NTROVERSY BETWEEN NEW YORK AND VIRGINIA.

Accompanying the Message of Governor Seward, as published by order of the Legislature, is the correspondence growing out of the demand of the Executive of New York, for the secreted of three colored men, viz: Peter Johnson, Edmund Smith and Isaac Gansey, as fugitives from justice ; they having been charged by John G. Colley, of Norfolk, Va., "with fetoniously stealing and taking from him a certain nogro s'ave named lease, the property of the said Colley." The law violated was passed by Virginia before the Revolution.

In the month of July, 1839, these men were arrested upon a warrant of a Police Justice of this city, charging them with being "fugitives from justice," and held in prison, awaiting the action of the Gov-

In this state of the case, the requisition made by the Governor of Virginia for their surrender, was served upon Governor Seward, on the 30th of July, on the eve of his departure for Auburn. The papers being in the view of Gov. Seward defective and un satisfactory, he informed the agent who served the requisition, that the defects might be supplied, and directed the Sheriff of Now York, who held the men in custody, to notify the prisoners of the charge, so as to give them an "opportunity of being heard, before deciding upon the requisition."

Gov Seward then proceeded to Auburn, and arrived after fifteen days. In the mean time, Recorder Morris had the men brought before him upon habeas corpus, and ordered them to be discharged from custody, on the ground that "according to the testimony before him, neither of the prisoners had committed an offence even against the law of Virginia, and that the testimony was not such as to authorise the detention of the pusoners." The case, it may be remembered, caused much excitement at the time.

It was proved before the Recorder, that the slave was "a ship carpenter, and had ocen engaged at Norfolk in repairing the schooner on board of which the three prisoners were hands; that after the schooner sailed, the slave was not to be found; that they (the owners) by express reached the harbor of New York before the schooner arrived; that they went on board the schooner and made known to the Captain (a white man) their suspicions that the slave was concealed on board." Search was accordingly made, (the Captain siding in it,) and the slave was found concealed among the live oak timber. The prisoners were the only colored men on board, and it was proved by the confession of the slave, that one of them told the slave he was foolish to remain in Virginia as he could get good wages North, and that this suggestion induced him to run away and secrete himself on board

The slave was carried back to Virginia by his master. On the 30th August following, the Governor of Virginia called the attention of Gov. Seward to the requisition, and desired him to dispose of it without delay. In his letter he states, -

" As the demand was founded upon the accusation of an offence peculiarly and deeply affecting the general interest of the good people of this Commonwealth-recognized as felony and severely punished by our laws-and as, if longer delay is permitted, the off inders may escape altogether. I trust you will excuse my anxiety for callthat you will dispose of it with all convenient promptitude after the receipt of this letter, and apprise me of the result."

Gov Seward, on the 16th of September. replies, as the reason for delay, that after his arrival at Albany he learned from the public papers that the prisoners had been discharged by the Recorder, on the ground, as he supposed, that the requisition and affidavit were deemed ausufficient, and that he inferred from the silence of the agent who served the requisition, that the application had been abandoned, or the decision of the tend beyond the limits I have mentioned, of all the States by requiring the prompt surren-Recorder acquiesced in.

He then proceeds to examine the supposed defects in the affidavit and requisition, and declines to deliver the supposed fugitives to be carried to Virginia for trial, not a felony within the meaning of the Con-

Gov. Seward, in defence of this ground

" Admitting the affidavit to be sufficient in form and substance to charge the defendants with the crime of stealing a negro slave from his master in Virginia, as defined by the laws of that State, yet in my opinion the offence is not within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States. The words employed in the Constitution, "treason, felony or other crime," are indeed very comprehensive. It has long Leen conceded that citizens of the State upon which the requisition is made, are hable to be surrendered as well as citizens of the State making the demand; and it is further regarded as unsettled that the discretion of the executive in making the demand is unlimited, while the executive upon whom it is made, has no legal right to refuse compliance if the offence charged is an act of "treason, felony or other crime," within the meaning of the Constitution Can any State at its pleasure declare an act to be treason, felony or crime and thus bring it within the constitution provision I confess that such does not seem to me to be the proper construction of the constitution. After due consideration; I am of opinion that the provisions applies only to those acts which, if committed within the jurisdiction of the State in which the person accused is found, would be treasonable, felopious or criminal. by the laws of that State.

