

venomous reptile. But, says "The Spectator," "Little Bell," (who had only committed a *little* murder of a *little* boy, for a *little* plunder,) "was hanged to satisfy the brute sentiment of revenge for violated humanity." Had the writer studied the important subject of the motives of punishment, in ignorance of which (and with only very crude notions of one or two stray principles of jurisprudence) he writes, he would have perceived that the vindictive sentiment is of such subtlety that it cannot be excluded from the operation of justice; for, wherever there are the natural sympathies with the injured, there will be the natural antipathies against the injurer; and wherever there are not these things, justice soon loses the main spring to its practical application. Further, among the motives of punishment, is the removal of a person dangerous to society. It may be very questionable whether the proper removal is by death, but the removal must be by the severest punishment provided by the laws, which with us is death; and, until another means is substituted, that must be employed. We think it much more humane, however, that an unaccountable being, aged fourteen, with chubby cheeks and flaxen hair, should be hung, than that he should, after a term of confinement, be let loose to cut the throats of people who have their value to those about them and the world. We acknowledge to feel more sympathy with society than with criminals; especially when they are assassins. Still, the removal of dangerous criminals from the opportunities of mischief, might be effected by other means than the repugnant extremity of taking life. Perpetual imprisonment would suffice, and to perpetual imprisonment we would rather have seen Bell sentenced than to death. But it is not recognized in law; and the extreme punishment, such as it is, in lieu of a wiseer was, therefore, his just lot.

PARISIAN GAMING HOUSES.—"Impossible as it has been found to restrain these hells, the matter seems 'ordered better' in France; for the Government derives from them an annual income of nearly four and half million of francs, with which are borne the following items of the public expenditure: Secret services (police); Royal Hospital for the Blind; succour to the former colonists of St. Domingo; general succours to charitable institutions and others, and aid to the royal theatres. This is certainly turning an uncontrollable evil to some advantage, while in London we have the hells without the profit to our charities, &c.—*Standard*."

This is what Rowland Hill called turning the Devil's arms against himself; but, instead of turning the Devil's arms against himself, we fortify him in his strong-holds. The most desirable thing would undoubtedly be to prevent gambling; but if that cannot be done, the next best thing is to regulate it so as to abate its mischiefs as much as possible, and to extract any benefit it can render to society in exchange for its evils. This the French system does by making the profits of the gaming-houses contributory to the support of charities.

What is the effect of the strict laws against gaming-houses in London? Do they prevent the vice? No. There is actually more play in London than in Paris. The effect of the law is merely to make the Halls guarded places, in which none but accomplices and victims are admitted. An extraordinary and encouraging degree of privacy is thus procured for the gamblers. In Paris, if a father desires to know whether his son plays, or a merchant wishes to know whether his clerk or partner plays, he takes a round of the houses, or he makes inquiries among their visitors, and he soon ascertains the fact. In London there are no such means of discovery. The youth just touched with the pernicious passion, indulges in it without fear of discovery or interruption. The law has made the den of vice a fortress against those interested in saving the victims. Taylor, a well-known keeper of a Hell, had gone through the usual course of being a thief clerk, or partner, in a banking-house, and continued so for several years, after he had turned gambler, without discovery; and, indeed, at last, he himself disclosed the fact to the principals, fearing, as he said, that the house might be injured by his practices. Publicity would prevent such cases, which are too numerous; but publicity is prevented by the impolitic prohibitions of the law, which only give the worst mode of practice to the vice they cannot stifle.

AMERICA.

[ACCIDENT having raised the question of America between us and a citizen of the United States, we addressed a few queries to our friend on the subject, and have received his answer, with a permission to render it public. We give his letter, in his own words.]

"You have asked me," says our correspondent, "what answer I can give, in particular, to the opinions and facts contained in the recent work of Mr. Basil Hall on my own country? As to the former, I feel no disposition to make any reply whatever. The opinions of this writer, so far as they are supported by good reasons, are superior to any rejoinder; and so far as they are not, I am quite willing to refer the matter at issue to the good sense of the world. I never had any susceptibility on the subject of the opinions which foreigners might entertain of the United States; for I very well know how difficult it is for an European to get even an approach to a right knowledge of our institutions, or of the nature of our social organization. Of all the foreigners that I have met in America, I do not remember one who appeared to me to understand the first principles of the Government; and all have betrayed such a confusion of thought, in reference to society, that I have always been more disposed to laugh at their comments than to get angry. One comes among us with crude notions of the simplicity of a young republican nation, and of the extraordinary degree of virtue that is necessary to what is called 'self-government'; and because he finds rogues in the prisons and prostitutes in the streets, he shrugs his shoulders, and exclaims, 'Voilà un French friend of mine, who actually used the expression, 'Voilà un peuple pourri, avant d'être mur!' Another thinks we are all sages, so many Diogenes in their tubs; and because we laugh, and that too with no very light vivacity, he is ready to swear we are no philosophers at all. A third, who has been educated in contrary ideas, expects to see sans-culottes in every drawing-room; ladies going to the in ox-carts; and citizen Tom, the Tinker, squirting his saliva into the face of citizen Peter, the rich proprietor; and because he sees society jogging on much as it does in other civilized countries, he lays a finger on his nose, and runs back with the mare's-nest, that the Yankees are leaning to aristocracy, and have already secret emissaries in Europe looking out for a spare Leopold. I do assure you there is no very great caricature in this statement. Were I to write what I have actually heard and witnessed of this nature, I do not think the different speakers and actors would recognise their own folly; for it is when such opinions are laid plainly before us on paper, that we begin most sensibly to see and to feel their absurdity. We are not free from cant in America, and we have done a good deal, by our own abuse of terms, towards leading the rest of the world into their egregious errors."

