

James D. Hume,
Esq.

11 June 1835.

14. Can you state the proportion of the carrying trade in British and foreign ships at the different periods?—That is an account which, I believe, cannot be made up correctly. The Custom-house books do not give the early account of the quantities imported in British and foreign ships. I have always endeavoured to ascertain as well as I have been able, for my own information, in round numbers, what was conceived to be the difference; and I believe the trade was as nearly as possible divided when the whole import was from Europe. The British and the foreign ships pretty nearly divided the trade between them.

15. Previous to what year?—I think about 1816 or 1817.

16. In giving the average from 1793 to 1797, the importation from Europe as 164,600, and the Colonial only 1,225 up to that period, you conceive that the carrying trade was equally divided between the British and the foreign ships?—Yes; I believe they have always had about half the Baltic trade.

17. You are understood to say, that having made diligent inquiry, and having the best sources of information open to you, the result of that inquiry and that information is, that up to 1816 the carrying trade was, in your opinion, nearly equally divided between British and foreign?—Yes, that is the opinion I have formed for my own use; I believe it will be found to preserve much about the same proportion since the period when the accounts can be obtained. I am not at present prepared with that account. In considering the proportion of the trade enjoyed by the British and foreign ships, war must be expected to have a very considerable temporary effect, I therefore have drawn this estimate with regard to the comparison between the state of the carrying trade since the war, and what I conceive it was before the war. Before the war, I consider the whole import to have been about 400,000 loads of wood, that is, taking all descriptions of wood converted into loads; if this be halved, as I believe it ought to be, it will give 200,000 loads to British ships, and 200,000 to foreign. The more recent state of the carrying trade, I think, may be considered in the manner I am now about to state it. I take 100,000 loads of timber, for example, to come from Europe, and I put 50,000 of that to British and 50,000 to foreign ships. I then have about the number of 400,000 loads from the Colonies: those I put of course entirely to the British ships; but it has always been argued, in forming a comparison of the share of the trade, which I presume is the matter to be considered, that one voyage to the colonies is equivalent to two to the Baltic; I therefore, in making the calculation, double that sum, and put down another 400,000 under the column of British ships. Taking the deals in the same way, I say, there are 300,000 loads of deals from Europe, giving 150,000 to British and 150,000 to foreign ships. The deal trade from the two quarters is very nearly equal, but the Colonial deals are short, therefore I put 200,000 loads of deals from the Colonies under the head of British ships; and, on the same ground of one voyage being equal to two, I add another 200,000; then there are the sundries, the various other commodities of wood, such as battens, staves, masts, quarters, and various other things; these perhaps will be about 100,000 loads, 60,000 of which I estimate to come from Europe; and that divided, gives 30,000 to British and 30,000 to foreign. I have estimated that 40,000 of the hundred loads of sundries come from the Colonies; and of course the whole of that I put under the head of British ships; and I add the same sum as doubling the voyage. From this it should appear that the British ships have the carrying, or equivalent to the carrying, in the manner the estimate is formed, of 1,530,000 loads; while the carrying trade of the foreign ships may be estimated as equivalent to 230,000 loads. That I consider to be as fair a rough estimate as I can make of the proportions of the trade held by the two descriptions of ships employed in the carrying of wood. The timber and the deals may not separately be quite correct, but their joint amount will, I think, be right.

18. You have stated in your evidence that there was a period when the duty was first intended to be protective on colonial timber; was that protection at that time considered to be a temporary or a permanent measure, according to your belief?—The period referred to, I presume is 1810, when the duty, which before had been raised to 1*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.*, was doubled: it is very evident that the duty until that period was levied entirely with a view to the production of revenue. But I might here remark, that as the duty gradually increased from 6*s.* 8*d.* to 1*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.*, it had, before, begun to have a protective effect; for it is to be perceived that the imports from the Colonies had very considerably increased in the latter years, in so much as to defeat in a considerable degree the purposes of the revenue; but in 1810 it is
very