

satisfactory an issue than a lengthy reply, describing the horrors of the slave trade, with counter-proposals. Sir Stratford returned to the charge in 1823, but only received a copy of an act of Congress, stating the slave trade to be piracy, and that American citizens should be hung if taken *in flagrante*.

But Sir Stratford was not fated to be so successful in his negotiations with the rising republic, as he has since been with the despotic Porte. He kept on writing and urging, but to little purport, save at last, in April, 1824, a treaty was concluded making the slave trade piracy, and conceding the mutual right of visitation and search between the vessels of Great Britain and the United States, *on the coast of Africa, America, and the West Indies*, and signed on the part of Mr. Rush for the latter, and Mr. Huskinson and Mr. Canning for the former country. What fascinations could have been brought to bear on Mr. Rush to sign an agreement so soon to be repudiated at home?

Then we must pass over a long, barren bleak, till we come to the unfertile arrangements of 1842, the terms of which we have previously given, and which seem only to have resulted in the notoriety they have won for the American flag as a safeguard to slave-trading interests, and the principles they have instilled into the minds of the recent meeting of the *soi-disant* ship-owners of New York, that "our flag covers the cargo, whether that cargo consists of niggers or nothing."

If the deck of an American vessel is to be considered as inviolable as American soil, are these the means by which it is to be brought about?

The argument that a ship at sea and a man ashore hold equal rights with regard to visit or arrest, is simply absurd; though if the policeman, following on the wake of a suspicious character on land, can get into his haunts to ascertain the nature of the cargo he is carrying away, he does not generally hesitate upon the question of his right to visit.