"The term 'self-government,' is constantly in our mouths. Nothing is more common than to hear how necessary it is for a people who are 'self-governed' to be simple, and how absolutely requisite it is for a republic to be virtuous. One would not wish to quarrel with this doctrine if it produce fruits, for every nation is the better for its virtue; but the smallest examination will show that, of all forms of

government, our own is, perhaps, the one in which private vice is the least likely to injure public interests. Self-government it is, in the broad meaning of the term; but so far as individuals are concerned, it is strictly each man governing his neighbour. The whole secret of our institutions, and I think of our success, is to be found in the doubtless fact, that the mass will not submit to laws which impose unnecessary restraints, and that the responsibility of every agent is constant, direct, and severe. We often say among ourselves, 'What matter's it who is president, or governor?—he cannot do any harm.' Now, rely on it, if there were any self-government in the case, he could do a great deal of harm. So tremendously efficacious is public opinion, and so constant and sudden the action of popular will, that I do believe a man might be taken from a penitentiary and put into the presidential chair, and (provided he could be kept from stealing the spoons and absconding) it should be found that he would maintain a tolerably clean life and a reasonably dignified deportment. I need not tell you that there are rulers in Europe, of ancient lineage, who hardly consider this self-denial necessary. The effect of such a system is to make men seem virtuous if they are not so; and dress a man in fine clothes, his behaviour will begin to improve. I have no doubt that the effect of republican institutions is to make a nation more moral, and I should prescribe the incessant and severe responsibility which accompanies such a form of government as the most certain and speedy cure of the very corruption which is said to disqualify so many people in this hemisphere from enjoying its benefits.

"We have not been discriminating in the use of political terms, and have greatly misled other people in consequence of our misnomers. You shall have proof of what I say. The first great division of parties in the United States, was on the degree of power to be conceded to the General or Federal Government. This is, after all, the only question that can ever seriously divide the minds of the people, for every thing connected with personal privileges has already been obtained. Those who were in favour of the Union as it now stands, were called Federalists; and those who were disposed to leave more power in the States, were called Anti-Federalists, because they preferred the Confederation to the Union. The Federalists prevailed on the vote of adopting the Constitution, and soon obtained an immense majority of the nation. The beaten party chose, however, to act together as an Opposition; and they abandoned a name that was unpopular, affecting to call themselves Republicans, or greater lovers of liberty than their opponents, whom they chose to stigmatize as Aristocrats. Thus you will perceive that the party which carried the present institutions of the States were called Aristocrats. Desiring of getting rid of so ill-sounding a name, the Federalists made an effort to be called Federal-Republicans; but it did not succeed, since it had not the merit of originality. They then turned the tables on their adversaries, whom they termed Democrats, or men who, like the French of that period, cut the throats of women and priests. I very well remember the time when a Democrat was held in pious horror, in the good and religious State of Connecticut for example, which was an ultra-Federal, and by implication, an ultra-Aristocratical state. You may wish to know something of this knot of seceders, in a coun-

try as truly democratical as ours. Here is its history. Connecticut was settled in 1633, by colonists from Massachusetts; the latter enjoying at the time a government as democratical as that of Unterwalden. For the first years of its separate existence, Connecticut was a pure democracy, the people meeting in primitive assemblies. In 1665, Charles II. granted a charter to Connecticut. By this charter the people named their own Executive annually; their Council, or Upper House, for the same period, and their Assembly twice a-year. Every major (with immaterial and necessary exceptions) voted; and the other institutions were of the most popular character. This charter continued to be the sole constitution of Connecticut until 1818, when it was changed for purposes of convenience, as connected with the Government of the United States. It is unnecessary to show you how thoroughly terms are confounded, when a people who have lived for two centuries under such a system deny their democracy. No community on earth is more jealous of its rights, or more attached to its institutions, than that of Connecticut; and yet the people are, even now, a little tender of being called Democrats, not having got over their reluctance to being confounded with those who cut the throats of priests and women! I have often had occasion to observe the mistakes which this confusion, or perversion of terms, has led Europeans to adopt, and I am quite willing to admit that my countrymen have no one to censure but themselves in this particular. Captain Hall intimates that he had a difficulty in understanding the language of America. I am told this gentleman is a Scotchman, and if he has the Scotch peculiarities of speech, this may be literally true; but if he speaks, as one has reason to infer from his rank in life, as well as he writes, it is quite absurd, unless he alludes to their abuse of terms. Nothing is more certain, than that in many things, as in politics, morals, religion, and taste, we use the same terms as the English, meaning very different things, or at least very different degrees of the same things. Something of this misconception exists between the people of all nations, until one has travelled and corrected his vocabulary by actual observation; but it peculiarly exists between the English and the Americans, in consequence of the identity of the language and the dissimilarity of the institutions and habits.

