Canada, the proportion of which would be £17,740

Besides Lumber of every description, not an article of which would descend the natural channel,—and effect the following saving to the Province from present prices, which are 2s. per barrel of flour, and 75s. per ton merchandise:—

500,000 barrels of flour, at 10d.	£20,833 6 8
20,000 tons merchandise, at 55s.	55,000 0 0
Insurance 1 per cent.	12,500 0 0

£88,333 6 8

I adduce these statements to prove my former position, that the Welland and the St. Lawrence, must be the cheapest conveyance to the ocean. The argument adopted by the hon. and learned member from Lennox and Addington is, if you extend aid to this object and the St. Lawrence, you will have no means for any other object—it will absorb all the revenues of the province. This would be correct if the province had only a limited credit, say £2,000, and you give half to the one and half to the other, you would of course have nothing left. But so long as the credit of the province is unlimited—if you feel satisfied those objects will ultimately repay the interest from tolls—it will not check any other improvement, on the contrary will promote them; and the only effect which can be produced by the argument, is to enlist the feelings of those interested in other improvements against these undertakings. Again he expresses the greatest alarm, at the