

THE RALEIGH STAR AND NORTH CAROLINA GAZETTE.

THOMAS J. LEMAY, (Printer for the State,) EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 1843.

[THREE DOLLARS A YEAR—IN ADVANCE.]

No. 16.

NOTICE.

Will be offered for sale, for cash, on the premises, on Wednesday, the 10th day of May next, the following tracts or parcels of land and town lots, lying in Hertford county, for the purpose of satisfying the taxes due thereon and poll taxes due for the year 1841, (there being no personal property of Isaac Pipkin's on which I can distrain for the poll taxes) and costs of advertising the same, the same having been listed by Isaac Pipkin, viz.

- House and lot lying in the town of Murfreesboro', ad-joining the town of Murfreesboro', being the house and lot whereon said I. Pipkin and family lived, valued at \$2,500, 87 50
- House and lot lying in Murfreesboro', ad-joining the Mason lot, valued at \$300, 90
- Store house and lot, lying in Murfreesboro', adjoining the Mason lot, valued at \$250, 75
- 16 1/2 acres land, lying in Murfreesboro', ad-joining the lots of Jno. G. Wilson, Sam'l J. Wheeler and others, valued at \$80, 26
- 61/2 acre lot lying in Murfreesboro', adjoining the lots of Jno. G. Wilson, Camp's heirs and others, valued at \$100, 30
- 585 acres land, lying near Murfreesboro', adjoining the lands of H. M. Bank's heirs, T. Capshart and others, valued at \$3,516, 10 65
- 182 acres land, adjoining the lands of Benj. Walt, John W. Southall and others, valued at \$732, 2 20
- 366 acres land, lying in Mary's Neck, adjoining the lands of John Maggett's heirs, Jno. G. Wilson and others, lying on Meherrin river, valued at \$1,464, 4 40
- 25 acres land, lying in Mary's Neck, adjoining the lands of James Maggett and others, lying on Meherrin river, valued at \$380, 1 15

Also will be offered for sale, on Thursday the 11th day of May next, on the premises, in the town of Winton, the following town lots as above mentioned, viz. Town lots (number not known) lying in the town of Winton, adjoining the lots of John A. Anderson, William T. Byrum, Lawrence Eley and others, valued at \$234, 70

and of poll taxes due for the year 1841, 38 00
RICHARD G. COWPER, Sheriff.

JOHN P. BRIDGES, D. Sheriff.
Hertford county, March 2nd, 1843.
Price adv. \$10 15—St.

E. P. NASH'S
PIANO FORTES.
The best evidence the subscriber can possibly give of his own opinion, as to the superiority of the Piano Fortes which he has every way ordered that others may have an opportunity of seeing the matter, he proposes to place them upon in the parlors of such persons as may be desirous of supplying themselves with articles of the kind.

A line addressed to the subscriber, at Petersburg, Va. would answer just as good a purpose every way as a personal interview, since he takes upon himself the risk of selecting and guaranteeing to please in every respect.

A large assortment always on hand. Upwards of one hundred have been sold by him, without ever receiving a bad one.

E. P. NASH, Petersburg, Va. 14

NEW MUSIC
This day received at the North Carolina Bookstore, a fresh supply of Vocal and Instrumental music, at half the former prices from 25 to 65 cents per page. Call and examine it.

TURNER & HUGHES. 14

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS.
The nine Congressional Districts of the State of North Carolina, as laid off and established by the act of the last Session of the General Assembly, are imposed of the following counties:

- 1ST DISTRICT. Cherokee, Randolph, Macon, Burke, Haywood, Yancy, Blount, Cleveland, Henderson, Caldwell, Population, 69,388; Whig majority, 3702.
- 2D DISTRICT. Meclendon, Lincoln, Iredell, Population, 76,293; Whig majority, 493.
- 3D DISTRICT. Ashe, Stokes, Wikes, Rockingham, Surrey, Caswell, Population, 71,359; Democratic majority, 283.
- 4TH DISTRICT. Richmond, Guilford, Montgomery, Guilford, Ashe, Randolph, Population, 73,117; Whig majority, 4905.
- 5TH DISTRICT. Wake, Moore, Chatham, Johnston, Cumberland, Wayne, Population, 71,192; Democratic majority, 745.
- 6TH DISTRICT. Robeson, Sampson, Columbus, Duplin, Bladen, Lenoir, Brunswick, Onslow, New Hanover, Johnston, Population, 65,638; Democratic majority, 2397.
- 7TH DISTRICT. Orange, Franklin, Person, Warren, Granville, Hades, Population, 70,532; Democratic majority, 850.
- 8TH DISTRICT. Nash, Washington, Edgemont, Tyrrell, Pitt, Hyde, Greene, Craven, Beaufort, Carteret, Population, 76,400; Democratic majority, 727.
- 9TH DISTRICT. Martin, Chowan, Bertie, Perquimans, Hertford, Pasquotank, Gates, Currituck, Northampton, Currituck, Population, 69,182; Whig majority, 474.