different its enactments may be from those | State has t existing in their own State. The true ques- the govern tion is, whether the State of which they are rights that car citizens is under a constitutional obligation e goty is done to surrender us citizens to be carried to the that which of offended State, and there tried for offences scrupulously to unknown to the laws of their own State. I do her an injur

are recognized as crimes before the universal law of all civilized countries. I think it is also well understood that the object of the constitutional provision in question was to recognize and establish this principle in the mutual relations of the States, as independent, equal and sovereign communities. As they could form no treaties between themselves, it was necessarily engrafted in the Constitution. I cannot doubt that this construction is just Civil liberty would be very imperfectly secured in any country whose government was bound to surrender its citizens to be tried and condemned in foreign jurisdiction for acts not prohibited by its own laws. The principle, if adopted, would virtually extend the legislation of a State beyond its own territory and over the citizens of another State, and ects which he policy and habits of one State may lead its legislature to panish as felony, must be considered of that hemous character in another State for certain purposes, while for all other purposes they would be regarded as violations of moral law.

In some of the States of the Union, adultery is made a felony; in another the being a father of a illegitimate child is made a crime; and in another marriage without license or other formalities is penal. To admit the principle that violations of these and similar laws, which are in their character mere municipal regulations adapted to the policy of a particular community, are felonies" and "crimes" within the meaning of the Constitution, would involve the most serious consequences by imposing obligations which it would be impossible to execute. It is evident there must be some limit to the description of "crimes" meant by the Constitution; and that which I have applied in this instance, seems to me to give full and fair scope to the provision, and at the same time preserve the right of exclu- for the charge, and sufficient to put the accused sive legislation to each State over persons confessedly within its jurisdiction, while it preserves that harmony which is so essential to our mutual interest.

The offence charged in the affidavit before me, is not understood to be that kind of kidnapping a person, by which he was deprived of his liberty or held in duress, or suffered personal grong or injustice, but is understood to mean the taking of a slave, considered as property, from his owner. If I am incorrect in this supposition, the vagueness and uncertainty of the affidavit must excuse my error But I think there can be no controversy upon this point. I need not inform you, sir, that there is no law of this State which recognizes slavery, no statute which admits that one man can be the property of another, or that one man can be stolen from another. On the other hand our Constitution and laws abolish slavery in every form. The act charged in the affidavit, if it had been committed in this State, would not contravene any statute, nor is it necessary to inform you that the common law, which is in force in this State when not abrogated by statute, does not re- felony, cognize slavery, nor make the act of which ing your attention to the subject, and asking the parties are accused in this case feloni-

It results from this view of the subject that the offence charged in the all latend specified in the requisition, is not a felony I full and complete execution of this provision of nor a crime within the meaning, of the constitution; and that waiving all the defects in the affidavit, I cannot surrender the supposed fagitives to be carried to Virginia for trial under the statute of that State.

So far as my knowledge extends, no State has ever admitted the constitutional obligation to surrender its citizens, to exalthough demands have been made in cases simalar to the one under consideration. If I entertained doubts of the justness of the views I have expressed, I should be very unwilling to establish a precedent so full of zens of this State.