"There is a strong disposition in most of the European Governments to represent the condition and character of the Americans in a false light. One is jealous of the example of their institutions: (I might have said, most have this jealousy;) another is apprehensive that her artisans may carry the knowledge of their crafts into the New World, and change a customer into a rival; while a third is desirous of making its own subjects believe there is no nation freer or happier than their own. I traced this jealousy even in Switzerland; the good Avoyers and their councils fearing that too much emigration would let the glaciers get the better of them. That communities, like individuals, should not look with a pleased eye at their thriving competitors, is perfectly natural, and is a weakness to be mourned over; but when either has recourse to malicious invention in order to defeat a success it cannot equal, it becomes a proper subject of censure rather than of pity. I have no wish to dilate on this point, but a mass of evidence lies before me that may one day be produced; for

a country has as much right to its good name as any one of its citizens.

"There is another cause of misconception between Europe and America, of which the latter is entirely innocent, and for which the former is not obnoxious to any very severe censure. It arises from the habit of referring all estimates to a familiar scale. Europe is tolerably familiar with all its own peculiarities, but it knows little of ours, and by consequence, whenever it becomes necessary to graduate an American fact, it is reduced to the European standard, if possible; and if impossible, it is incontinently set down as an American invention. England is a good deal addicted to accusing us of inventing untruths, while she denies our faculty of inventing the power-loom, the cloth-dresser, the steel reed-cutter, and fifty other machines now in use in that country, and which I believe we did, in good truth, invent. The existence of the Sea-serpent is denied on a reason no better, if examined, than that there never has been one in the Bay of Biscay or the English Channel. A striking instance of this indisposition to believe more of America than happens in Europe occurred lately in Paris under my immediate observation. An application was made to the American Legation for information on the subject of Public Instruction in the United States, in behalf of a society devoted to subjects of this nature. An American obtained the official reports of the common schools of the State of New York, and transmitted them to the proper person. Soon after, the Minister of Public Instruction, to whom these reports were given, made a speech on the French schools in the Chamber of Deputies, in which he quoted particulars from the above-named report. The average of the population of New York for the year 1830, to which the report referred, was about 1,930,000 souls, and the average of the scholars, in the common or public schools, was a small fraction less than 500,000; there were to be added, by estimate, 50,000 for the private schools, making 550,000 scholars in a population of 1,930,000. Now, it is a well-known fact that the proportion of infants to adults in America is much greater than it is in Europe, and vastly greater than it is in France. The Minister read his extracts very well until he got to the number of scholars, when (probably startled with a fact so *un-French*, as you would say in England) he suddenly reduced, on his own authority, the number to 200,000! It is quite evident he meant no more than to save his own reputation for veracity and observation, for he immediately added, 'or all the children they had.' Every day furnishes evidence of this propensity; nor are those who indulge in it at all pleased at being set right. A paragraph has just been running the round of the French papers, giving less than three hundred as the number of the American newspapers. I happen to have in my possession a minute account of the journals of New York, by which it appears there are in that single state 237. This ratio would give about 1300 for the whole country; but it is probably too high—a thousand would be near the truth: and this fact I took the pains to state, referring to authorities, and carrying my communication in person to two of the journals, neither of which would make the correction. We Americans are constantly accused of not making the world acquainted with our own condition, and then of complaining that the

world knows nothing about us. These are not the first, by fifty instances, in which I have been made to see that Europe must have such information as suits her own views, or she would rather do without it altogether.

"As for the book of Mr. Hall, I repeat, let his opinions pass for what they are worth. His facts are greatly in our favour, in my view of the subject, though they are not often as much so as they ought to be. I do not mean to accuse him of wilful misrepresentation, for I have no reason to believe he has been guilty of it; but I propose to show you, that he has mutilated things in a way entirely to mislead his reader. To begin with a visible object.

"Mr. Hall says, in so many words, that an American stage resembles a French diligence more than any thing else. Of this fact you shall judge for yourself. A diligence has four broad tired wheels, a stage, four narrow tired; the first has five horses driven by postillions, the last, four driven in hand; the first is composed of three compartments, resembling three carriage bodies, the last, of one; the first is on horizontal springs, the last, on upright jacks; the first carries its baggage on top, the last, behind; the first carries passengers on top, with a cabriolet, the last does not; the first travels five miles an hour, the last, from five to twelve, generally about eight. Now I do not know two things in art, appropriated to the same uses, which resemble each other less than a French diligence and an American stage. It is quite evident, by the foregoing description, that the resemblance is much stronger between an English coach and an American stage, although they differ essentially. We will go to less material things.

"Mr. Hall sums up his statistical information in a table annexed to Vol. III. This is an imposing looking document, and it is quite evidently intended to set the reader right in several points believed, until the publication of the book, to be misunderstood. One of its objects is to show the ratio of contribution to Government by each inhabitant. We will first touch on this point. The table gives the amount of population of each State and its annual expenditure, then dividing the last by the first, it gets the ratio of contribution. The line of New York stands as follows, omitting those items which are not connected with the ratio of contribution. It must also be remembered, that all the calculations are expressly made to *January 1, 1828*.

