

BUSINESS NOTICE.

The "MIRAMICHI ADVANCE" published at Chatham, New Brunswick, N. B., every Thursday morning...

Miramichi Advance.

CHATHAM, THURSDAY, AUGUST 15, 1878.

Read It.

We reproduce in this issue, the Speech delivered by Hon. Mr. Burpee, Minister of Customs, in reply to Hon. Mr. Tilley's Speech attacking the present Dominion Government and its policy.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

We had intended to give our readers the result of a few days of personal observation in St. John, going at intervals...

While one who has been familiar with St. John in the past observes little change on leaving the city station, one who reaches the top of Dorchester Street Hill than he encounters new things at every turn.

new buildings erected in the city since the fire...

Perhaps one ought not to write impressions of business matters in St. John which are only the result of a few days observation...

It is quite evident that a large portion of the elegant structures which rise on each side as one passes along the streets, represent more or less of debt.

It is true that the insurance at the time of the fire was large and the money derived from them went far in the work of reconstruction...

It is safe to predict that high rents and small business will, before many months, shake a good many business men...

Politics are active in view of the approaching Dominion Elections. Mr. Tilley, of whom a great deal was expected, before he addressed the electors of St. John, is canvassing his old constituency.

Opposed to him is J. S. Bois Deverer, a comparatively young man, who has been in politics for many years.

These two gentlemen are in the contest for the representation of the City. The County is entitled to two members. Hon. Mr. Burpee, Minister of Customs, and Chas. W. Weldon, Esq., Q. C., are associated together on the Liberal ticket...

Mr. Deverer belongs while Hon. Geo. E. King, late Attorney General of the Province, and A. L. Palmer, M. P., are on the Conservative and Protectionist ticket...

Mr. Tilley also belongs. Those who are familiar with the politics of New Brunswick will realize at once that things have not very much changed since the days of Confederation.

When Mr. Tilley went into the first Dominion Government, which was both avowedly and in reality a coalition between Liberals and Conservatives, he did so as a Liberal...

He was afterwards in an association with only six years with Sir John A. Macdonald who had made him a convert to Tory faith and practice.

Yet he is, as was abundantly proved by his Institute speech the other night, Mr. Palmer, who was always considered a Liberal, has also gravely lowered his flag...

Mr. Tilley, for having naturally supported Mr. Tilley, who first went to Parliament and being left to the mercy of Sir John when Mr. Tilley left Parliament, he woke up in the present election contest finding that he must fight under the Tory banner or give way to more Conservative.

King, another Liberal of other days, has allied himself with Mr. Tilley's ticket, the combination being one as strong in political inconsistency as it is on account of its personnel.

The three gentlemen who compose it, although they avoid themselves, though members of the Conservative Party, still contain that they are true Liberals, but it is needless to say that Liberal St. John pretty generally declines to accept them as such.

On the other hand the Protectionist Party points to the fact that while Mr. Burpee is a Liberal, his associates, Messrs. Deverer and Weldon were heretofore known as Conservatives.

They ask how it is that those gentlemen can be accepted by the Liberal Party. The answer is a conclusive one, the difference being that Messrs. Deverer & Weldon, though formerly allied with the Conservative Party, have since embraced Liberal principles and are openly in accord with the Liberal Party, while Messrs. Tilley, Palmer and King, though formerly allied with the Liberal Party, have deserted it, embracing Conservative principles and that of their opponents.

Mr. Tilley, Mr. Palmer and Mr. King have come out squarely and avowed themselves opponents of the Government, and I am very glad that they have taken that stand, for in doing so they avowed themselves supporters and followers of Sir John A. Macdonald, and decided to his policy and defended his acts.

They have thus presented a fair issue before the electors, one which can be directly dealt with, and it will be for you to say whether you will support the present Government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, of which I am a member and of which Mr. DeVerer and Mr. Weldon are supporters, or whether you will go back to Sir John A. Macdonald and restore to him that confidence which was forfeited five years ago.

