

however, still having them finer, richer, and more plenteously than he? Will fatal temptations to deceptive courses, each ending in a moral and social fall, be got rid of by the mere extrusion of those who have already fallen? Or, if that were possible, could we send away the lowest and worst of our people, without still leaving a lowest and worst class to lament over?

These considerations go not against emigration, but against false expectations of its public consequences. In thousands of instances, emigration has been an undoubted good to the individual emigrants themselves. Industry and charity have often nobly struggled by means of it against the most depressing ills of life; and industry and charity ever best fulfil their functions in the general system of things, when, without waiting for the calculations of the politician or the economist, they go straight to the unconstrained, unpatronized, but judicious accomplishment of the object before them. Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Sidney Herbert, the Earl of Shaftsbury, and the thousands of strong hearts who win their own way to the antipodes or the west, have our full sympathy, although we do not believe we shall find a moral or political panacea in emigration.

But if emigration will not leave Britain a paradise to those who remain, it is equally unlikely to take away any serious proportion of our real strength. The exodus of our greatest year of emigration, (that is, the last,) was not quite so great as our annual increase; and that exodus consisted far more of those whose removal was to their own advantage and ours, than of those whom we should much regret to lose. In 1851, the emigration amounted to 335,966 persons; our increase is from 360,000 to 390,000 persons per annum. If then the emigrants had been drawn proportionately from all parts of our population, we should have remained nearly as before; we should merely have failed to realize an increase. But of these 335,966 emigrants, from a population of twenty-seven