

been pronounced—in our favor. As neophytes are notoriously the most zealous advocates of their recently-espoused opinions, we fully anticipate that we shall have from his pen a glowing eulogium on our Board of Trade, for their promptitude in urging on the attention of the British Government the modification of the British Navigation Laws. Nay, we do not absolutely despair, that our humble selves and our exertions in the same cause may be honored with the meed of his approbation.

FACTS AND FIGURES.

The *Quebec Gazette* and the *Gazette* of Montreal afford us another opportunity of placing statistics before the country, which sooner or later must convince every reflecting man, we think, that the Navigation Laws embarrass our commerce and sacrifice our interests to a degree in comparison with which the effects of every other restriction dwindle into insignificance.

Our opponents assert, in the first place, that British ships not only compete with foreign vessels in every quarter of the globe, but that in the trade of the United States, in particular, they are actually driving American vessels out of their own ports by their general superiority and cheapness.

Of the falseness of this assertion we shall take pains to satisfy even the most sceptical of our readers—not, be it remembered, with the view of disparaging our national shipping, for nothing can be further from our wishes, but to enable our readers and the public to judge fairly between our statements and those of our opponents.

Every one knows how large a percentage of the whole trade of the United States is carried on with Great Britain and her dependencies, and one would naturally suppose if British not only competed with American vessels, but were actually driving them out of their own carrying trade, that a very large share of the whole trade of the Union would be done in British bottoms.

Our readers will judge for themselves as to this point from the following facts, compiled from a Report of the "Commerce and Navigation of the United States for the fiscal year 1815," laid before Congress in its last session by the Secretary of the Treasury, and for which we are indebted to that eminently useful and very able periodical, *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine*. That Report shows that the Exports of the United States for the year stated were carried in the following proportions:—

In American vessels.....	\$86,912,442
In Foreign vessels.....	27,704,164

The Imports show a still greater disparity, viz:—

In American vessels.....	\$162,428,481
In Foreign vessels.....	14,816,083

Summed up, the result stands thus:—

TOTAL IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.	
In American vessels.....	\$189,370,923
In Foreign vessels.....	42,520,247

That is, of a trade reaching the enormous sum of two hundred and thirty-two millions of dollars annually, the gigantic share of forty-two millions worth! or less than a fifth of the whole! is wrested from the Americans by all the foreign vessels put together that trade with the American Union! Verily, this is a glowing picture of the terrible effects of the vaunted competition of British vessels. Under its effects the American will certainly, ere long, be driven off the sea; more especially when it is considered that of the *fifth* thus seized by foreign vessels, only a *share*, perhaps a half of the whole, or in other words, a *tenth* of that small percentage can fall to the share of British bottoms! Verily, our opponents—a monopolist shipowner on the one hand, and the Administration organ on the other—must either have extensive imaginations, or pliant consciences, to suffer them to indulge in such unfounded assertions.

But to apply these facts to our own condition, is it not warrantable to infer that, if these American vessels, which can preserve *four-fifths* of their trade to themselves in spite of open competition with British and all other foreign vessels, were allowed to compete here for our carrying trade, they would either drive British vessels entirely out of it, or, what is more likely and at the same time more to be desired,—so materially lessen the average rate of freights as to leave us nothing to envy—nothing to complain of? We think it cannot admit of a doubt. But all we ask for is simply to be allowed to use them when they can be

got cheaper; that is, when freight is scarce and dear, let us have the right of going to a large American shipping market which we can reach in a day or two, instead of compelling us to go to a market some 3300 miles off,—a restriction which throws insuperable difficulties in our way, and, as already proved, subjects us to enormous sacrifices.

The next point advanced by our opponents—the cost of navigating a British vessel in the Quebec trade—is quite irrelevant to the point at issue. The figures given on this point in the *Quebec Gazette* may be right, or they may be wrong. They have no bearing upon the question at issue. If British can be sailed as cheap as American vessels, they have obviously nothing to fear from competition; if they cannot, then this colony is manifestly laid under contribution for the benefit of the British shipowner. Whether he is, and to what extent, we leave the public to judge for themselves, after carefully digesting the statistical facts we have from time to time laid before them.

One word more, and we have done. The *Quebec Gazette* disingenuously cavils at the data we employed in reasoning in our twenty-seventh No. as to the probable losses entailed upon the colony as respects timber freights. We have looked into our calculations, and see nothing to alter. We agree with our monopolist contemporary of Quebec, that 10 brls. of flour are the equivalent of a load of timber. Now let him make the necessary abatements (supposing, for the sake of the calculation, that produce could be shipped in the common run of timber vessels) from the 4s. 9d. for a brl. of flour, to place an A1 vessel here on a footing with the inferior vessels usually employed in the timber trade at Quebec, which are for the most part either "unclassified" or classed under a "diphthong," and we venture to assert, when he puts all the necessary abatements together—such, 1st, as the lighterage to Quebec; 2nd, the usual, we may say, the invariable difference made by merchants here when they send produce to vessels at Quebec (rarely less than 3d. per brl.); and lastly, a sufficient allowance for the extra charge for insurance—that he will find that the net result multiplied by 10, his own figure, will come near being the equivalent of 36s. 6d. per load. If not, let him show us the difference, and we will give him the benefit of it in our next calculation.

In conclusion, we subjoin the following table, shewing the export trade of various states of the American Union, and the proportion of each carried in foreign bottoms. It may be useful for our Quebec friends as well as ourselves in our future endeavors to expose the evils which maritime restrictions subject us to.

	AMERICAN VESSELS.	FOREIGN VESSELS.
Maine.....	1,114,721	140,284
Massachusetts.....	8,789,843	1,561,187
New York.....	28,744,775	7,430,523
Pennsylvania.....	3,271,714	302,618
Maryland.....	4,105,830	1,116,147
Virginia.....	1,906,554	198,927
South Carolina.....	6,670,433	2,199,515
Georgia.....	2,723,983	1,533,152
Alabama.....	6,615,568	3,922,660
Louisiana.....	18,910,178	8,247,287
Florida.....	1,193,003	321,742
	84,046,602	27,261,573

Meantime, we recommend these important facts to the consideration of our opponents, both at Quebec and elsewhere.

A NEW DIVISION OF PARTIES.

"We had hoped that all parties in Canada would unite in favour of a policy which is for the interest of the whole people, but it is vain to hope to enlighten those who are blinded by ignorance and prejudice."—*Montreal Pilot*, of yesterday.

In England the old distinctive appellations of party appear to be fast disappearing. Instead of Tory, Whig, and Radical, we find the terms Free-Trader and Protectionist almost invariably used to indicate the division of parties. Everything seems to be brought to this practical test. Cheap or dear food, these are the two great ideas of the day. The question proposed to the elector in the Registration Court and at the hustings turns upon this. It is no longer a question of men. The day when a mere name could excite the public, has passed away. How can we best improve our social condition? behold the enquiry of every class of politicians in England. Party clamour fades away before this test, and the efforts of demagogues and leaders are impotent to obstruct the onward tendency of the age.

That this influence should fail to be felt in Canada, is not to be supposed. Here, as elsewhere, there are grave questions to be decided which must occupy the public mind, and influence public opinion. Although there are none of those complex abuses here which exist in the mother country, and which render