The Executive of Virginia, under date of October 4, 1839, acknowledges the receipt of this answer from Gov. Seward, and after recapitulating the substauce of it, the citizens of Pennsylvania and Ohio may en ges of nations as expounded by Chancellor Kent proceeds as follows:

pletely at war with what I understand to be the law of nations governing the intercourse, the rights and obligations of separate and foreign countries, and by consequence yet more inconsistent with the you may in vain demand their surrender. You town clerks neglecting to return names of confriendly and federal relations of these States. as prescribed by a Constitution of government fully considered and freely adopted entered your territory for the predetermined pur- ers of boarding houses neglecting to report for- of guilt. In the fluctuations of trade, the they were spoken. by each in its foreign capacity, that I cannot agree by remaining silent to be considered as acquiescing for a moment in their correctness. According to the laws of nature and of nations, every independent community of people has an undoubted right to form for itself a civil society-to construct its own form of government-to devise and enact its own system of laws -to conduct its internal or municipal regplations in such manner as may best conduce to its own happiness and prosperity all such polit cal relations and commercial ward Smith and Isaac Gansey, is not recognized equal number of petty offences. Can it be posarrangements with other countries as may pot be in conflict with the universal principles of justice, and the rights of other nations. It thus becomes a free, independent and sovereign State, and assumes its proper station among the great family of na-I do not question the constitutional right citizens of any other country can rightly (the property stolen being a slave.) "that there classes of offences" to which the constitutional of a State to make such a penal code as it interfere with its municipal regulations in shall deem necessary or expedient, nor do I any way. "It is an evident consequence claim that citizens of another State shall be of the liberty and independence of nations, siden from another. Now, sir, need I tell you any rule more safe, more liberal, or less calcula-

other. Of all the o a nation. soverost precions, and they would not The citizens of no believe the right to demand and the recipro- other country are in any wise bound to put cal obligation to surrender fugitives from foot upon her soil; but if they choose of justice between sovereign and independent their own free will to do, they become at netions, include only those cases in which once entitled to the protection, and subject the acts constituting the offence charged, to the penalties of her laws; and during their sojourn are in duty bound to deport themselves as good and orderly members of the society to which they have thus temporarily attached themselves. Should they choose to pursue a different course, however, by injuring the citizens-destroying or purloining their property, and violating the laws, they then forfeit their right of protection, and subject themselves to the punishment affixed by the supreme authority to their offences.

According to Vallet, page 162 : " If the offended State has in her power the individual who has done the injury, she may, without scruple bring him to justice and ponish him. If he has escaped and returned to his own country, she ought to apply to his savereign to have justice done in the case. And since the latter ought not to suffer his subject to molest the subjects of other States, or do them an injury, much less to give open audacious offence to foreign powers, he ought to compel the transgressor to make reparation for the damages or injury if possible, or to inflict on him an examplary punishment; or finally, according to the nature and circumstances of the case, to deliver him up to the offended State, to be there brought to justice."

In strict accordance with these views, are those expressed by a very able and distinguished citizen of your State, James Kent, in the first volume of his commentaries, page 36. "It has sometimes been made a question how far one go vernment was bound by the law of nations, and independent of treaty, to surrender upon demand fugitives from justice, who having committed crimes in one country flee to another for shelter. It is declared by the public jurists that every State is bound to deny any ayslam to criminals; and upon application and due examination of the case, to surrender the fugitive to the foreign and the law and usage of nations rest on the plainest principles of justice. It is the duty of the government to surrender up fugitives upon demand, after the civil magistrate shall have as certained the existence of reasonable grounds upon his trial." Thus then it is seen, even in reference to nations not bound by treaty or confederated by compact, that the usage of surrendering fugitives from justice is observed and cherished in the most liberal spirit. But the principle is greatly enlarged in its application to those countries situated near each other, and whose citizens are engaged in constant negotiations or frequent intercourse the one with the other. In such cases the duty of each sovereign to restrain his subjects from interfering with those of the other, becomes indispensably necessary to secure the blessings of peace, and to avoid the evils of a constant state of war. Hence Vattel, page 183, observes, "The matter is carried still further in states that are more closely connected by friendship and good neighborhood. Even in cases of ordinary transgressions which are only subjects of civil prosecution, either with a view to the recovery of damages or the infliction of a slight civil punishment the subjects of two neighboring states are reciprocally obliged to appear before the magistrate of the place where they are accused of baving fail ed in their daty."

