The House then resolved itself into a Committee on the Message, when Mr. Bayard proceeded, in answer to Mr. Livingston, in which he spoke about three hours, after which the House adjourned.

FRIDAY, March 7.

The amendments of the Senate to the bill declaring the assent of Congress to certain acts of the States of Maryland and Georgia, were referred to the Committee of Revision and Unfinished Business.

Mr. SPaight, from the committee appointed for that purpose, reported a bill to alter the times of holding the District Court of North Carolina; which was read a first and second time, and committed for Monday next.

Mr. Harner presented a petition of about fifty families, residing on a tract of territory ceded by the United States of North Carolina, stating that they had been left unprotected and unacknowledged by any civil authority, and praying to be placed under such government as Congress in their wisdom may see fit. Referred to a select committee, to consider and report thereon.

WASHINGTON, March, 1800.

The House took up the unfinished business of the day, and the question, Will the House agree with the Committee of the Whole in their disagreement with Mr. Livingston’s resolutions respecting the District Court of North Carolina? being under consideration,

Mr. Marshall, said, believing, as he did most seriously, that in a Government constituted like that of the United States, much of the public happiness depended, not only on its being rightly administered, but on the measures of Administration being rightly understood—on rescuing public opinion from those numerous prejudices with which so many causes might combine to surround it, he could not but have been highly gratified with the very eloquent, and what was still more valuable, the very able and very correct argument which had been delivered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. Bayard) against the resolutions now under consideration. He had not expected that the effect of this argument would be universal,
but he had cherished the hope, and in this he had not been disappointed, that it would be very extensive. He did not flatter himself with being able to shed much new light on the subject; but, as the argument in opposition to the resolutions had been assailed with considerable ability by gentlemen of great weight, he trusted the House would not think the time misspent which would be devoted to the reestablishment of the principles contained in that argument, and to the refutation of those advanced in opposition to it. In endeavoring to do this and to its own observations in support of the resolutions, not in the precise order in which they were made; but as they applied to the different points he deemed it necessary to maintain, in order to demonstrate, that the conduct of the Executive of the United States could not justly be charged with the errors imputed to it by the resolutions.

His first proposition, he said, was that the case of Thomas Nash, as stated to the President, was committed to the Senate in the 27th article of the Treaty of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation, entered into between the United States of America and Great Britain.

He read the article, and then observed: The _canon fidebris_ of this article occurs, when a person, having committed murder or forgery within the jurisdiction of one of the contracting parties, and having sought an asylum in the country of the place where he was found, is charged with his delivery, and the same is demanded, on such proof of his guilt as, according to the laws of the place where he shall be found, would justify his apprehension and commitment for trial, if the offence had there been committed.

The case stated is, that Thomas Nash, having committed murder on board of a British frigate, navigating the high seas, under a commission from His Britannic Majesty, had sought an asylum within the United States; on this case his delivery was demanded by the Minister of the King of Great Britain.

It is manifest that the case stated, if supported by proof, is within the letter of the article, provided a murder committed in a British frigate, on the high seas, be committed within the jurisdiction of that nation. That such a murder is within its jurisdiction, has been fully shown by the gentleman from Delaware. The principle is, that the jurisdiction of a nation extends to the whole of its citizens, whether within its own territories or not.

This general principle is especially true, and is particularly recognised with respect to the fleets of a nation on the high seas. To punish offences committed in its fleet, is the practice of every nation in the universe; and consequently the opinion of the world is, that a fleet at sea is within the jurisdiction of the nation to which it belongs. _Rutherfo rd_, vol. ii. p. 491, says: "there can be no doubt about the jurisdiction of a nation over the persons which compose its fleets, when they are at sea, whether they arewarded or presently stationed in any particular part of it."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Gallatin) though he has not directly controverted this doctrine, has sought to weaken it by observing that the jurisdiction of a nation at sea could not be complete even in its own vessels; and in support of this position he urged the admitted practice of submitting to search for contraband - a practice not tolerated on land, within the territory of a neutral Power. The rule is as stated; but is founded on a principle which does not affect the jurisdiction of a nation over its citizens or subjects in its ships. The principle is, that in the sea itself a nation has jurisdiction over its citizens or subjects, and a belligerent Power to prevent aid being given to his enemy, is not restrained by any superior right of a neutral in the place. But, if this argument possessed any force, it would not apply to national ships-of-war, since the usage of nations does not permit them to be searched.