The mercury in the thermometer at Newber, Canada, on the 23d ult., was down four degrees.

Amusing Scene in a Paris Court.—A ludicrous scene occurred in the Royal Court of Justice, January 7. La Presse had issued an additional sheet for a law and police cases; the Attorney General claimed the pecuniary deposit, as security, for a distinct journal. La Presse resisted and was exempted by the inferior tribunal. The Royal Court was employed with the Crown appeal. Paillet, lawyer of La Presse, delivered, unfolded, the largest of the American monster hebdomadals, stretched it out, with both arms extended to the utmost, so as to render it a complete screen from head to foot, and from behind it, exclaimed to the bench:

"See the Americans are not people who dread quantity of matter and paper; they recoil from no dimensions—they allow all our professors are figurative—the courts will be more liberal and broad-sighted. The spread of letters can now here do harm. All the auditors of Paillet (judges not excepted) were convulsed with laughter. The decision sanctioned the supplement of La Presse."

The New York Commercial states, that Gen. Robert Swartwout, while at the Custom House on Tuesday, dropped down senseless in a fit. Appropriate remedies were immediately applied, and he was conveyed to his residence.

A sailor having attempted to kiss a lass he met with on shore, she bridled up and declared he had insulted her; whereupon Jack exclaimed, "Well, that beats all! I've never to sea these twenty years, and I never knew a salute called an insult afore!"

A SARCOPHAGUS.
On Saturday last, a large sarcophagus, brought from Palestine in the Frigate Constitution by Commodore Elliott, arrived at Spruce street wharf, Philadelphia, from Norfolk, on board of a small schooner. Some thousands of persons repaired to the wharf to view this curious relic of the past. It is said to be 1800 years old.

A ROGUE CAUGHT.
The Bangor Whig says, that on Saturday night last, the Eastern Bank was entered by a robber, who first broke into an office above the bank, tore up the floor, and descended into the banking room, where a watchman, who had marked his movements, secured him, and marched him off to jail.

NEW READING.
The following is clipped from the Picayune. It cannot fail to raise a laugh:
"Without faith it is impossible to be saved," was made by a French preacher to read, "without faith it is impossible to be shaved."

A RASCAL.
The Alabama Journal contains an advertisement to the effect that one Dr. Jno. E. Wright, from Monroe county, Georgia took up his residence in Green county, Alabama, married the daughter of his landlady, Mrs. E. Storey, and after the lapse of two weeks with his wife, took leave of absence for a few days, as he said, to visit Columbia, Miss. In stead of going to Mississippi, he went to Green county, Georgia, where he had a wife, to whom he had been married some four or five years, and two children, the daughter of John Biggers, Esq., of said county. He remained a few days at the latter place, when he left, with his first wife, to go to Green county, Alabama, as he said, and has not since been seen.

A HORRIBLE STORY.
While the men were engaged in erecting a barn, in Armstrong county, Pa. some women were catching chickens, and cutting their heads off, preparatory to the feast usually served up on such an occasion. Two children, a boy and a girl, having observed the process gone through with by the women, with the chickens, one of them laid her head down on a block of wood, while the other proceeded to chop her head off with a hatchet. Two men on the top of the barn, who were in the act of receiving a log from those who were pushing it up from below, hearing the screams of the women, and terrified at seeing the horrid sight, let go their hold of the log, which fell, and in falling, crushed nine persons to death. The details of this horrid affair are too sickening to dwell upon.

FOUR PATRIOTS DEAD.
On Sunday, the 12th ult., no less than four revolutionary soldiers died in Allegheny township, Westmoreland county, Pa. —
John Delap, aged 80 years.
John Gallagher, aged 104 "
Robert Doods, aged 79 "
John Johnson, aged 103 "

MOST DISTRESSING OCCURENCE.
We copy the following from the Pekin (Ill.) Palladium of the 22d ultimo:
"We are just informed of a most melancholy accident that took place on one of the praires in the western part of the State. A family of emigrants, eleven in number, while on their way to Iowa, were frozen to death in their wagon. The horses stopped

at a house, when the inmates, not seeing any one alight from the wagon were induced by mere curiosity to make a closer examination. Upon looking into the wagon they were horror-struck at the appalling spectacle which presented itself to their view.