I do not think that this constituency of this province will support the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, whether they do or not, I am quite certain that the Dominion will not do it. I believe, and the country believes in the integrity and ability of Mr. Mackenzie, and I believe also that, at the coming election, he will be returned to power for another five years.

On the Opposition side you have Hon. Mr. Tilley, who has been in political life for 30 years, Mr. King, who has been a public man for 11 years, and Mr. Palmer, for 6 years. They come forward as advocates of the great Tory party, a strange position surely for men to be in who at one time claimed to be Liberals.

On the other side you have Mr. DeVerer, who has been five years in public life; Mr. Weldon and myself. Our records are before you, and you have to judge of us as you have seen in Parliament and out of it. If you think the public acts of the Government have been such as to merit your confidence, I would ask you to vote for the supporters of the Government. It has been run in the cars of the people of the Maritime Provinces for the past ten or eleven years that the leaders of the Liberal party of Canada are hostile to the Maritime Provinces. There was not a dinner or public meeting at which these charges were not made. Yet no man in the Dominion is as little open to censure of this kind as Mr. Mackenzie. He, as Premier, treated all parties alike. The Liberal Government did not do a thing to the detriment of the Maritime Provinces, but very little work in the six years they were in power, irrespective of Intercolonial Railway, they only expended in public works in New Brunswick \$117,000. The Liberal Government since they came into power four years and a half ago, have expended \$740,000 in public works in this Province. That surely does not look as if they were actuated by a sectional spirit. It is a fact that Mr. Mackenzie is as liberal in his views as his party is in name.

Trace his record during the six years that he was in Parliament in opposition to the late Government, and you will find it the same. Every vote he gave when maritime questions came up was in our interest. He opposed the taxes on flour and coal, which were advocated by Sir John and Mr. Tilley in 1868. In 1870 he opposed the imposition of a similar set of duties and had Mr. Tilley again voting on the other side. He voted for the introduction of the tariff which Mr. Tilley opposed, although he had introduced it in New Brunswick. Mr. Mackenzie also voted with the majority of the New Brunswick members to abolish dual representation, and had Mr. Tilley opposed to him in that also. He voted for the trial of election petitions by the judges and for other reforms. The Premier has voted for every Liberal measure, and the charges against him of unfairness are wrong, as his votes will show. I will give another illustration of the friendly part that Mr. Mackenzie has acted towards St. John. In 1869 he endeavored to carry a resolution in Parliament that the Intercolonial be the middle or frontier route rather than by the North Shore. Mr. Tilley voted against this resolution and so did Sir John. Although by carrying the Intercolonial by that route, as you all know great injury was done to St. John and the Government of Canada was compelled to incur a large amount of needless expenditure.

When Mr. Tilley addressed the electors here the other evening and endeavored to explain away the statement that, when he was in Parliament, he had voted for Mr. Tilley in 1870, he had his complete Lieut. Governor of New Brunswick in his pocket, he said that Sir Albert J. Smith and myself should have explained to Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Blake and others the true position of affairs. I do not remember that I did so, but I do not know that there was anything for me to explain. There was their order in Council of the 27th Oct., 1873, relative to the Governmentship of the banks of the River Columbia and there it remains to this day. Mr. Tilley having spoken of it I cannot avoid alluding to it. No explanation that I could have made would have explained that order away.

THE TARIFF AND OTHER ISSUES OF THE DAY. Speech of the Hon. Isaac Burpee, Minister of Customs.

AS DELIVERED IN THE MECHANICS' INSTITUTE, ST. JOHN, ON WEDNESDAY EVENING, JULY 31, 1878.

Mr. Burpee said:—I thank you very cordially for the opportunity which you have given me on rising to address you and look upon it as an honor of my position, politically and as a member of the Government. I regard it as a mark of your confidence in me and my fellow candidates and I shall accept it as an honor of the successful issue of the present election. I think that as a Government we occupy a fair position before the country, and that the gentlemen who come forward to solicit your suffrages on the Government side may be very well satisfied with their position as contrasted with that of their opponents.