New York population, 1,611,307; receipts, 1,888,312 dols.; expenditure, 1,934,307 dols.; each person pays to State Government, 1 dol. 17 cents. Now I am quite willing to believe that Captain Hall, when he made out his table, did it in perfect good faith, but I must also believe that he did it with so strong a desire to establish his case, that he was accessory to his own blunders. The population of New York on *June 1, 1825*, was found to be, by actual enumeration, 1,516,458, or 5,151 more than his table makes it two years and a-half later. A census was taken on *June 1, 1830*. I have not seen the full returns of this census, but I have seen them all, with the exception of one ward in the city of New York, and one township in Oneida county. The result cannot differ greatly from 1,925,000 souls. The date chosen by Mr. Hall, for his table, divides the period between these two enumerations in nearly equal parts. The gain between 1825 and 1830 is 308,697; half of this, or 154,346 souls, added to

one dollar, 17 cents, as recorded by Mr. Hall, and this without entering at all into the merits of the question of how much money a community might choose to spend, annually, simply because it had it to spend. It is not at all probable that New York, when its canal debt is paid, will hoard its receipts, and then we shall see a community living on its private fortune like an individual.

"Fancy, for instance, that the Duke of Bridgewater had bequeathed to England his canal for the benefit of common schools. The money would pass through the hands of a public officer, but would it be fair to charge it against the subject as so much additional imposition? In this way the more property a State possesses the poorer it will appear on paper!

"Mr. Hall makes a similar error in his statement of the cost of the United States Government, and in his estimate of the population, considered in reference to the contribution of each individual. He underrates the population at least half a million, as is proved by the census of 1830, and he includes in the expenditure all investments and payments, and not only the interest but the money paid on the principal of the public debt. Ten millions a year is appropriated to the debt, by far the greater part being for diminishing the principal; though the payments necessarily vary according to the original conditions of the several loans. Nor is this all. His table says *discreetly*, that the debt was *reduced* only 2,734,374 dols. in the year 1826, when a document before me shows that there was paid 11,684,465 dols. on account of the debt that year, of which sum only 3,977,864 dols. were for interest. Here is a mistake of 4,972,227 dols., or of nearly two-thirds! Nothing is more probable than that some small errors exist in the figures used by careless printers; but I have consulted several different documents, and though I find one or two trifling oversights of this nature, I see nothing to justify the difference between my statements and those of the table of Mr. Hall.

"Now I give you the following copy from Mr. Hall's table, in order that you may judge for yourself of its value, by comparing one part of it with another.

TABLE III. Expenditures (meaning of Government of United States).

Mean of the Years 1826-7-8.				
Civil List.	Miscellaneous.	Foreign intercourse.	Military Department.	Naval Department.
Dollars. 1,271,877	Dollars. 993,987	Dollars. 421,199	Dollars. 3,852,717	Dollars. 3,843,621
Public Debt.	Revolutionary Pensions.	Other Pensions.	Indian Department.	Total.
Dollars. 11,046,698	Dollars. 1,136,672	Dollars. 215,762	Dollars. 737,714	Dollars. 23,448,655

the known population of 1825, would give us very nearly the population of January 1, 1828. The result would be 1,766,653. As the increase is a little dependent on the original stock, however, this amount may possibly be the odd 6,653 too many. Mr. Hall is then clearly mistaken by ten per cent. So much for his division; let us see if his dividend is any better. Mr. Hall gives the Comptroller of the State as his authority, for saying the expenditure of New York was 1,934,307 dols. taking, as it would appear, an average of the years 1826-7-8. In neither of these years did the State of New York impose any tax on its citizens. By the Comptroller's reports, it appears that the average *current* expenses of New York are, one year with another, those named included, about 320,000 dols. This includes the ordinary and *extraordinary* expenses, which, together, vary from 250,000 to 350,000 dollars. But the State is very rich. It owns land, bank stock, has a *fund* for the support of common schools, and is the proprietor of sundry salt works, and of a vast deal of canal. The latter alone produces an income of more than a million annually. Now all these receipts pass through the Treasury, the Treasurer being bound to keep the public funds. In order to make the canals, the State borrowed money, some years since, pledging their receipts, and certain other of their funds, together with the general faith of the State, to the repayment. This debt *cannot* yet be paid, by the terms of the loans, and consequently after paying the interest, a large balance is invested yearly, awaiting the time when the debt can be paid. This period will arrive in a few years, after which it will become a question what is to be done with the income from the State property? for should the tolls on the canals be continued, there will be an excess of quite a million and a-half over the present rate of expenditure. Let us see whence this money of the canal fund comes. It is derived from tolls on goods transported, partly into other States, and partly into Canada, and partly for home use. It is a *rent* for the use of salt-springs, the property of the State, of which salt a great deal is sold in Canada! You will remember the "salt duty," as it is called, is not a tax, but strictly a rent, for anybody may consume salt made any where else, in the Superintendent's own house if he please, without the smallest imposition from the States. You see that Mr. Hall has made the capital mistake of setting down the whole of the accounts of the State as its *expenditure*. He may say, and very justly, that the Comptroller has reported 1,934,307 dols. as *paid*. The money belonging to the school *fund* is periodically transferred to the proper agent, and the interest of the canal debt being paid, the balance of that fund is transferred to the Commissioners, to keep good the faith of the State against the day when the debt itself can be discharged. The reserve sum is now large, and will soon equal the entire debt. The object of Mr. Hall is, to show how much the citizen of New York *pays* for the protection of Government. This can be done by proving his actual contribution for that purpose. But in 1828 there was *no* contribution, the property of the State being equal to its wants. Still there was a current expenditure, and this current expenditure, or about 300,000 dols. should have been his dividend instead of 1,934,307! The proposition would then have been 1,760,000(30,000,000)(18). The answer being 18 cents, instead of

TABLE IV.