According to the practice of the world, then, and the opinions of writers on the law of nations, the judge committed his delivery, as demanded by the Minister of the King of Great Britain.

It is deemed unnecessary to controvert this construction, because the proposition, that the United States had no jurisdiction over the murder committed by Thomas Nash, is believed to be completely demonstrable.

It is not true that all nations have jurisdiction over all offences committed at sea. On the contrary, no nation has any jurisdiction at sea, but over its own citizens or vessels, or offences against itself. This principle is laid down in 2 _Ruther ford_, 488, 491.

The American Government has, on a very solemn occasion, avowed the same principle. The first Minister of the French Republic asserted and exercised powers of so extraordinary a nature, as unavoidably to produce a controversy with the United States. The situation in which the Government then found itself was such as necessarily to occasion a very serious and mature consideration of the opinions it should adopt. Of consequence, the opinions then declared deserve great respect. In the case alluded to, Mr. Genet had asserted the right of fitting out privateers in the American ports, and of making war upon American citizens in order to cruise against nations with whom America was at peace. In rea-
I.A common jurisdiction."

Bniate part of each nation, on an element where all have redations on the members of nations at peace with us, Secretary of State, in his letter of the 17th of June, 1793, says:

"For our citizens then to commit murders and depredations on the members of nations at peace with us, or to combine to do it, appeared to the Executive, and to those whom they consulted, as much against the laws of the land, to murder or rob, or combine to murder or rob its own citizens; and as much to require punishment, if done within their limits, where they have a territorial jurisdiction, or on the high seas, where they have no jurisdiction. That is to say what reaches their own citizens only; this being an appropriate part of each nation, on an element where all have a common jurisdiction."

The well considered opinion, then, of the American Government on this subject is, that the jurisdiction of a nation at sea is "personal," reaching its own citizens only, and that this is the "appropriate part of each nation" on that element.

This is precisely the opinion maintained by the opponents of the resolutions. If the jurisdiction of America at sea be personal, reaching its own citizens only; if this be its appropriate part, then the jurisdiction of the nation cannot extend to a murder committed by a British sailor, on board a British frigate, or navigating the high seas under a commission from His Britannic Majesty.

As a further illustration of the principle contended for, suppose a contract made at sea, and a suit instituted for the recovery of money which might belong. It had been observed by his colleague, (Mr. BAYARD,) for the purpose of showing that the distinction taken on this subject by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. BAYARD) was inaccurate, that any vessel robbed on the high seas could be the property only of a single nation, and being only an offence against that nation, could be, on the principle taken by the opponents of the resolutions, no offence against the law of nations; but in this his colleague had not accurately considered the principle. As a man who turns out to rob on the highway, and forces from a stranger his purse with a pistol at his bosom, is not the particular enemy of that stranger, but alike the enemy of every man who carries a purse, so those who without a commission rob on the high seas, manifest a temper hostile to all nations, and therefore become the enemies of all. The same inducements which occasion the robbery of a single vessel, exist to occasion the robbery of others, and therefore the single offence is an offence against the whole community of nations, manifests a temper hostile to all, is the commencement of an attack on all, and is consequently, of right, punishable by all.

His colleague had also contended that all the offences at sea, punishable by the British statutes from which the act of Congress was in a great degree copied, were piracies at common law, or by the law of nations, and as murder is among those, consequently murder was an act of piracy by the law of nations, and therefore punishable by every nation. In support of this position he had cited 1 Blant. P. C. 367, 271-3, Inst. 112, and 1 Wood. 140.

