confined to fuch goods or effects as are exposed to view, or can be come at.

They are indeed called Agents, and are named by the parties, but they are certainly very different from the perfons utually underftood under that denomination. They are in reality appointed by the Prize Act for certain fpecial purpofes. They are rather officers of the Court than agents of the parties. To the Court of Admiralty they give fecurity, and that not a fecurity in each particular cafe, but a general fecurity for the due performance of their general duties. They are under the controul and direction of the Court as of its proper authority, independent of any act, or motion of the Captors. The parties have no controul over the property in their hands, they cannot take it out, or direct the cifpofal of it, but according to the reftrictions of the Act. Nor can they give any authority to him to retain it in his hands, after the expiration of the time limited. And they are not Agents for the Captors only, but for all other perfons intereftedthey are Agents as well for Greenwich Hospital as for the Sailors.

3. I think there is fome weight likewife in the obfervation made by the Solicitor General, that a failor, coming here, for a flort time, in His Majefty's Service, can fcarcely be the perfon intended by the Act, under the defeription of an abfent or abfconding debtor—To be abfent, or to abfcond, implies a previous refidence, and how can a perfon be confidered as a refident who accidentally vifits this harbour in one of His Majefty's Ships, and has nothing like a domicil within the Province?

In the cates of Sill v. Boswick, and Hunter v.

Pot Lav for mer the give $\mathbf{2}$ the fhev cauf beca felf, Ι not beca nant fore I ed a take land tion expi which conj muf the faid as th the and of th Law