Public Debt.		Yearly Reduction.	
Years.	Dollars.	Dollars.	
1825	83,788,432	—	
1826	81,054,059	2,734,374	
1827	73,987,357	7,066,702	
1828	67,475,622	6,511,735	

"I omit his statement in sterling money, as unnecessary to our object. The first thing which strikes us on looking at these tables, is the large comparative amount of the 'Revolutionary Pensions.' These pensions were granted about the time Mr. Hall has chosen for his mean of expenditures, and are to be considered as a fruit of the flourishing state of the American finances. The peace was made in 1783, and allowing fifteen to have been the age of the soldier at that period, the youngest of these pensioners must be sixty-three years old to-day. It is clearly a temporary expenditure, and is creditable to the nation; and yet it is one-twentieth of the whole expenditure, that even Mr. Hall charges. The other pensions are the result of the war of 1812, chiefly. The Indian Department, *i. e.* payments, annuities, &c. to those Indians we are said to rob. Its amount is 734,714 dollars annually. We will now compare Mr. Hall with himself. By adding his reductions of the debt together, we find a total of 16,312,811 dollars for the years 1826-7-8. By multiplying his mean of payments on debt by three, we get an answer of 33,140,094 dollars. By taking the mean of his debts for the years 1825-6-7, we get 79,609,949 dollars, for the sake of convenience, we will say, of 80,000,000 dollars for the mean of the public debt during Mr. Hall's three years. Were *all* this debt at six per cent. interest, the yearly interest would be 4,800,000 dollars. Our proposition would then stand as follows:—

Money paid on account of debt, during years 1826-7-8 . . .	33,140,094 dols.
Deduct interest	14,400,000
	18,740,094
Deduct principal, according to Mr. Hall	16,312,811
	2,427,283 dols.

Now here is a balance of 2,427,283 dols. entirely unexplained. Let us see if it is enough. By a table in the American National Calendar, I find there was paid on account of interest on the public debt, in the years 1826-7-8, only 10,562,803 dols. instead of the 14,400,000 dols. above allowed. Deducting this sum from our estimate of debt, at 6 per cent. (it is notorious that the average was less than five,) and we get nearly four millions more to add to this unexplained balance. Any one can correct the table for himself, by a knowledge of the fact that the United States did not pay *more* than 6 per cent. interest

on any part of its debt. In point of fact, it paid 6 per cent. on less than half, in 1826 and in 1828, on only about 25,000,000 dols.—on 13,000,000 dols. it paid only 3 per cent.

"The statement of Mr. Hall, in reference to the ratio of contributions of the citizens to the Government of the United States is liable to the following objections. It is valueless, since the expenditure is stationary, or in its nature diminishing rapidly, while the population is rapidly progressive. It is erroneous, since he has not given, by half a million, enough people, and because he takes the gross amount of payments of the Treasury as the gross amount of expenditure. The miscellaneous expenditures of the United States are chiefly sums invested in canals, &c. I am much mistaken in the time if it was not during the three years of Mr. Hall, that England paid 1,200,000 dols. for spoiliations, which would, of course, pass through the Treasury, and appear in the gross amount of payments. Again, the Federal Government has been paying, from time to time, sums to different States, and this money, Mr. Hall, on his principle of aggregate amounts would charge twice against the citizen. Is it fair to charge reductions of debt as annual contributions? It is true the citizen pays it, but under what circumstances. The policy of the United States exacts a Tariff, and, will ye nill ye, we have a revenue of 25,000,000 dols. In a few years, say four at the most, the debt will be paid, and then something is to be done with this money, or the Tariff abandoned. Admitting that we should appropriate a few millions more annually to the navy, as probably will be done, there will be an excess of 10,000,000 dols. to dispose of. One plan is to divide this money, among the States, according to population. New York would get 1,400,000 dols. annually. Her canals are giving an increasing revenue each year, and her canal debt being paid, she will have, under this regulation 3,000,000 dols. a year to pass through her Treasury. Admitting that the State buys English Consols with this money, according to Mr. Hall's table, her citizens will suffer an imposition in proportion to their riches.

"It should be remembered that the American system of government is intended to meet the wants of a vast population. The great size of the territory compels expenditures for objects that just now are of no great importance, but which, ten years hence, will become so. Thus Mr. Hall takes 1,611,307 as the population of New York in 1828, and calculates his ratio of contribution with this division; whereas, had he waited until to-day, he would have had, with the same dividend, a division of 2,000,000. The citizen of New York, instead of contributing even the eighteen cents to his state-government, as I have shown he did in 1828, contributed to-day only fifteen!