"The father and nine children were lying dead in the bottom of the wagon; the mother, probably the last survivor, was sitting up and holding the reins, as if driving. We did not learn the name of this unfortunate family, or from what part of the country they were removing."



THE FARMER'S REMEDY FOR HARD TIMES.

"SELL MORE THAN YOU BUY."
Institute a right system of economy, and live, to use a familiar saying, "within yourselves." Dispense with silk and broad cloth—with tea and coffee—and substitute for them the fabrics of your own households; and for other, the simple, but more nutritious diet, milk.

Improve your lands and your cultivation cultivate no more land than is rich enough to give back a profit upon the labor of cultivation. Make all the mure you can. Carry into your farm yards corn stalks, weeds, leaves, and every thing that is convertible into manure. Sprinkle over this litter, when first spread over the yard, some lime or plaster, if you have it; or, if not, save all your ashes, (do this at any rate, keep it under cover un-leached, and use it as a substitute. Renew this litter from time to time as may be necessary turn over the whole mass two or three times during the winter, and in the spring you will have a large supply of good manure, which plough in, if used for corn, but not too deep. Cover the yard again with litter after the manure is carried out. Supply your own wants—of such as you especially—keep them well; they will pay well for it. Cultivate as many vegetables as will supply both white and black, so that all may have plenty throughout the year. You will find it easily done if you will try. Cabbage, potatoes, sym-blins, tomatoes and other culinary vegetables, are raised with little labor; and negroes are more healthy and much more comfortable by having plenty of vegetables with their meat. And, for them especially, a good store of blackey peas for winter use.

Hogs are easily raised. If grazed on clover from April to May (according to the season) until October—for which purpose two or three acres of good clover will be sufficient for thirty, and an acre or two of cymbalins (or more if planted among corn) be added—a daily supply of these through the summer and fall will save the corn crib. This, however, is upon the supposition that the farmer has discarded the old "razor backs," land pikes and alligators, and supplied himself with a good stock of hogs—Cymbalins are also excellent food for cows. A peck to each, morning and evening, if you have tolerably good grazing, will produce the richest milk and butter.

Plant pumpkins with corn wherever the land is rich enough, gather them carefully into some sheltered place before they are frosted, and they may be kept until late in the winter, supplying the very best food for milk cows. If to succeed these you have a crop of mangel wurtzel or sugar beet, which may be kept securely by piling up in a conical form, and covering first with leaves or straw, and then with ten or twelve inches of earth, these will carry your cows to the spring grass.

But some perhaps may object that all these little crops will require more labor than they can spare. Try it, and you will find it to be otherwise. They will save a good deal of corn; and the cultivation of all the cymbalins pumpkins and roots necessary, upon a farm of medium size, will not cost so much as one broad cloth coat, or one silk dress.

If you can, grind all the corn fed to your stock. Cut up all your long forage also, and mix for horses and mules. Even shucks, where there is nothing else, or where folder, oats and hay are saleable, cut and moistened with salt-water some hours before feeding, are excellent to mix with ground stuff of any kind.

If the cob be crushed and ground with corn, a mixture of one third or one half of good wheat bran is recommended.

To cut all the forage for a large stock, it is doubtful whether the efficient labor of a farm can be spared, in bad weather. But upon many farms there are some old or weak hands who render little service, yet who might be profitable employed in this way, with the aid of an improved straw cutter.

Take at least one agricultural paper, published in our own State. A good pig will pay for it.

In selecting men to represent you in the assembly, don't vote for politicians.

Choose men of your own class, of the most respectable character, and with sound practical sense—not prone to much talking—who, when they go to the assembly, will have no party work to do, but will attend to the public business promptly and faithfully, and when that is done, go home to their yearly work, and then say if in the year is about \$35,000, and that only ten useless talking, if saved, would enable the state to give \$10,000 a year towards the improvement of its agriculture. Compare the time consumed by our assembly with their yearly work, and then say if you can find, and send them to the assembly—they will take up less time in making signs than is now taken up in making speeches.

POOR RICHARD.
RIGHT OF VISITATION, OR SEARCH.
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.
Washington, March 23, 1843.

Sir—I transmit to you with this despatch a message from the President of the United States to Congress, communicated on the 27th of February, and accompanied by a report made from this Department to the President, of the substance of a despatch from Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Fox, which was by him read to me on the 24th ultimo.