The amount of these cases is, that no new of-
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acts of Parliament” change the law as to others than “British subjects”? The words are general, “all treasons, felonies, &c.” Why are they confined in construction to British subjects? The answer is a plain one: The jurisdiction of the American courts has been confined to its territory and to its own subjects.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Gal-
L) abandons, and very properly abandons, this untenable ground. He admits, that in this case, the United States have not been the enemy of nations, and that the United States can only punish offences against their own laws and the law of nations. He admits, too, that if there had only been a mutiny (and consequently if there had only been a murder) on board the Hermione, that the American courts could have taken no cognizance of the crime. Yet mutiny is punishable as piracy by the law of both nations. That gentleman contends that the act committed by Nash was piracy, according to the law of nations. He supports his position by insisting that the offence may be constituted by the commission of a single act; that unauthorized robbery on the high seas is this act, and that the crew having seized the vessel, and being out of the protection of any nation, were pirates.

It is true that the offence may be completed by a single act; but it depends on the nature of that act. In a single act of unprovoked violence committed on the high seas, against the world—an intention to rob generally, then it is piracy; but if it be merely a mutiny and murder in a vessel, for the purpose of delivering it up to the enemy, it is piracy against a single nation and not to be piracy. The sole object of the crew might be to go over to the enemy, or to free themselves from the tyranny experienced on board a ship-of-war, and not to rob generally.

But, should it even be true that running away with a vessel to deliver her up to an enemy was an act of general piracy, punishable by all nations, yet the mutiny and murder was a distinct offence. Had the attempt to seize the vessel failed, after the commission of the murder, then, according to the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the American courts could have taken no cognizance of the crime. Whatever then might have been the law respecting the piracy, of the murder there was no jurisdiction. For the murder, not the piracy, Nash was delivered up. Murder, and not piracy, is comprehended in the 27th article of the treaty between the two nations. Had he been tried then and acquitted on an indictment for the piracy, he must still have been delivered up for the murder, of which the court could have no jurisdiction. It is certain that an acquittal of the piracy would not have discharged the murder; and, therefore, in the so much relied on trials at Trenton, a separate indictment for murder was filed after an indictment for piracy. Since, then, if acquitted for piracy, he must have been delivered to the British Government on the charge of murder, the President of the United States might, very properly, without prosecuting for the piracy, direct him to be delivered up on the murder.

This passage proves not only that all offences at sea are not piracies by the law of nations, but also that all indictments for piracy must depend on the law of nations, “except where, in the case of British subjects, express acts of Parliament” have changed the law. Why do not these “express
All the gentlemen who have spoken in support of the resolutions, have contended that the case of Thomas Nash is within the purview of the act of Congress, which relates to this subject, and is by the United States punishable in the American courts. That is, that the act of Congress designed to punish crimes committed on board a British frigate. Nothing can be more completely demonstrable than the untruth of this proposition.

It has already been shown that the legislative jurisdiction of a nation extends only to its own territory, and to its own citizens, wherever they may be. Any general expression in a legislative act must, necessarily, be restrained to objects within the jurisdiction of the Legislature passing the act. Of consequence an act of Congress can only be construed to apply to the territory of the United States, comprehending every person within it, and to the citizens of the United States.

But, independent of this undeniable truth, the act itself affords complete testimony of its intention and extent. (See Laws of the United States, vol. i. p. 10.) The title is: "An act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States." Not against Britian, France, or the world, but singly "against the United States."

The second section relates to treason, and its objects are, "any person or persons having allegiance to the United States, and such others as may be on its territory or in its service."

The second section relates to misprision of treason, and it declares, without limitation, that any person or persons, having knowledge of any treason, and not communicating the same, shall be guilty of that crime. Here then is an instance of that limited description of persons in one section, and of that general description in another, which has been relied on to support the construction contended for by the friends of the resolutions. But will it be pretended that a person can commit treason without this express provision, have been incurable as felons in the courts of the United States? But surely the act of Congress admits of no such extravagant construction. His colleague, Mr. M., said, had cited and particularly relied on the ninth section of the act; that section declares, that if a citizen shall commit any of the enumerated piracies, or any acts of hostility, on the high seas, against the United States, under color of a commission from any foreign Prince or State, he shall be adjudged a pirate, felon, and robber, and shall suffer death.

