

persons and things within its own territory according to its own sovereign will and public policy."

The good sense of these principles, their remarkable pertinency to the subject now under consideration, and the extraordinary consequences resulting from the British doctrine, are signally manifested by that which we see taking place every day. England acknowledges herself overburdened with population of the poorer classes. Every instance of the emigration of persons of those classes is regarded by her as a benefit. England therefore encourages emigration; means are notoriously supplied to emigrants, to assist their conveyance, from public funds; and the New World, and most especially these United States, receive the many thousands of her subjects, thus ejected from the bosom of their native land by the necessities of their condition. They come away from poverty and distress in overcrowded cities, to seek employment, comfort, and new homes, in a country of free institutions, possessed by a kindred race, speaking their own language, and having laws and usages, in many respects like those to which they have been accustomed; and a country which upon the whole is found to possess more attractions for persons of their character and condition than any other on the face of the globe. It is stated that in the quarter of the year, ending with June last, more than 26,000 emigrants left the single port of Liverpool for the United States, being four or five times as many as left the same port within the same period for the British Colonies and all other parts of the world. Of these crowds of emigrants many arrive in our cities in circumstances of great destitution, and the charities of the country both public and private are severely taxed to relieve their immediate wants. In time, they mingle with the new community in which they find themselves and seek means of living; some find employment in the cities, others go to the frontiers, to cultivate lands reclaimed from the forest; and a greater or less number of the residue becoming in time naturalized citizens, enter into the merchant service under the flag of their adopted country.

Now, my Lord, if war should break out between England and a European Power, can anything be more unjust, anything more irreconcilable to the general sentiments of mankind, than that England should seek out these persons thus encouraged by her, and compelled by their own condition, to leave their native homes, tear them away from their new employments, their new political relations, and their domestic connections, and force them to undergo the dangers and hardships of military service, for a country which has thus ceased to be their own country? Certainly, certainly, my Lord, there can be but one answer to this question. Is it not far more reasonable that England should either prevent such emigration of her subjects, or that if she encourage and promote it, she should leave them not to the embroilment of a double and a contradictory allegiance, but to their own voluntary choice, to form such relations, political or social, as they see fit, in the country where they are to find their bread, and to the laws and institutions of which they are to look for defence and protection?

A question of such serious importance ought now to be put at rest. If the United States give shelter and protection to those whom the policy of England annually casts upon their shores, if by the benign influences of their Government and institutions, and by the happy condition of the country, those emigrants become raised from poverty to comfort, finding it easy even to become landholders, and being allowed to partake in the enjoyment of all civil rights, if all this may be done, and all this is done, under the countenance and encouragement of England herself, is it not high time, my Lord, that yielding that which had its origin in feudal ideas is inconsistent with the present state of society, and especially with the intercourse and relations subsisting between the Old World and the New, England should at length formally disclaim all right to the services of such persons, and renounce all control over their conduct?

But impressment is subject to objections of a much wider range. If it could be justified in its application to those who are declared to be its only objects, it still remains true that in its exercise it touches the political rights of other Governments, and endangers the security of their own