

not to be mistaken
divided people ;
to success, but
and very general

which the United
States very grievous
le, were yet of a
er would not jus-
for instance, the
ne occasional in-
ematick applica-
pel such aggres-
aking a resort to
States, either ne-
ndian war, of the
as yet been giv-
gress, an expedi-
e Indian territo-
rt of the United
British traders,
t, whether there
en proper to re-
inary, which the
p. With all the
frontier, impor-
ection against the
war, which adds

' has not induced
the reasons, or
the undersigned
ses either real or
ne United States,
on foreign rela-
gress, the United
against Great-Bri-
council.

tersigned sympa-
his abuse of pow-
ir account. They
and its difficulty ;
and how blind the
ow into controver-

moral nation will
expedient. If the
act nature, be in-
ality seems to re-
spect be need

fied. If it be proposed to vindicate any right by war, wisdom de-
mands that it should be of a nature by war to be obtained. The in-
terests connected with the subject of impressment are unquestiona-
bly great to both nations ; and in the full extent of abstract right as
asserted by each, perhaps irreconcilable.

The government of the United States asserts the broad principle
that the flag of their merchant vessels shall protect the mariners.
This privilege is claimed, although every person on board, except
the captain, may be an alien.

The British government asserts that the allegiance of their sub-
jects is inalienable in time of war, and that their seamen, found on
the sea, the common highway of nations, shall not be protected by
the flag of private merchant vessels.

The undersigned deem it unnecessary here to discuss the question
of the American claim, for the immunity of their flag. But they
cannot refrain from viewing it as a principle, of a nature very broad
and comprehensive ; to the abuse of which the temptations are
strong and numerous. And they do maintain, that before the ca-
lamities of war in vindication of such a principle be incurred, all the
means of negotiation should be exhausted, and that also every prac-
ticable attempt should be made to regulate the exercise of the right ;
so that the acknowledged injury, resulting to other nations, should
be checked, if not prevented. They are clearly of opinion that the
peace of this happy and rising community should not be abandoned
for the sake of affording facilities to cover French property ; or to
employ British seamen.

The claim of Great Britain to the services of her seamen is neither
novel, nor peculiar. The doctrine of allegiance for which she con-
tends is common to all the governments of Europe. France, as
well as England, has maintained it for centuries. Both nations
claim, in time of war, the services of their subjects. Both by de-
crees forbid their entering into foreign employ. Both recall them
by proclamation.

No man can doubt that, in the present state of the French marine,
if American merchant vessels were met at sea, having French sea-
men on board, France would take them. Will any man believe that
the United States would go to war against France on this account ?

For very obvious reasons, this principle occasions little collision
with France, or with any other nation, except England. With the
English nation, the people of the United States are closely assim-
ilated, in blood, language, intercourse, habits, dress, manners and
character. When Britain is at war and the United States neutral,
the merchant service of the United States holds out to British sea-
men temptations almost irresistible ;—high wages and peaceful em-
ploy, instead of low wages and war-service :—safety in lieu of haz-
ard ;—entire independence, in the place of qualified servitude.

That England, whose situation is insular, who is engaged in a war
apparently for existence, whose seamen are her bulwark, should look
upon the effect of our principle upon her safety with jealousy, is
inevitable ; and that she will not hazard the practical consequences