This section is only a positive exclusion of the act to a case which might otherwise have escaped punishment. It takes away the protection of a foreign commission from an American citizen, who, on the high seas, robs his countrymen. This is no exception from any preceding part of the law, because there is no part which relates to the conduct of vessels belonging to a foreign Power; it only proves, that in the opinion of the Legislature, the penalties of the act could not, without this express provision, have been incurred by a citizen holding a foreign commission.

It is most certain, then, that the act of Congress does not comprehend the case of a murder committed on board a foreign ship-of-war.

The gentleman from New York has cited 2 Woodson, 429, to show that the courts of England extend their jurisdiction to piracies committed by the subjects of foreign nations. This has not been doubted. The case from Woodson is a case of robberies committed on the high seas by a vessel without authority. There are ordinary acts of piracy which, as has already stated, being offences against all nations, are punishable by all. The case from 2 Woodson, and the note cited from the same book by the gentleman from Delaware, are strong authorities against the doctrines contended for by the friends of the resolutions.

It has also been contended that the question of jurisdiction was decided at Trenton, by receiving indictments against persons there by a signor for the same offence, and by retaining them for trial after the return of the habeas corpus.

Every person in the slightest degree acquainted
with judicial proceedings, knows that an indictment is no evidence of jurisdiction; and that, in criminal cases, the question of jurisdiction will seem to be made but by arrest of judgment after conviction.

The proceedings, after the return of the habeas corpus, only prove that the case was not such a case as to induce the Judge immediately to decide against his jurisdiction. Titled evidence was not free from doubt, and, therefore, might very properly be postponed until its decision should become necessary.

It has been argued by the gentleman from New York, that the form of the indictment, itself evidence of a power in the court to try the case. Every word of that indictment, said the gentleman, gives the lie to a denial of the jurisdiction of the court.

It would be assuming a very extraordinary principle, indeed, to say that words inserted in an indictment for the express purpose of assuming the jurisdiction of a court, should be admitted to prove that jurisdiction. The question certainly depended upon the nature of the fact, and not on the description of the fact. But as an indictment must necessarily contain formal words in order to be supported, and as forms often denote what a case must substantially be to authorize a court to take cognizance of it, some words in the indictments at Trenton ought to be noticed. The indictments charge the persons to have been within the peace, and murder to have been committed on their persons, a state of the peace. Questions of the jurisdiction of the court are necessary averments, and are necessary averments, and, to give the court jurisdiction, the fact ought to have acceded with them. But who will say that the crew of a British frigate on the high seas, are within the peace of the United States? or a murder committed on board such a frigate, against the peace of any other than the British Government?

It is, then, demonstrated that the murder with which Thomas Nash was charged, was not committed within the jurisdiction of the United States, and, consequently, that the case stated was completely within the letter and the spirit of the twenty-seventh article of the treaty between the two nations. If the necessary evidence was produced, he ought to have been delivered up to justice. It was an act to which the American nation was bound by a most solemn compact. To have tried him for the murder would have been mere mockery. To have condemned and executed him, the court having no jurisdiction, would have been murder. To have acquitted and discharged him would have been a breach of faith, and a violation of national duty.

But it has been contended that, although Thomas Nash ought to have been delivered up to the British Minister, on the requisition made by him in the name of his Government, yet, the interference of the President was improper.

This, Mr. M. said, led to his second proposition, which was:

That the case was a case for Executive and not Judicial decision. He admitted implicitly the division of powers, stated by the gentleman from New York, and that it was the duty of each department to resist the encroachments of the others.

This being established, the inquiry was, to what department was the power in question allotted?