Mr. Tilley, Mr. Palmer and Mr. King have come out squarely and avowed themselves opponents of the Government, and I am very glad that they have taken that stand, for in doing so they avowed themselves supporters and followers of Sir John A. Macdonald, and decided to his policy and defended his acts.

THE BALLOT.

Why the Advocate thinks it can successfully misrepresent even a matter of Statutory Law we do not know, but it must be because those who control it have no opinion of public intelligence or regard for their own character, save in so far as may serve the purposes of the coming electoral contest.

The Advocate of yesterday, among other palpable misrepresentations of public matters, which are, for the most part only amusing, gives its readers what it has the impudence to state is a representation of the Ballot to be used at the approaching election.

We have only to say that the Ballot, as thus shown, is one of the silliest frauds of the Advocate and is not at all the Ballot required by the Election Act, as amended last winter. Under that Act the Ballot will be (in this County) as follows:—

Election for the Electoral District of Northumberland, 1878.

MITCHELL. Peter Mitchell, City of Montreal, Gentleman.

SNOWBALL. Jabez Bunting Snowball, Chatham, Merchant.

The cross in the above Ballot (which our local readers will see, is very different from the Advocate's deceptive effort) indicates that the voter has taken it into the private apartment for the purpose and marked it for Mr. Snowball.

The Advocate states the Returning Officer is to initial the counterfoil, which is untrue and as the Advocate knows and the law will show—illegally it is the voter's mark which goes on the counterfoil and which is torn off before the Ballot is deposited in the ballot box.

The Returning Officer's initials go on the Ballot. The electors may rest assured that we give a fair view of the Ballot above, which may be relied on and the elector only acts a short sighted part in placing before his readers a Ballot which is only a Protectionist counterfeit and a very poor one at that, as those who have to mark Ballots on polling day will learn for themselves.

Rooms to Let.—The Montreal Protectionists have engaged rooms for the use of persons by whom they hoped to be assisted in the campaign against the Liberals. The rooms are not very much used, however, although the Times advertises their attractions in each issue.

Mr. Snowball's Opponents are very much worried because they fear his large business will prevent him from giving proper attention to his duties as a representative in Parliament. As he has always attended well to every matter of either public or private business which he has undertaken, it is only fair to presume that he will continue to do so. The electors are willing to trust him in that respect.

"St. John" claims Mr. Snowball as a "Tilley man." Mr. Snowball's sentiments are, we believe, in accord with those once professed by Mr. Tilley but as Mr. Tilley has embraced the Protectionist cause and would endorse Sir John Macdonald's policy, by which our Flour, Coal, Salt and other articles in general use are to be rendered dear by excessive duties, Mr. Snowball cannot possibly follow him. The best men of the Liberal party in New Brunswick are exactly the same position as regards Mr. Tilley.

When Mr. Tilley addressed the electors here the other evening and endeavored to explain away the statement that, when he was in Parliament, he had voted for Mr. Tilley in 1870, he had his complete Lieut. Governor of New Brunswick in his pocket, he said that Sir Albert J. Smith and myself should have explained to Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Blake and others the true position of affairs. I do not remember that I did so, but I do not know that there was anything for me to explain. There was their order in Council of the 27th Oct., 1873, relative to the Governmentship of the banks of the River Columbia and there it remains to this day.

Mr. Tilley having spoken of it I cannot avoid alluding to it. No explanation that I could have made would have explained that order away.

THE TARIFF AND OTHER ISSUES OF THE DAY. Speech of the Hon. Isaac Burpee, Minister of Customs.

AS DELIVERED IN THE MECHANICS' INSTITUTE, ST. JOHN, ON WEDNESDAY EVENING, JULY 31, 1878.

Mr. Burpee said:—I thank you very cordially for the opportunity which you have given me on rising to address you and look upon it as an honor of my position, politically and as a member of the Government. I regard it as a mark of your confidence in me and my fellow candidates and I shall accept it as an honor of the successful issue of the present election. I think that as a Government we occupy a fair position before the country, and that the gentlemen who come forward to solicit your suffrages on the Government side may be very well satisfied with their position as contrasted with that of their opponents.