"You may say that a stranger cannot readily understand all these details. Why write about them? Every stranger has access to my authorities, and I have not set forth a single fact that is not obtained from a printed document, Mr. Hall's included!

"The three volumes are filled with errors and misconceptions. I do not mean Mr. Hall is mistaken or misconceives when he says, we are not the 'wisest, virtuouslest, discreetest, best' people going; but my allusion is simply to facts. There are so many of these mistakes that I scarcely know which to expose. He greatly misconceives the

spirit of the constitution. He talks of innovations on the prerogatives of the President, and on the sacred rights of the Judges, without seeming to know that all these offices can be constitutionally abolished, if we please. All that he says of invasion of the prerogative of the President, (who, by the by, has no strict prerogative) is a mistake, the Constitution never having been touched at all, as respects that officer, except in correcting an oversight in the manner of his election. It is curious to see the Englishman reasoning here, on this subject, according to English ideas. With you, the Constitution is altered by Parliamentary enactments, more or less direct, but no such thing happens with us. We have a particular way of altering the Constitution constitutionally. I dare say Mr. Hall can say that this or that American descanted to him gravely on the reverse of my statement; but this is one of those cases in which we use the same terms meaning different things. I shall exhibit one more of Mr. Hall's misconceptions, for it is a good example to show how difficult it is for an European to understand a question purely American, and then quit the subject.

"In page 293, Vol. II., Mr. Hall has a comparative view of the length of time the Members of Parliament and of Congress respectively have served, with a view to show the vacillating quality of popular fame, and the consequent inexperience in legislation of the representatives of democracy. To begin, Mr. Hall says, that a representative in a State Legislature, or in Congress, must not only represent a particular spot, but that he must have resided actually on that particular spot a certain time previously to his election. I was amused when I found a Scotchman calling an American Congressional district, a spot. At all events, each of these spots must have forty thousand inhabitants, and some of them have several hundred thousands. He is in error as to Congress. A Member of Congress need not be an inhabitant of the district he represents, or perhaps, always. The constitution requires, for reasons connected with the nature of a Confederacy, that each Member should be a citizen of the State he represents. As for the local selfishness which influences the representative under such a system, I would ask if it be not quite as useful as the selfishness which controls the member for Grampound or Old Sarum? But the most extraordinary mistake in this extraordinary book is in the eight or ten pages taken to prove that Members do not sit as long in Congress as in Parliament. When I reflect that the work is written by a man who actually read the Constitution of the United States, and who took leisure for his task, I scratch my head and ask when will an Englishman think straight about America? You will remember that I say nothing as to whether long or short service is best for a country—I am dealing only with facts. In the first place, there were probably Members in Parliament in 1828 who sat *before there was a Congress at all*. In the next place, we have had what is called the Old Congress, and what is called the New; or, the Congress of the Confederation, and the Congress of the Union. The latter dates only from 1789, and Mr. Hall, although in another part of his book he struggles hard to show that an institution ought to date from the time when a char-

was made in the form of choosing the President, says nothing of any anterior service. Again, we have State Legislatures, and few men go to Congress who have not sat in these Legislatures, where the habits of legislation are just as well obtained as in Congress itself. And finally, and the most destructive to his calculation of all, the number of the members is *periodically increased in America*, and in the nature of things a great many must be of that date in the house. Thus in New York in 1789, there were but *seven* members, whereas to-day there are thirty-four; and in the next Congress there will be thirty-eight if not forty. Again, in 1789 there were but thirteen States in the American Union, and now there are twenty-four. The eleven new States were admitted at different times, and of course brought in their members with them. Now Mr. Hall gravely tells us, under these notorious circumstances, that Members of Congress, under an average of the services of the respective members of the year 1828, do not sit as long as Members of Parliament, there having been no change in the latter within the life of man, except in the admission of the Irish members thirty years ago. In point of fact, in the old emigrating States of America, as in New England, and Georgia, the Carolinas, &c. a respectable man is almost certain to serve his constituents as long as he pleases. The same is true in the old *stationary* districts of other states, as, for instance, in New York, whose population has augmented from less than 400,000 to 2,000,000 since 1789. Thus Mr. Samuel Smith of Maryland has been in Congress, one house or the other, ever since the New Constitution! Mr. Macon of North Carolina, Mr. Wood and Mr. Taylor of New York, &c. &c. are all examples of what I have just said. A far greater proportion of the Members of Congress voluntarily retire, than of Parliament, and for obvious reasons. Neither our habits, nor our laws, admit of pluralities in office. A Member of Parliament can hold a foreign mission, but a Member of Congress cannot. Officers in the army and navy can sit in Parliament, but they cannot in Congress. A great many Members left Congress in 1812 to join the army. If a Member of Congress, as often happens, is elected Governor of his own State, or if he be made a Supreme Judge, either in his own State or under the United States, or a Collector, or enter the cabinet, or indeed accepts anything else of moment, he is obliged to quit Congress, so that what is in truth a greater evidence of the continuance of popular favour, is, by Mr. Hall, supposed to be evidence of popular jealousy and popular vacillation. Did the American law act in Parliament, Sir James Graham, Mr. Stanley, Mr. Spring Rice, Lord Althorp, and a hundred others who serve to swell out his time of average service, would not be able to sit at all. When Mr. Hall brings the comparisons to the Senate of the United States, he is still more glaringly absurd. Did it never strike him to compare the length of service between the French and the English Peers? They sit, or did sit, by the same tenure, and the result might have upset his theory. I shall apply to Mr. Hall an extract from his own book.