The gentleman from New York had relied on the second section of the third article of the Constitution, which enumerates the cases to which the Judicial power of the United States is extended, and which contains the words, "in all cases in law and equity, arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States; but the resolutions declare that Judicial power to extend to all questions arising under the Constitution, treaties, and laws of the United States. The difference between the Constitution and the resolutions was material and apparent. A case in equity, was a term well understood, and of limited signification; it was a controversy between parties which had taken a shape for judicial decision. If the Judicial power extended to every question under the Constitution, it would involve almost every subject proper for Legislative discussion and decision; if, to every question under the laws and treaties of the United States, it would involve almost every subject on which the Executive could act. The division of the gentleman stated, could exist no longer, and the other departments would be swallowed up by the Judiciary. But it was apparent that the resolutions had essentially misrepresented the Constitution. He did not charge the gentleman from New York with an intentional misrepresentation; he would not attribute to him such an artifice in any case, much less in a case where detection was so easy and so certain. Yet this substantial departure from the Constitution, in resolutions affecting substantially to unite it, was not less worthy of remark for being unintentional. It manifested the course of reasoning by which the gentleman had himself been misled, and his judgment betrayed into the opinion those resolutions expressed. By extending the Judicial power to all cases in law and equity, the Constitution had never been understood to confer on that department any political power whatever. To come within this description, a question must assume a legal form for forensic litigation and judicial decision. There must be parties to come into court who can be reached by its process, and bound by its power; whose rights admit of ultimate decision by a tribunal to which they are bound to submit.

A case in law or equity proper for judicial decision may arise under a treaty, where the rights of individuals acquired or secured by a treaty are to be asserted or defended in court. As under the fourth or sixth article of the Treaty of Peace with Great Britain, or under those articles of our late treaties with France, Prussia, and other nations, which secure to the subjects of those nations...
their property within the United States; or, as would be an article, which, instead of stipulating to deliver up an individual, should stipulate his punishment, provided the case was punishable by the laws and in the courts of the United States. But the Judicial power cannot extend to political compacts; as the establishment of the boundary line between the American and British dominions; the state of the late guarantee in our Treaty with France, or the case of the delivery of a murderer under the twenty-seventh article of our present Treaty with Britain.

The gentleman from New York has asked, triumphantly asked, what power exists in our courts to deliver up an individual to a foreign Government? Permit me, said Mr. M., but not triumphantly, to retort the question. By what authority can any court render such a judgment? What power does a court possess to seize any individual and determine that he shall be adjudged by a foreign tribunal? Surely our courts possess no such power, yet they must possess it, if this article of the treaty is to be executed by the courts.

Gentlemen have cited and relied on that clause in the Constitution, which enables Congress to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offences against the law of nations; together with an act of Congress, declaring the punishment of those offences; as transferring the whole subject to the courts. But that clause can never be construed to make the Government a grant of power, which the people making this grant could not have passed this jurisdiction to that department. It is proper for the decision of the courts.

It has been contended that the conduct of the Executive on former occasions, similar to this in the principle, has been such as to excite an opinion, even in that department, that the case in question is proper for the decision of the courts.

The fact adduced to support this argument is the interception of the late President on the case of prizes made by the United States, or by privateers fitted out in their ports.

The nation was bound to deliver up those prizes in like manner, as the nation is now bound to deliver up an individual demanded under the 27th article of the Treaty with Britain. The duty was the same, and devolved on the same department. In quoting the decision of the Executive on that case, the gentleman from New York has taken occasion to bestow a high encomium on the late President; and to consider his conduct as furnishing an example worthy the imitation of his successor. It must be the cause of much delight to the real friends of that great man; to those who supported his Administration while in office from a conviction of its wisdom and its virtue, to hear the unqualified praise which is now bestowed on it by those who had been supposed to possess different opinions. If the measure now under consideration shall be found, on examination, to be the same in principle with that which has been cited, by its opponents, as a fit precedent for it, then may the friends of the gentleman now in office indulge the hope, that when he, like his predecessor, shall be
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In that letter, the Secretary states a consultation between himself and the Secretaries of the Treasury and War, (the President being absent,) in which (so well were they assured of the President's way of thinking in those cases,) it was determined that the vessels should be detained in the custody of the Consuls, in the ports until the Government of the United States shall be able to inquire into and decide on the fact.

