

voyages, &c. To which Sir Richard Raines replied, "As if His Majesty must be deprived of the use of his *own subjects* for his *own* expeditions, that *foreigners* might use them for *theirs*."

We find that the same claims, the same objections, and the same rational and just answers were made in the reign of James II. as at the present day. In the reign, however, of Charles the II. great complaints having been made of the search of *foreign ships of war*, the instructions were modified so as only to include *merchant vessels*, and the *instructions and practice have continued the same from that period to the present*.—The writers from whom I have obtained these important facts cite in support of them [Pepys MS Collection].—As Mr. Pepys was the person who drew up the instructions, better authority cannot possibly be cited.

It appears that these instructions have been executed both against the Dutch and French, and have been issued to every officer, in every war, for nearly two hundred years, and the writers who speak of the right in the reign of Charles the II. call it an ancient and acknowledged right. Would it then be reasonable to expect that Great-Britain should abandon the usage, and give up her ancient practice in favour of *us alone*, when the similarity of language, and the extensive practice of frauds in the granting certificates of protection, as well as the impositions in procuring naturalization, render the practice doubly important against us?

Our navigation, doubled in the space of ten years, and yet it is absolutely impossible that our seamen could have multiplied in the same ratio—If, however, we should suppose that the seamen increased in a full ratio to population, they would not increase more than 50 per cent. in ten years—hence there must have been a deficit of at least 10 or 15,000 seamen, all of whom were supplied by Great-Britain. An English writer, on this subject, seems to be fully aware of the extent of this evil, and of the nature of the frauds—he gives two examples out of two thousand, which he says can be adduced—"Henry Donaldson made oath, before the Mayor of Liverpool, that, on the 15th of December, 1800, he procured a protection from Joshua Sands, collector of New York, by assuming the name of Henry Kent—that it was obtained on the oath of a woman, who swore for several other Englishmen on the same day—he said the woman was charged with having sworn to several hundred in a short time." Sworn to before Tho. Golightly, Mayor—Liverpool, May 17, 1810.

Another impressed on the same day at Liverpool, had about him a certificate signed by Mr. Graaf, Deputy Collector in Philadelphia, which he got by giving an old man four dollars for swearing "that he knew his father, mother, &c." whereas he had neither father or mother, as described, nor had he ever been in America. These and many other affidavits and documents have been taken by the British government, and they well know the extent of these abuses, and the vast difficulty of remedying them by any act of Congress whatever.

Great as has been the profit to the southern states by the employment of British *seamen*, who, either naturalized or not, have