Mr. Tilley, Mr. Palmer and Mr. King have come out squarely and avowed themselves opponents of the Government, and I am very glad that they have taken that stand, for in doing so they avowed themselves supporters and followers of Sir John A. Macdonald, and decided to his policy and defended his acts.

They have thus presented a fair issue before the electors, one which can be directly dealt with, and it will be for you to say whether you will support the present Government of Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, of which I am a member and of which Mr. DeVerer and Mr. Weldon are supporters, or whether you will go back to Sir John A. Macdonald and restore to him that confidence which was forfeited five years ago.

I do not think that this constituency of this province will support the policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, whether they do or not, I am quite certain that the Dominion will not do it. I believe, and the country believes in the integrity and ability of Mr. Mackenzie, and I believe also that, at the coming election, he will be returned to power for another five years.

On the Opposition side you have Hon. Mr. Tilley, who has been in political life for 30 years, Mr. King, who has been a public man for 11 years, and Mr. Palmer, for 6 years. They come forward as advocates of the great Tory party, a strange position surely for men to be in who at one time claimed to be Liberals.

On the other side you have Mr. DeVerer, who has been five years in public life; Mr. Weldon and myself. Our records are before you, and you have to judge of us as you have seen in Parliament and out of it. If you think the public acts of the Government have been such as to merit your confidence, I would ask you to vote for the supporters of the Government. It has been run in the cars of the people of the Maritime Provinces for the past ten or eleven years that the leaders of the Liberal party of Canada are hostile to the Maritime Provinces. There was not a dinner or public meeting at which these charges were not made. Yet no man in the Dominion is as little open to censure of this kind as Mr. Mackenzie. He, as Premier, treated all parties alike. The Liberal Government did not do a thing to the detriment of the Maritime Provinces, but very little work in the six years they were in power, irrespective of Intercolonial Railway, they only expended in public works in New Brunswick \$117,000. The Liberal Government since they came into power four years and a half ago, have expended \$740,000 in public works in this Province. That surely does not look as if they were actuated by a sectional spirit. It is a fact that Mr. Mackenzie is as liberal in his views as his party is in name.

Trace his record during the six years that he was in Parliament in opposition to the late Government, and you will find it the same. Every vote he gave when maritime questions came up was in our interest. He opposed the taxes on flour and coal, which were advocated by Sir John and Mr. Tilley in 1868. In 1870 he opposed the imposition of a similar set of duties and had Mr. Tilley again voting on the other side. He voted for the introduction of the tariff which Mr. Tilley opposed, although he had introduced it in New Brunswick. Mr. Mackenzie also voted with the majority of the New Brunswick members to abolish dual representation, and had Mr. Tilley opposed to him in that also. He voted for the trial of election petitions by the judges and for other reforms. The Premier has voted for every Liberal measure, and the charges against him of unfairness are wrong, as his votes will show. I will give another illustration of the friendly part that Mr. Mackenzie has acted towards St. John. In 1869 he endeavored to carry a resolution in Parliament that the Intercolonial be the middle or frontier route rather than by the North Shore. Mr. Tilley voted against this resolution and so did Sir John. Although by carrying the Intercolonial by that route, as you all know great injury was done to St. John and the Government of Canada was compelled to incur a large amount of needless expenditure.

When Mr. Tilley addressed the electors here the other evening and endeavored to explain away the statement that, when he was in Parliament, he had voted for Mr. Tilley in 1870, he had his complete Lieut. Governor of New Brunswick in his pocket, he said that Sir Albert J. Smith and myself should have explained to Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Blake and others the true position of affairs. I do not remember that I did so, but I do not know that there was anything for me to explain. There was their order in Council of the 27th Oct., 1873, relative to the Governmentship of the banks of the River Columbia and there it remains to this day.

Mr. Tilley having spoken of it I cannot avoid alluding to it. No explanation that I could have made would have explained that order away.