eral Constitution is found the following clause: ed in any State with treason, authority of the State delivered up to be reing jurisdiction of the es passed an act providing for the General Government, by prescribing the form in which the demand should be made, and requiring the surrender accordingly. (See laws of the United States, by Story, vol. 1, page 284.) Thus the framers of the Federal Constitution intended not only to secure to " the citizens of each State all privileges and immunities of the several States," but to preserve unimpaired the happy and harmonious relations der of every person who shall commit a criminal offence in one State, and flee to another for protection, to be removed for trial and punishment " to the State having jurisdiction of the erime." But according to your Excellency's construction of this clause, the terms "treason. on the ground that "the offence charged is danger to the personal security of the citi- felony, or other crime," although comprehensive enough to embrace all criminal offenders and to reach all fugitives from justice, must be so restricted and interpreted as to include all such of fences as " are recognized as crimes by the uni- imprisonment in the State prison," so that they versai laws of all civilized countries" Thus would not be subjects of demand under the usa-Now, sir, these doctrines are so com. thousand offences made criminal by your laws, larceny; extorting by threatening letters; ma to the great annoyance and injury of your people, king conveyances to defraud creditors; conceal-but if they happen to be crimes peculiarly affectment of property by insolvent debtors; buying ting the inhabitants of New York, or of a grade lands in suit; buying a pretended title; transor character each not " recognized as crimes by acting business in the name of a party not inthe universal laws of all civilized countries," terested; wantonly opening a lock on a canal; ion, the law should be permanent, and not worthy of an American, it may punish your own citizens for committing stables; any violation of health laws; entering similar offences, but those of other States who the quarantine ground without authority; keeppose of violating your laws-injuring the rights, e guers arriving by sea: ferrying without li-State exulting in their crimes, and it is neither day time; adulterating distilled spirits or sel!- ject to his creditor, and to put his future lib-

In the 4th article and 2d section of the Fed.

tween the States, would, in my humble judg in the State adopting such code, however governed as they think proper; and that no New York, but those of Virginia, that the de- in my termer letter, to wit, to confine the appli- row was flowing, I enjoy in the act a grati- cy of States was a line

ght to interfere in | mand was made? and breause the injury inflic- | cation of the constitutional provision to those of | figure which my feeble ted upon a citizen of Virginia happens not to be fonces which are forbidden by the laws of this recognized as criminal by the laws of N. York, State, and when the principles of these laws although expressly made felony by the laws of conflict with those of the laws of other States, this State, you refuse to surrender the offender, to refer the question to the test of the laws of and, by consequence, to decline all agency in all other civilized countries, redressing the grievance complained of. I do The next letter from the not mean to be drawn into a discussion of the abstract right of slavery, or to urge any argue the resolutions of the Virginia Legislature, to guments against the right or property of any whom the subject had been referred, and presents nation or people to interfere with our domestic various additional arguments to show that the institutions. That, I assure you, sir, with all Governor of New York is in error in the grounds possible deference, is not with the people of Vir he had taken. The following are the resoluginia a debateable question. Upon that subject tions I need only add, Virginia knows her rights and will at all times maintain them

> It is the essence of sound construction that the obligations of the constitution should be made to apply uniformly and equally to all -the States and their citizens respectively -and yet because the stealing of a slave is made felony in Maryland and not in New York, two citizens of hese States may confederate and come into Virginia and steal a slave, and fiee to their respeclive States for refoge; and upon a demand from the G vernor of this State for the surrender of each, the constitution, according to your view. requires the Governor to surrender the offending citizen of that State, but does not require you to surrender the offending citizen of your State. The conclusion is, that the constitution which was designed to confer upon the citizens of all the States precisely equal rights, authorizes the punishment of a citizen of Maryland for the perpetration of a crime for which it excuses a citizen of New York-although both are equally guilty. Such could never have been the intention of those who framed the constitution. Their sense of justice would have revolted at the very idea of such inequality and iniquity.

