

<i>Downward Freights by way of the Erie Canal.</i>		<i>Downward Freights by way of the St. Lawrence.</i>	
	Cents.		Cents.
From Cleveland to Buffalo	16	Average of 1848 from Cleveland to Quebec.	60
From Buffalo to Albany	77		
From Albany to New York	8		
	<hr/> 101		

Leaving a balance in favour of the St. Lawrence route of 41 cents per barrel.

No. 2.—*Upward Freight by way of the Erie Canal for 100 lbs. of merchandise:—*

	Cents.
From New York to Albany	4
From Albany to Buffalo	45
From Buffalo to Cleveland	15
	<hr/> 64

Ditto by way of the St. Lawrence:—

	Cents.
From Quebec to Cleveland	30

Leaving a balance in favour of the St. Lawrence route of 34 cents per 100 lbs. of merchandise.

Let us next employ the above data to extend our comparison of rates from New York and Quebec, respectively, to Liverpool. We have already stated that on comparing the necessary expenses of a ship of 500 tons, trading between those respective ports we have found that they do not differ materially; and hence we conceive we may reasonably assume that under a system of free navigation, the rates from both ports would be nearly equal. But in order to leave no room for captious exceptions being taken to our reasoning, we will assume the average rate of freight from New York to Liverpool to be 2s. or 48 cents per barrel (a document published by the Council of the Board of Trade in 1846, showed the average for three years to be 2s. 1d. per barrel); and we will allow 3s. (72 cents or 50 per cent. advance to be the corresponding rate from Quebec, and yet it will appear after making that enormous allowance for sea-going freight that the St. Lawrence from Cleveland to Liverpool is unquestionably cheaper than the route *viâ* the Erie Canal. For example,—

	Cents.
Freight of a barrel of flour from Cleveland to New York <i>viâ</i> the Erie Canal	101
„ „ New York to Liverpool	48
Total	<hr/> 149
Ditto from Cleveland to Quebec <i>viâ</i> the St. Lawrence	60
Ditto from Quebec to Liverpool	72
Extra insurance from Quebec to Liverpool over the rate from New York $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on 25s. . . .	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
Total	<hr/> 139 $\frac{1}{2}$

Difference in favour of the St. Lawrence, 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents, after allowing 50 per cent. to cover the contingency of a possible difference of freight from Quebec as compared with New York under a system of free navigation.

The foregoing data, it may be remarked, apply to the whole season of navigation, with the exception of a few weeks in the fall of the year, when a larger allowance will require to be made for the difference of insurance, although even this it is expected will be materially reduced hereafter, by Government establishing additional lighthouses in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence, and by the competition of American Insurance Companies with those of England, the beneficial effects of which competition have already been experienced to a small degree this year.

Having thus proved, as we conceive, that the St. Lawrence is a cheaper route than the Erie Canal to the sea for the surplus produce of the West, and having shown that we can afford to pay 50 per cent. more than the average rate for sea-going freight at the port of New York, and yet have a margin of 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents. left in favour of the St. Lawrence route, may we not reasonably consider ourselves entitled to adopt the Council's conclusion in favour of the St. Lawrence, rather than against it; viz., "That the port which is found to be the most eligible for the exports will also be found to be the best suited for the imports of a country, for one reason among many others in this case, that inward freight cheapens outward freight, and *vice versa*?"

The Council's prediction of "the ruin of the trade of the St. Lawrence" being predicted on the fallacies which we have thus refuted, must of course fall to the ground along with them.

II. In the following passages the predominant idea is one in which we cannot agree, viz., that in proportion as our trade with a foreign country increases, our attachment to the mother country must diminish.

"It would be superfluous for your petitioners to point out the injurious effects which could not but result from such a diversion of trade, suffice it to say, it would create and cement ties of beneficial interest between Canada and the United States, and proportionally weaken the attachment which this colony entertains for the mother country.