"For my part, I acknowledge fairly, that after some experience in the embarrassing science of travelling, I have often been so much out of humour with the people amongst whom I was wandering, that I have most perversely derived

pleasure from meeting things to find fault with; and very often, I am ashamed to say, when asking for information, have detected that my wish was rather to prove my original and prejudiced conceptions right, than to discover that I had previously done the people injustice. The melancholy truth is, that when once we express any opinions, especially if we use strong terms for that purpose, a sort of parental fondness springs up for the offspring of our lips, and we are ready to defend them for no better reason than because we gave them birth. Travellers, therefore, and others, should be cautious how they bring such a fine family of opinions into the world, which they can neither maintain respectfully, nor get rid of without a certain degree of inconsistency, generally painful, and sometimes ridiculous."

The tone of Mr. Hall, in speaking of our navy, is good, but he says the discipline is more severe than in his own, and he accounts for it by a process which is greatly in favour in Europe, and which is a chief reason why Europe knows so little of America. He says the insubordinate habits of the people, with their ideas of liberty and equality, require a strong arm to bring them to the necessary training at sea! This is an opinion, and not so easily disposed of as his facts, but in my opinion it is equally erroneous. Here is what I conceive to be the truth. The navy of the United States was created in 1797, at a time when the navigation of the United States had a forced and unnatural increase, during a great European war. The officers were taken from merchant ships. The latter had not the habit of military command, and like all new beginners their ideas were exaggerated. In addition to this leading fact, the men were of all nations, including the most profligate of our own; for it was rare, in a time of peace, that a good, sober, American seaman would ship in a vessel of war. Perhaps such crews required a stronger arm than common. An American officer could not send his boat, and take the best man out of a merchant ship as is done in England, but he was obliged, at a time when good sailors in merchant ships were receiving from twenty to thirty dollars a month, to accept such as offered. A short time after the war with England had commenced, first-rate American crews offered, and the hand of authority immediately became lighter. In short, every seaman knows that of his class, there is no sailor more easily governed by reason and kind treatment than the American. It is in the nature of things. The people have the same order, or even more than other nations, with far less personal restraint, and why should their habits and characters change because they have gone on ship-board?

"It would require a book as large as his own properly to dissect the three volumes of Mr. Hall. I must repeat, that so far as facts are concerned, he is constantly in error, and from that sort of misconception which is nearly inseparable from the different habits of the two countries. You will remember that a year in America is not like a year in France or England. One may see a great deal of most countries in a year, but the size of the United States, the scattered nature of its population, and the time which is unavoidably wasted on the road, diminishes the period of observation there greatly.

"Mr. Hall has been innocently enough misled in another particular. He was in America when the people were struggling to turn out an unpopular cabinet. Now had he visited it at any time between 1800 and 1823, he would scarcely have heard politics mentioned. If he thinks we are always excited by politics he is greatly mistaken.

"There is one more point that I shall consider before I conclude. Most Englishmen who go to the United States complain that they are offended by allusions to the late war in the prints, on the highways, and in the steam-boats, &c. I do not know it is pretended that these allusions are personal at all, but as an Englishman happens to understand the language, and has ears to hear, his ears or eyes are necessarily offended. The inference seems to be that we entertain an increasing and lasting dislike to the English nation, and an overweening love for ourselves. In the course of many long, and free, and friendly conversations that I have had with Englishmen, since my last arrival in Europe, I have been told distinctly, that they, liberal men on most subjects, thought our declaration of war in 1812, betrayed a particularly hostile spirit to England, especially as it came at a moment when she was struggling for the freedom of the world, against all the world, and with all her energies. Now I think you will agree with me that this latter is the vulgar opinion of England on the point in question.

"You will remember that our two wars with England embrace nearly all of our military exploits. Were we to say nothing of them, we should be silent altogether on those subjects which in every country are oftenest alluded to by those who are fond of extolling their own deeds. I apprehend the people say rather less of these sort of things among us than in other nations. I am sure far less is said in Congress than is said in Parliament, or the French Chambers, either of what we have done, or of what we can do in this way: no reasoning is necessary to show why the least allusion of this sort should be offensive to an Englishman. But how, for instance, does a Frenchman fare in England? You hang out your conquered banners in your churches, pile your cannon in your parks, and invent a thousand clap-traps for the stage. We have conquered standards too, but they offend the eye of no traveller; our captured cannon is in the arsenals, and otherwise we make far less display of military triumph than is even usual. Really from long observation of both Europe and America, I must say that we are not particularly offenders in this way.