The State of Virginia has an unquestionable right to devise its own system of jurisprudence -to regulate by law the conduct of its own citzens-to declare what shall constitute property within her borders-and to secure her people in the free acquisition, tenure and enjoyment of it -and finally to declare what acts shall be considered felonious or criminal, and to denounce upon those who commit them such punishment as her Legislature may prescribe. Should a citizen of New York come within her dominions, while here he can claim the protoction of her laws for the security of his person and his property; but on the contrary, should be com-State where the crime was committed. The mit an act made criminal by her laws and then language of the authorities is clear and explicit; flee to New York, the federal constitution, the the same time, informed the Governor of Virgilaws of nations, and ever offended justice itself authorizes Virginia to demand, and requires New York to surrender him for trial-not, as I have said, for violating the laws of New York, but those of Virginia. All the writers upon in ternational law, I believe, concur in the doctrine of Mr. Kent, " The guilty party cannot be tried and punished by any other juricdiction than the one whose laws have been violated." And the constitution of the United States expressly declares that he shall be delivered up " to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the

Governor Seward, under date of Oct. 24 1939, replies to this letter at considerable length and denies what he states to be the position of the Executive of Virginia, viz: " that it is the duty of the State upon which a requisition is made, to deliver up its citizens when charged with any crime, without reference to the nature of the offence;" and in regard to the quotation from Chancellor Kent, he insists upon the whole of the Chancellor's opinion on the subject, a part only of which had been given by the Executive

of Virginia. He says,-

The Chancellor continues the discussion by saying "the only difficulty in the absence positive agreement consists in drawing the line between the classes of offences to which the usage of nations does, and to which it does not apply, inasmuch as it is understood in practice to apply only to crimes of great atrocity or deep ly affecting the public safety." In accordance with Chancellor Kent's exposition are the views presented by other writers of great authority .-Grottus admits that some ages past, the right of demanding fagitive delinquents has not been insisted on in most parts of Europe, except in crimes against the State or those of a very heinous nature. As for the lesser faults, they are connived at on both sides unless it is otherwise agreed on by some particular treaty. You will permit me here to say with all respect, that it is the "usage of nations" as it is "understood in practice," that we are seeking to ascertain, and that the difficulty in the present case is the very difficulty mentioned by Chancellor Kent. The question under consideration, stated in the language of Chancellor Kent, would be wheth er the crime mentioned in your requisition is a crime of "great atrocity or deeply affecting the public safety." I must respectfully insist that I cannot as a magistrate and in a case involving the liberty of cruzens of this State, admit that to be a crime of this character, which the laws of this State do not pronounce to be even a

Let us now inquire what would be the conse-

quences of your position. By the laws of this State the following offences are declared to be | der a uniform system of bankruptcy highly | effect upon the audieuce misdemeanors, that is, crimes of a grade lower than felony. They are not crimes of "great atrocity or deeply affecting the public safety, not are they crimes "punishable with death or ter the territory of New York and commut a or as recognized by laws of this State. Petit and disturbing the repose of your peaceful and cense; selling goods by auction in violation of unoffending countrymen may flee from your laws; auctioneers selling goods except in the your right to demand, nor the duty of their Go- ing such spirits; defacing mile stones; cheatverpor to surrender them for trial and punish- ing at play; winning or losing more than twen ty-five dollars in twenty four hours; driver of Such a construction of the clause in question a carriage rushing his burses; negligently sufwould utterly defeat the object of those wise and fering fire to run beyond one's own land; setting sagacious statesmen who framed the federal up of drawing lotteries; selling or buying tickets compact; and instead of promoting neace be- in such letteries; racing animals; and all offences against the laws relating to excise and to the ment, cherish a constant state of excitement and regulation of taverns and greceries. Undoubtcollision between them. But, sir, is it true that edly the Legislature of every one of the twen--and to establish by treaty or otherwise the offence committed by Peter Johnson, Ed- ty-six States in the Union has defined about an -claim on the liberty or the future independas criminal by " the universal laws of all civil | sible that the article of the Constitution was inized countries?" They are charged with felo- tended to establish a system of police by which niously stealing from John G. Colley, a citizen the citizens of the respective States should, at of this State, property which could not have the pleasure of magistrates of other States, be been worth less than some six or seven hundred transported as criminals to other States upon is no law of his State which recognizes slavery; provision does and to which it does not apply -no statute which admits that one man can be In drawing this line for my own guidance in the the property of another, or that one man can be exercise of this power. I have looked in vain for

