

tion of the canal. If the rate charged by the canal were an *adequate one*, and had been made with a view to its obligations to the State, the city of Baltimore would have less right to complain, whatever might be the injury she suffered in other respects; but when she was heavily taxed for the construction of a work, which, at the same time deprived her of the means of paying that tax, the evil was one which it was supposed would readily call for the interference of the State, the only authority, which could exercise a sufficient control over the subject," &c.

As the residue of the paragraph relates to the totally inadmissible and *impossible* arrangement proposed by that company last winter, and properly disposed of by the last Legislature, we deem it unnecessary either to quote or notice it.

We have italicised those parts of the quotation to which we invite attention. It will be seen that the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company is here accused of charging "*very low rates*" for the transportation of *flour*. That the rates are so low as not to afford "*a remunerating revenue.*" That "if the rate charged by the canal were *an adequate one* the city of Baltimore—or in other words the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company, would have less right to complain, whatever might be the injury it suffered in other respects." And the interference of the Legislature of Maryland is impliedly invoked to compel this company, to increase its charges, for the obvious purpose of thereby having the trade driven from the Canal to the Rail Road, but professedly in order to make the canal yield "*a remunerating revenue.*"

As it is scarcely presumable that the officers of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company are not aware of the fact, that this company *are not carriers* on the canal, and that the only charge over which the company has any control is *the toll* required for the privilege of transportation, we are bound to infer that the rates of charge, which are here alluded to, relate exclusively to the present *toll* for the transportation of flour on the canal.

Now it is well known, that according to the general experience of internal improvement companies, both in this country and Europe, a low, but judiciously regulated rate of tolls, is, under ordinary circumstances, rather calculated to increase than diminish revenue by augmenting the amount of transportation, and that in consequence of such experience, a material reduction in the rates have been made in nearly every section of this country, on the most prosperous canals. The conclusion therefore sought to be inculcated by the rail road company, is unauthorised, even if their statement in regard to the rates was correct; but it is not correct. Although we would apparently have been fully justified in following the example of other companies, and reducing our tariff of tolls to such rates as are charged on kindred improvements elsewhere, we have yet to say, that no such reduction has been made; and furthermore that the toll on flour, is under the present tariff of this company, actually higher than it was ten