As to the declaration of war, what were the facts? We complain of depredations on our commerce, and of the impressment of our seamen. On these points we negotiated *twenty years* without effect. Your orders in council were continued, and England still took our seamen, making any lieutenant in her own service a judge of the national character of the man. I will tell you an anecdote. About five-and-twenty years since, I first visited England. We made the channel in a snow-storm, and ran into St. Helens' roads and anchored in thick weather. When it cleared up, we found ourselves lying in shore of an English fleet. I remember the character of our crew perfectly, and as it was no bad epitome of our men-of-war and other vessels in that day, I will give it to you in detail. The captain and first mate were Americans, the second mate was a Portuguese, shipped only for the outward passage. The cook was an American negro, and the cabin boy an English lad. We had ten before the mast; of these, five were American born, one was a Scotch lad whose

family had emigrated when he was a child, one was a Prussian, one a Spaniard, one a Dane, and one an Englishman, who had been wrecked on our coast, and was working his passage home. The weather was no sooner clear, than a boat shoved off from one of the ships, and pulled towards us. We hid the Englishman in an empty cask, and the rest of the crew hunted up their evidences of national character. We were soon boarded and the crew was mustered. Much the finest man, and much the ablest seaman we had, the first mate excepted, was a man from New Jersey, named Cooke. The lieutenant picked him out by instinct. Cooke produced the usual American protection. "This will not do," said the Lieutenant, "I can buy one of these for two dollars in New York." "Will this do?" asked Cooke, producing another document. He had a certificate of discharge from the British frigate Cambrian, signed by her captain, G. P. Beresford, I think, on account of his having satisfactorily proved that he was a *native citizen of the United States*, after having served in that ship some eighteen months, if my memory does not fail me. The Lieutenant was staggered at this. Looking about him, and hearing so much broken English in answer to his questions, he soon fastened on another man, the second-best of our crew. This man, whose name was Gaines, was a native of the city of New York. He too brought forth his protection, but it was not heeded. Gaines had served long in the ship, and the officers interfered warmly in his behalf, when the Lieutenant very coolly answered that he would not have his trouble for nothing, and compelled the poor fellow to go with him. We asked the name of his ship, and he gave us one, pointing to a vessel towards which his boat however did not steer. We could never find Gaines. Our ship soon went up to London, when Cooke asked me to go with him to one of the public offices to get some prize money for his service in the Cambrian. We went, and on account of some formality Cooke was required to leave, until next day, his certificate of discharge, which contained the dates of his period of service. I remember the countenance with which he entered the street as if it were but yesterday. "Here I am without a paper, and six feet high," he said, "for they have kept my discharge in this office, and the Lieutenant, who impressed Gaines, carried off with him my protection." I knew the latter fact to be true. In less than an hour he was carried off from before my eyes by a press-gang. I never heard of him afterwards, for all attempts to trace him were fruitless.

"Of all the questions between the two countries, that of impression is the most serious, and it is the one which the wise men of both nations ought to consider, now there is opportunity to do so calmly. The peace of 1815 left this cause of dispute just where it was. The American Government was blamed for apparently abandoning one of the principal rights for which it made war. But which there would be no impressions, and it was wise to defer the settlement of the dispute, since every twenty-three years double the population, and quadrupled the other resources of the United States. But England has stood on the verge of a general war for the last twelvemonth, and is far from being assured of a long continuance

of peace. As between the United States and England, there exist no serious grounds of dispute at all likely to lead to a contest. Their trade is immense, and although it is idle to expect that America will not become a great manufacturing nation, (and a great rival manufacturing nation too,) the increase of that country is so rapid that, by changing the nature of the articles, there must exist, for a long time to come, perhaps always, great motives for maintaining the present commercial intercourse. Is it discreet to leave the peace of two countries, so situated, at the mercy of third parties? The moment England is involved in a serious war, she will resort to impressment, (unless the question be attended to previously,) and the moment her officers begin to impress, her sailors will begin to take refuge in other countries. One effect of an European war will be to increase, and that suddenly, the tonnage of America, and of course to create an extra demand for seamen. In a country like ours there is never any great surplus supply of any particular branch of manual labour for a long period. When one pursuit is occupied men turn to another. The consequence will be that our merchants will avail themselves of their unquestionable right of employing any seamen that offer. England and all nations practice this right, in war or in peace, as neutrals or as belligerents. The flag is the protection of the individual, unless it enter the ports of the nation claiming the services of the refugee.

"Wise men will not consult their recollections, and their pride, and their wishes, on a subject like this, but the necessities of the case. To me it seems as certain, as that the sun which sets to-night will rise to-morrow, that a war with the United States will follow a war between England and any other great maritime power, unless this question shall be disposed of before hostilities are commenced. Writers in the Quarterly Review may believe it adds to their importance by treating this matter superciliously, but when the United States put afloat thirty or forty sail of the line, as I am prepared to demonstrate they could readily do, and as I am certain they would do, in the event of another war with England, what avails these airs? These ships must be met, and fought, and taken—the question will not be in the least decided—ay, and all that might be sent to replace them.

"The statesman who shall dispose of this complicated question, new there is a calm and an opportunity, to the mutual satisfaction of the two nations, will merit general gratitude. Numerous eulogies from the pen of interested writers will never settle the right of impressment. It must be treated by men of masculine understandings, and simple, honest intentions, with a desire to avoid a great and threatening danger. All the sentimentalists in Christendom will never make of England and the United States anything but rival nations; but their rivalry need not degenerate into malignancy, unless one party betrays a domineering and the other a turbulent temper. The competition between men is frank, and generates respect;—it is the spirit of sycophancy that tempts one to presume, and which would induce the other to submit."