The next letter from the Governor of Virginis, under date of April 6, 1840, communicates

Resolved. That the reason assigned by Governor of New York for his refusal to surrender Peter Johnson, Edward Smith, and Isaac Gansey, as fugitives from justice, upon the demand of the Executive of this State, are wholly uosatisfactory; and that that refusal is a palpable and dangerous violation of the Constitution and laws of the United States

Residued, That the course pursued by the Ex ecutive of New York cannot be acquiesced in and if sanctioned by that State, and persisted in, will become the solemn duty of Virginia to adopt the most decisive and efficient measures for the protection of the property of her citizens, and the maintenance of rights, which she cannot, and will not, under any circumstances, surrender or abandon "

"Resolved, That the Governor of this State be authorized and requested to renew his correspondence with the Executive of New York requesteng that that functionary will review the grounds taken by him, and that he will urge the consideration of the subject upon the Legisla ure of his State."

" Resolved, That the Governor of Virginia be requested to open a correspondence with the Executive of each of the slaveholding states, requesting their co-operation in any necessary and proper measure of redress which Virginia may be forced to adopt."

" Resolved. That the Governor of Virginia be requested to forward copies of these proceedings to the Executive of each State of this Union, with the request that they be laid before their respective Legislatures."

Governor Seward, in compliance with the re quest in these resolutions, laid the subject before the Legis'ature in April last, upon which however, in the Senate, no action was had; but in Assembly, a committee reported, in substance, that " the positions taken by the Governor of the State were sound and judicious." He, at nia, that some delay would necessarily ensue in consequence of this reference to the Legislature before he could return an answer. During the past summer, several short leriers passed between the two Governors, the burden of which on the part of the Governor of Virginia, was, to remind Gov. Seward of his promise to give the subject due consideration and a final answer 've ry soon." At length, on the 9th of November, 1840, Gov. Seward forwarded his answer, in which he reviews the whole ground of the matter at issue; maintains bis previously assumed pesition, and strengthens it with additional argaments; refuses to accede to the requisition, and denies the applicability to such a case as this, of the existing inter-national or inter-State laws,

respecting " fugitives from justice." On the receipt of this answer, the Governor of Virginia offered a reward for the apprehension of the three individuals before named, and open ed a correspondence with the Executive of each of the slave holding States, as directed by the 4th resolution above quoted. On the 2d of De cember, he sent a special message on the subject, to the Legislature of Virginia, then in session, in which he informs them of the result of the correspondence, and presents anew to their consideration the whole subject, with his reasons, at great length, in opposition to the views of Governor Seward

He recommends in this Message, the appoint ment of one or more special commissioners on the part of Virginia, for the purpose of bringing, the quastion directly before the Legislature of New York and ascertaining whether that body concurs in the views of Governor Seward, of which he expresses his disbelief, not withstanding the report of the Assembly's Committee.

In this position the matter rests at present. [New York Jour. of Com.

BANKRUPT LAW.

We give below an extract from a letter by Col. R. M. Johnson, on this subject, that

our readers may know his views. " In the 1st article, eighth section, fourth clause, of the Constitution, it provides that Congress shall have power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform the points Mr. Calhoun laws on the subject of bankruptsies, through- establish. As the Senate out the United States .- It was seen by the ever, the subject seemed framers of that instrument, that the relations between the crizens of different States, and led into one of the most especially between the trading communities | displays of eloquence and of the different towns and cities, would renimportant to their interests. In this grant remarkable silence and a of power, the patriachs of our independence | vailed, and the very evidently considered it the discharge of a sacred duty; and it is difficult for me to assign any good cause why this provision has disposed to rebuke. not been carried into effect, unless it has terized by a gush of pa been prevented by clashing sentiments upon prehending in its sym its details, as it cannot be controverted by country, North, South, I any that bankrupts, innocent, unfortunate States as sovereign bankrupts, have always existed, upon which looking to their present such a law would operate; and in my epin- and to their future glory temporary "