Lord Aberdeen's despatch, as you will perceive, was occasioned by a passage in the President's Message to Congress, at the opening of its late session. The particular passage is not stated by his Lordship; but no mistake will be committed, it is presumed, in considering it to be that which was quoted by Sir Robert Peel, and other gentlemen, in the debate in the House of Commons on the answer to the Queen's Speech, on the 3d of February.

The President regrets that it should have become necessary to hold a diplomatic correspondence upon the subject of a communication from the head of the Executive Government to the Legislature; drawing after it, as in this case, the further attention of your Government.

Such a necessity, however, unavoidably incurred in consequence of Lord Aberdeen's despatch; for, although the President's recent message may be regarded as a clear exposition of his opinions on the subject; yet a just respect for Her Majesty's Government, and a disposition to meet all questions with promptness, as well as with frankness and candor, require that a formal answer should be made to that despatch.

The words in the message at the opening of the session which are complained of, it is supposed, are the following: "Although Lord Aberdeen, in his correspondence with the American Envoys, at London, expressly disclaimed all right to detain an American ship on the high seas, even if found with a cargo of slaves on board and restricted the British pretension to a mere claim to visit and inquire, yet it could not well be discerned by the Executive of the U. States how such visit and inquiry could be made without detention on the voyage, and consequent interruption to the trade. It was regarded as the right of search, presented only in a new form and expressed in different words; and I therefore felt it to be my duty distinctly to declare, in my annual message to Congress, that no such concessions could be made; and that the United States had both the will and the ability to enforce their own laws; and to protect their own flag from being used for purposes wholly forbidden by those laws, and obnoxious to the moral censure of the world."

This statement would tend, as Lord Aberdeen thinks, to convey the supposition not only that the question of the right of search had been disavowed by the British Plenipotentiary, at Washington, but that Great Britain had made concessions on that point.

Lord Aberdeen is entirely correct in saying that the claim of a right of search was not discussed during the late negotiation, and that neither was any concession required by this Government, nor made by that of Her Majesty.

The 8th and 9th articles of the Treaty of Washington, constitute a mutual stipulation for concerted efforts to abolish the African slave trade. This stipulation, it may be admitted, has no other effects on the pretensions of either party, than that which this Government could not admit as a right, and in the exercise of a just and proper spirit of amity, a mode was resorted to which might render unnecessary both the assertion and the denial of such claim.

There probably are those who think that what Lord Aberdeen calls a right of visit, and which he attempts to distinguish from the right of search, ought to have been expressly acknowledged by the Government of the United States, at the same time, there are those on the other side, who think that the formal surrender of such right of visit should have been demanded by the United States, as a precedent condition to the negotiation for Treaty stipulations on the subject of the American slave trade. But the treaty neither

asserts the claim in terms, nor denies it. Still, the whole proceeding shows, that such differences and disputes as had advantages and inconveniences which, it cannot be denied, are always liable to result from the practice which Great Britain had accustomed to be lawful. These evils and inconveniences had been acknowledged by both Governments. They had been such as to cause much irritation, and to threaten to disturb the amicable sentiments which prevailed between them. Both Governments were sincerely desirous of effecting for their avowed purposes; and likely, at the same time, to preserve all friendly relations, and to take away causes of future individual complaints. The Treaty of Washington was intended to fulfil the obligations entered into by the treaty of Ghent. It stands by itself, its clear and intelligible. It speaks its own language, manifests its own purpose. It needs no interpretation, and requires no comment. As a fact, as an important occurrence in National intercourse, it may have important bearings on existing questions, respecting the public laws and individuals, or perhaps Governments, may not agree as to what these bearings really are. Great Britain has discussions, if not controversies, with other great European States upon the subject of visit or search. These states will naturally make their own commentary on the treaty of Washington, and draw their own inferences from the fact that such a treaty has been entered into. Its stipulations in the mean time, are plain, explicit; satisfactory to both parties, and will be fulfilled on the part of United States, and it is not doubted on the part of Great Britain also, with the utmost good faith.

Holding this to be the true character of the Treaty, I might, perhaps, excuse myself from entering into the consideration of the grounds of that claim of a right to assert for the British Government, which I deem it right, nevertheless, and no more than justly respectful towards the British Government, not to leave the point without remark.

