



TRADE OF WHITEHAVEN.

The following is a return of the imports, per foreign going ships, into this port during 1862:—

Lady Gordon	286 Quebec	Timber J. & W. Jackson
Atlantic	868 New Richmond	do & dist J. & A. McGowan
Lavinia	141 Dantzig	Sleepers J. & W. Jackson
Archibald	76 Cadiz	Wine H. & H. Jefferson
Alice and Max	2347 Dantzig	Timber J. & W. Jackson
Vigilance	128 Arendel	do do do
Thetis	176 Stathelle	do Earl of Londale
White Star	308 Richbucto	Deals J. & W. Jackson
Sleipner	96 Dantzig	Graitt Parron & Tomlinson
Lady Matheson	150 Jamaica	Sugar & R. Dawson & Co.
Warlock	309 Quebec	Timber J. & A. McGowan
Thomas Lee	809 do	do do do
Fisher	314 St. Mary's	do & dist do
Dryad	235 Quebec	Timber T. & J. Brocklebank
Emerdale	322 do	do J. & W. Jackson
Victoria	108 Stettin	do S. Jameson & Son
Perseverance	130 Riga	Hemp T. & J. Brocklebank
John Scott	222 Quebec	Timber J. & A. McGowan
Donegal	174 do	S. Jameson & Son
Lady Gordon	301 do	J. & W. Jackson
Diana	108 Richbucto	do do do
Ituna	215 Quebec	do L. Kennedy & Co.
Ira	263 Gothenburg	Deals J. & A. McGowan
Pauline	77 Morley	Graitt T. Jackson
Resolution	63 St. John's	Dealt J. & W. Jackson
Orney	94 Londonderry, N.S.	do J. & A. McGowan
Calmsfoot	308 St. John's	do do do
Maria Stella	98 Nantes	Grain Gides & Co.
Pere Legal	98 do	do J. Forster
St. J. R. Reid	326 Quebec	do T. Jackson
Badrart	366 do	Timber J. & W. Jackson
Utho v Hulton	316 Dantzig	do do do

An analysis brings out the following: The number of ships was 32, and the total tonnage 6484, being on an average 203 tons to each ship. There were 1 cargo of hemp, 1 of sugar, 1 of wine, 5 of grain, and as many as 24 of timber and deals. This preponderance of the timber trade establishes its claim to special consideration in the arrangements of the proposed new dock. Any scheme which does not offer it improved and sufficient accommodation must so far be defective.

SHIPBUILDING IN CUMBERLAND.

The following vessels were launched from the ports in this county during the year 1862:—

Launched.	Name of Ship.	Ton. class'd	Years class'd	Builders.
Jan. 2	Charlotte-Clarke	—	—	R. Risson and Son, Maryport
March 30	Benita	133	—	R. Williamson & Son, Harrington
March 31	Anne Lowther	1351	—	L. Kennedy and Co., Whitehaven
July 10	William Turner	486	A1 14	Harrington and Workington, Co. Workington
" 12	William Dixon	498	A1 13	C. Lamport, Workington
" 28	Anne-Gambles	495	A1 13	R. Williamson & Son, Harrington
" 29	Tanato	140	—	L. Kennedy and Co., Whitehaven
" 29	Flinby	290	A1 9	Messrs Wood, Maryport
Aug. 11	Chameral	583	A1 14	R. Risson and Co., Maryport
" 13	Adamantine	333	—	H. Williamson, Whitehaven
Sept. 27	Burdwan	803	A1 14	T. and J. Brocklebank, Whitehaven
Nov. 6	Mary Nicholson	504	A1 13	L. Kennedy and Co., Whitehaven
" 21	Lorton	519	—	R. Williamson and Son, Harrington
" 21	Ariel	170	—	T. and J. Brocklebank, Whitehaven
" 24	Lady Lilford	67	A1 7	H. Williamson, Whitehaven

1862



TO SHIPOWNERS AND MASTERS.

WILLIAM HUDDART,

Late Managing Builder for many years to Messrs. T. and J. BROCKLEBANK, at Whitehaven, who have now declined the Shipbuilding Business.

BEGS respectfully to intimate to his Friends and the Public generally, that he has taken and entered upon the Premises lately occupied by Messrs. L. Kennedy and Co., where he intends carrying on

SHIPBUILDING AND REPAIRING,

And is now prepared to receive Contracts both for New and Old Work.

All orders will be punctually attended to, and the work executed under his own immediate inspection.

N.B.—Oars and Trollobat Beams always kept on hand, and Spars made on the shortest notice. Yard on the North Side of the Harbour; Residence, 29, Duke Street, Whitehaven.

WANTED,
One Apprentice to the Shipsmith Business, and a number to the Shipwright Business.—Apply as above

THE SHIPBUILDING TRADE OF WHITEHAVEN.

To the Editor of the Whitehaven Herald.

SIR,—In your paper of last week I read with much interest a letter under the heading of "Graving-Docks for Whitehaven," wherein the writer points out with much force the want here, not only of graving docks, but other accommodations so necessary to the carrying on of the building and repairing of ships.

At the same time, momentous as the subject is, it is by no means a novel one. By those engaged in that business the want of such aids has been felt as a serious drawback both to builders and owners of vessels belonging to the port for many years; and from the present aspect of affairs there seems no likelihood of a remedy being applied. Coinciding with the writer, as far as he goes, I would still go further, and point out facilities which would be of much benefit to the building community. Our trustees seem, of late, to have been entirely taken up with the Wet-dock scheme, whilst other improvements (within their powers and their province) have been totally thrown aside. It is true a dock would be most desirable, but, then, that is in itself a vast work, and must take a lapse of time to complete even were it begun to-morrow, and it is just as likely to drag out another ten years of inaction as it has already done.

In the meantime we are losing ground daily for want of those necessary facilities which, on looking around, we see small, and comparatively insignificant ports in possession of.

Strangers visit our town and harbour, and admire our fine piers, which are certainly something to be proud of; but men of business ask, where are our patent slips, graving docks, hoisting cranes, timber slips, and grid-iron?—and echo (in the distance) answers "No where!" In fact, except the two last named, which are only apologies for things so-called, we have no aids, no appliances, for the shipbuilding trade of a port which at one time, I believe, marked as a fourth-rate place. Our fine merchant ships, after once leaving the port return no more, and for this reason, and no other, there is no convenience for repairing them, and the money which would be consequently spent here is lost to the town. If not too late, the Trustees might do worse than depute a committee of the most energetic of the Board, assisted by one or two experienced shipbuilders, to visit the Tyne, the Wear, or the Clyde, and see how far these hives of industry are ahead of us. Besides, were these most necessary means supplied to the public, either by the Harbour Trust or a private individual, they would become a source of profit to either party, as those who derived the benefit would be only too willing to pay any reasonable demand for so great an accommodation.

It has been sagely observed that coming events cast their shadows before; and no stronger instance can be adduced than the fact that our carpenters, seeing the declining state of our shipbuilding trade, and the prospect of its being eventually lost, coupled with the high rate of wages elsewhere, are leaving the town for more prosperous places, whilst those who are too old or disinclined to seek another home are alone left.

I do not mean to say, by any means, that ships, docks, and those only can enable us to keep pace with our neighbours along shore, but they would give an impulse to a trade that has long been the boast of Whitehaven and without which it must eventually be lost. Hoping that some able advocate will take up the cause,

I am, Sir, Yours &c.,
WILLIAM HUDDART,
SHIPBUILDER,
Whitehaven, April 21, 1862.

P.S.—Within these few weeks no less than one hundred of our carpenters have left the place. Their wages here are 30s per week each, equal to £7 80d per annum.