"It is repugnant to every principle of jus- and a solidity of argus tice to regard bankruptcy as a presumption by the pure English most honorable men are often its victims, | controversy with Gen. I and to hold the person of the debtor suberty or acquisitions beyond his own control, of Congress, over the when he has surrendered all, is to inflict a domain, was derived f nunishment where there is no crime, nor Constitution which ex criminal tribunal to investigate a crime, or ritory belonging to the to prescribe its punishment.

"Credit in trade is based upon confidence without limitation. in the success of him who obtains it, and Congress, had a general ought not in any degree to depend upon a revenue by taxes, and contingent right which the creditor may be exercised in a sound ence of the debtor. If he chance to be unsuccessfull, all that they can claim is a faith- original grants of these full surrender of his remaining effects. Let the States, and the coul him give these and begin the world again." second, to the powers of

"The interest of the debtor, the interest ernment and the State dollars. And I understand stealing to be recog. charges for offences of this description? Yet of the creditor, the interest of society, and especially to the important nized as crime by all laws, human and divine .- this must be true, onless, in the language of the glory of our country, all conspute to had parted with the ite tions. Neither the government nor the But you escape this conclusion by informing me Chancellur Kent, "a line be drawn between the sanction the measure. The object of Gov- power of collecting revi ernment ought always to be the mitigation purposes by duties on of human misery, and the advancement of third, to the actual co human happiness, as far as possible. If I the States in regard to de can light up the smile of gladness, even in He deprecated the con exempted from arrest, trial and punishment (says Vattel,] that all have a right to be it was not for an offence against the laws of ted to give just offence than that insisted upon one solitary bosom, where the tear of sor- were made to the new a right to be it was not for an offence against the laws of ted to give just offence than that insisted upon one solitary bosom, where the tear of sor- were made to the new a right to be it was not for an offence against the laws of ted to give just offence than that insisted upon

The law should em ing at the passage of the which may happen in fu views upon this subje myself as a standard for as I am, I could not act violation of conscience at of solemn duty. Fur I the system should be est cial effects would be f our country, and esnecial whole trading common which I believe prevails i Europe, and in every cavi globe. Indeed, from t the Jews, though an egric their septennial years of general jubilees. It is t a different form : the sar principle for the same of all power is based on the We have no legal or but the rich and the poor. unfortunate, are all equ perual revolution of prop coming rich, and the rich and to suffer any un to enterprise, is to of the nation. If the bankrupt law gives, ext visions to all who desire it other country, it is much great Republic. Most respectfully your

From the Mad

THE DEBATES IN The debates in the tw gress during the past week esting, and in many instan hibiting a marked degree general knowledge, and tive to public affairs.

The principal topic in the land system, connecte cidental but highly interes of Ky., has borne a consp. he has discharged with a and tact, which have already wide spread f The continued attacks Wright, Buchanan, and and parried in a manner ants in a defensive p of the Globe upon this false and unmannerly. Mangum, of N. C. which few days ago, was a order of merit. That S C., was characterized eloquence which have on distinguished that gentle of Indians, brought to th conversant with the su to argumentation. Mr. State adduced a variety ing information, and striking views of the highly animated and cipal Speakers in opr Wright, Benton, Calho and the debate was co by Mr. Webster, in rei and yesterday by Mr. I

On the occasion of A on Saturday, the S crowded with auditors Calhour consumed the the morning in a speech say was wholly onse from which we were solitary substantial sition to cede the public which they lie, ought to considered by the Senat tleman denounced the

tion, as unconstitutional

Mr. Webster follower notice merely, as was i nor of his introductory tance in his bands, and ever been our good fortun on one occasion could i which no one of either were enforced by an elec-Mr. Webster has so gr

Mr. Webster maintai trol of the national Lag

To guide and direct gress might look, first,