In his recent message to Congress, the President referring to the language of Lord Aberdeen, in his note to Mr. Everett of the 20th December, 1841, and in his late despatch to Mr. Fox, says, "these declarations may well lead us to doubt whether the apparent of difference between the two Governments is not rather one of definition than of principle."

Lord Aberdeen, in his note to you of the 20th of December, says, "the undersigned again renounces, as he has already done in the most explicit terms, any right on the part of the British Government to search American vessels in time of peace. The right of search, except when specially conceded by treaty, is a purely belligerent right, and can have no existence on the high seas during peace. The undersigned apprehends, however, that the right of search is not confined to the verification or nationality of the vessel, but also extends to the object of the voyage and the nature of the cargo. The sole purpose of the British cruisers is to ascertain whether the vessels they meet with are really American or not. The right asserted has, in truth, no resemblance to the right of search, either in principle or practice."

It is simply a right to satisfy the party who has a legitimate interest in knowing the truth, that the vessel actually is what her colors announce. This right we concede as freely as we can.

It is not instructed to detain American vessels, under any circumstances whatever; on the contrary, they are ordered to abstain from interference with them, by their slavers or otherwise. But where reasonable suspicion exists that the American flag has been abused for the purpose of covering the vessel of another nation, it would appear scarcely credible, had it not been made manifest by the repeated protestations of their representative, that the Government of the United States, which has stigmatized and abolished the trade itself, should object to the adoption of such means as are indispensably necessary for ascertaining the truth."

And in his recent despatch to Mr. Fox, his Lordship further says, "that the President might be assured that Great Britain would always respect the just claims of the United States; that the British Government made no pretension to interfere in any manner whatever, either by detention, visit or search, with vessels of the United States, known or believed to be such; but that it still maintained, and would exercise when necessary, its own right to ascertain the genuineness of any flag which a suspected vessel might bear, that if, in the exercise of its right, either from involuntary error, or in spite of every precaution, loss or injury should be sustained, a prompt reparation would be afforded; but that it should entertain, for a single instant, the notion of abandoning the right itself, would be quite impossible."

This, then, is the British claim, as asserted Her Majesty's Government. In his remarks in the speech already referred to, in the House of Commons, the first Minister of the Crown said, "There is nothing more distinct than the right of visit is from the right of search. Search is a belligerent right, and not to be exercised in time of peace, except when it has been conceded by treaty. The right of search extends not only to the vessel but to the cargo also. The right of visit is quite distinct from this. The right of search, with respect to American vessels, we entirely and utterly renounce. If we know the vessel, still we should be bound to let that American vessel pass on. But the right we claim is to know whether a vessel pretending to be American, and hoisting the American flag, is *bona fide* American."

The President's message is regarded as holding opinions in opposition to these. The British Government then suppose that the right of visit and the right of search are essentially distinct in their nature, and that this difference is well known and generally acknowledged; that the difference between them consists in their different objects and purposes; one, the visit having for its object nothing but to ascertain the nationality of the vessel; the other, the search, being an inquisition, not only into the nationality of the vessel, but the nature and objects of her voyage, and the true ownership of her cargo.

The Government of the United States, on the other hand, maintains that there is no such well known and acknowledged, nor, indeed, any broad and genuine difference between what has been usually called visit, and what has been usually called search; that the right of visit, to be effectual, must come in the end to include search; and thus to exercise, in peace, an authority which the law of nations only allows in time of war; and what admission in courts of Admiralty, what treaties recognize it? No such recognition has presented itself to the Government of the United States, but, on the contrary, it understands that public writers, courts of law, and solemn treaties have for two centuries, used the words "visit" and "search" in the same sense. What Great Britain and the United States mean by the "right of search" in its broadest sense, is called by Continental writers and jurists by no other name than the "right of visit." Visit, therefore, as it has been understood, implies not only a right to inquire into the national character, but to detain the vessel, to stop the progress of the voyage, to examine papers, to decide on their regularity and authenticity, and to make inquisition on board, for enemy's property, and into the business which the vessel is engaged in.—In other words, it describes the entire right of belligerent visitation and search. Such a right is justly disclaimed by the British Government in time of peace.—They nevertheless insist on a right which they denominate a right of visit, and by that word describe the claim which they assert; therefore it is proper and due to the importance and delicacy of the questions involved, to take care that, in discussing them, both Governments understand the terms which may be used in the same sense. If, indeed, it should be manifest that the difference between the parties is only verbal, it might be hoped that no harm would be done; but the Government of the United States has always held itself bound, with two great scrupulosity in the use of words, in insisting on its opinion that there is no such distinction, as the British Government maintains, between visit and search; and that there is no right to visit in time of peace, except in the execution of revenue laws, or other municipal regulations, in which cases the right is usually exercised, near the coast, or within the marine league, or where the vessel is justly suspected of violating the law of nations by piratical aggression; but, wherever exercised, it is a right of search. Nor can the United States Government agree that the term "right" is justly applied to such exercise of power, as the British Government thinks it indispensable to maintain in certain cases.