THE TARIFF AND OTHER ISSUES OF THE DAY. Speech of the Hon. Isaac Burpee, Minister of Customs.

AS DELIVERED IN THE MECHANICS' INSTITUTE, ST. JOHN, ON WEDNESDAY EVENING, JULY 31, 1878.

Mr. Burpee said:—I thank you very cordially for the opportunity which you have given me on rising to address you and look upon it as an honor of my position, politically and as a member of the Government. I regard it as a mark of your confidence in me and my fellow candidates and I shall accept it as an honor of the successful issue of the present election. I think that as a Government we occupy a fair position before the country, and that the gentlemen who come forward to solicit your suffrages on the Government side may be very well satisfied with their position as contrasted with that of their opponents.

Mr. Tilley, Mr. Palmer and Mr. King have come out squarely and avowed themselves opponents of the Government, and I am very glad that they have taken that stand, for in doing so they avowed themselves supporters and followers of Sir John A. Macdonald, and decided to his policy and defended his acts.

of a five per cent tariff on ships material and the very next demands a reciprocity tariff, or a retaliatory tariff against the United States. He has prepared a list of some of the articles used in ships which would come under the operation of such a retaliatory tariff, showing the previous duty paid in Canada on such articles and the duty that would have to be paid under Mr. Tilley's pet scheme for a reciprocity of tariffs with the United States. This is as follows:—

Table with 3 columns: Canadian tariff, United States tariff, and percentage.

Mr. Tilley professes to be very anxious for the property of our shipping interests, yet the reciprocity tariff which he proposed would be one of the surest means of destroying that interest. Under such a tariff a ship of 1000 tons would cost about \$7,000 more than our present tariff and the shipping and shipbuilding trades would be injured to a corresponding degree.

If we want to find the effect of such a tariff on the shipping of a country, we have only to look to the effect of such a tariff on the shipping of the United States and trace the decadence of their ocean mercantile marine from 1860 downwards. In 1860 the United States possessed 4,485,931 tons of sailing vessels; in 1865, their tonnage had fallen to 4,029,344 or 14.14 per cent less than in 1860. This decline was due to the ravages of the Alabama and other Rebel cruises. In 1870, in a time of great apparent prosperity their tonnage rose to 4,171,412. But between 1870 and 1875 the bubble of fictitious prosperity which had been raised by high prices for sugar and other commodities in 1875 the sailing vessels of the United States had fallen to 3,681,064 tons. But this decline had as its cause, was greatly accelerated by the decline which took place between 1875 and 1877, the tonnage of the United States in the latter year being only 3,271,400 or 14.14 per cent less than in 1875. Even this decline large as it is does not represent the full results of the tariff in question, for in the 17 years between 1860 and 1877 the population of the United States largely increased and the coasting tonnage of the United States must have increased to a corresponding extent, for the increase in the number of sailing vessels of the United States, cannot be explained by foreign competition or by a high tariff. Bearing this fact in mind and making allowance for this increase of coasting tonnage, we may judge how deadly was the effect of this tariff on the foreign shipping of the United States. The result, as we should feel its effects. Yet this is the tariff which Mr. Tilley would like to see imposed in Canada. (Cheers.)

A still more remarkable proof of the manner in which the application of the United States tariff to Canada would kill the shipping interests is furnished by the experience of the United States with respect to their foreign trade. In 1821 of the imports and exports of the United States, 88 per cent were carried in vessels belonging to the United States, and only 12 per cent in foreign vessels. In 1831 the United States still carried 86 per cent of the foreign trade of that country, and in 1841—83 per cent. In 1851 under a gradually increasing tariff the proportion was still 72 per cent, and in 1860, 66 per cent. Now, thanks to the enormous tariff of the United States, in 1869 the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 1841 and 1877, the position of United States vessels to foreign vessels in reference to the foreign carrying trade was reversed, and the United States carried only 26 per cent of that nationality were carried 74 per cent. Thus in the 26 years between 18