The right asserted is a right to ascertain whether a merchant vessel is justly entitled to the protection of the flag—which she may happen to have hoisted, such vessel being in circumstances which render her liable to the suspicion—first, that she is not entitled to the protection of the flag; and secondly, that if not entitled to it, she is either by the law of England, or an English vessel, or under the provision of treaties with certain European powers, subject to the supervision and search of British cruisers.

And yet Lord Aberdeen says, "that if in the exercise of this right, either from involuntary error, or in spite of every precaution, loss or injury should be sustained a prompt reparation would be afforded."

This, then, is the British claim, as asserted Her Majesty's Government. In his remarks in the speech already referred to, in the House of Commons, the first Minister of the Crown said, "There is nothing more distinct than the right of visit is from the right of search. Search is a belligerent right, and not to be exercised in time of peace, except when it has been conceded by treaty. The right of search extends not only to the vessel but to the cargo also. The right of visit is quite distinct from this. The right of search, with respect to American vessels, we entirely and utterly renounce. If we know the vessel, still we should be bound to let that American vessel pass on. But the right we claim is to know whether a vessel pretending to be American, and hoisting the American flag, is *bona fide* American."

The President's message is regarded as holding opinions in opposition to these. The British Government then suppose that the right of visit and the right of search are essentially distinct in their nature, and that this difference is well known and generally acknowledged; that the difference between them consists in their different objects and purposes; one, the visit having for its object nothing but to ascertain the nationality of the vessel; the other, the search, being an inquisition, not only into the nationality of the vessel, but the nature and objects of her voyage, and the true ownership of her cargo.

The Government of the United States, on the other hand, maintains that there is no such well known and acknowledged, nor, indeed, any broad and genuine difference between what has been usually called visit, and what has been usually called search; that the right of visit, to be effectual, must come in the end to include search; and thus to exercise, in peace, an authority which the law of nations only allows in time of war; and what admission in courts of Admiralty, what treaties recognize it? No such recognition has presented itself to the Government of the United States, but, on the contrary, it understands that public writers, courts of law, and solemn treaties have for two centuries, used the words "visit" and "search" in the same sense. What Great Britain and the United States mean by the "right of search" in its broadest sense, is called by Continental writers and jurists by no other name than the "right of visit." Visit, therefore, as it has been understood, implies not only a right to inquire into the national character, but to detain the vessel, to stop the progress of the voyage, to examine papers, to decide on their regularity and authenticity, and to make inquisition on board, for enemy's property, and into the business which the vessel is engaged in.—In other words, it describes the entire right of belligerent visitation and search. Such a right is justly disclaimed by the British Government in time of peace.—They nevertheless insist on a right which they denominate a right of visit, and by that word describe the claim which they assert; therefore it is proper and due to the importance and delicacy of the questions involved, to take care that, in discussing them, both Governments understand the terms which may be used in the same sense. If, indeed, it should be manifest that the difference between the parties is only verbal, it might be hoped that no harm would be done; but the Government of the United States has always held itself bound, with two great scrupulosity in the use of words, in insisting on its opinion that there is no such distinction, as the British Government maintains, between visit and search; and that there is no right to visit in time of peace, except in the execution of revenue laws, or other municipal regulations, in which cases the right is usually exercised, near the coast, or within the marine league, or where the vessel is justly suspected of violating the law of nations by piratical aggression; but, wherever exercised, it is a right of search. Nor can the United States Government agree that the term "right" is justly applied to such exercise of power, as the British Government thinks it indispensable to maintain in certain cases.

The right asserted is a right to ascertain whether a merchant vessel is justly entitled to the protection of the flag—which she may happen to have hoisted, such vessel being in circumstances which render her liable to the suspicion—first, that she is not entitled to the protection of the flag; and secondly, that if not entitled to it, she is either by the law of England, or an English vessel, or under the provision of treaties with certain European powers, subject to the supervision and search of British cruisers.

And yet Lord Aberdeen says, "that if in the exercise of this right, either from involuntary error, or in spite of every precaution, loss or injury should be sustained a prompt reparation would be afforded."