In his letter of the 12th of July, 1793, the Secretary writes, the President has determined to refer the questions concerning prizes "to persons learned in the laws," and he requests that certain vessels enumerated in the letter should not depart "until his ultimate determination shall be made known."

In his letter of the 7th of August, 1793, the Secretary informs Mr. Genet that the President considers the United States as bound "to effectuate the restoration of, or to make compensation for, prizes which shall have been made of any of the parties at war with France, subsequent to the 5th of June last, by privateers fitted out in British ports."

That it is consequently expected that Mr. Genet will cause restitution of such prizes to be made, and that the United States "will cause restitution to be made of all such prizes as shall be hereafter brought within their ports by any of the said privateers."

In his letter of the 10th of November, 1793, the Secretary informs Mr. Genet, that for the purpose of obtaining testimony of the facts of the case, theatty received by the President, and if they have not, to repeat the requisition that they may be given up to their former owners.

The duty was a department. In the letter to Mr. Morris, the Secretary asserts the principle, that vessels taken within our jurisdiction ought to be restored, but says, it is yet unsettled whether the act of restoration is to be performed by the Executive or Judicial department. The principles, then, according to this letter, is not submitted to the courts—whether a vessel captured within a given distance of the American coast was or was not captured within the jurisdiction of the United States, was a question not to be determined by the courts, but by the Executive. The doubt expressed is not what tribunal shall settle the principle, but what tribunal shall settle the fact. In this respect, a doubt might exist in the case of prizes, which could not exist in the case of a man. Individuals on each side claimed the property, and therefore their rights could be brought into court, and there contested as a case in law or equity. The demand of a man made by a nation stands on different principles.

Having noticed the particular letters cited by the gentleman from New York, permit me now, said Mr. M., to ask the attention of the House to the whole course of Executive conduct on this interesting subject.

It is first mentioned in a letter from the Secretary of State to Mr. Genet, of the 25th of June, 1800.
The decision, then, on the case of vessels captured within the American jurisdiction, by privateers fitted out of the American ports, which gentleman from New York has cited with such merited approbation; which he has declared to stand on the same principles with those which ought to have governed the case of Thomas Nash; and which deserves the more respect, because the Government of the United States was then so circumstanced as to assure us that no opinion was lightly taken up, and no resolution formed but on mature consideration; this decision, quoted as a precedent and pronounced to be right, is, found, on fair and full examination, to be precisely and unequivocally the same with that which was made in the case under consideration. It is a full authority to show that, in the opinion always held by the American Government, a case like that of Thomas Nash is a case for Executive and not Judicial decision.

But certainly this clause in the Constitution of the United States cannot be thought obligatory on, and for the benefit of, the whole world. It is not designed to govern the case of Thomas Nash; and which deserves the more respect, because the Government of the United States was then so circumstanced as to assure us that no opinion was lightly taken up, and no resolution formed but on mature consideration; this decision, quoted as a precedent and pronounced to be right, is, found, on fair and full examination, to be precisely and unequivocally the same with that which was made in the case under consideration. It is a full authority to show that, in the opinion always held by the American Government, a case like that of Thomas Nash is a case for Executive and not Judicial decision.

The clause in the Constitution which declares that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury," has also been relied on as operating on the case, and transferring the decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from the Executive to the Judicial department.

But certainly this clause in the Constitution of the United States cannot be thought obligatory on, and for the benefit of, the whole world. It is not designed to govern the case of Thomas Nash; and which deserves the more respect, because the Government of the United States was then so circumstanced as to assure us that no opinion was lightly taken up, and no resolution formed but on mature consideration; this decision, quoted as a precedent and pronounced to be right, is, found, on fair and full examination, to be precisely and unequivocally the same with that which was made in the case under consideration. It is a full authority to show that, in the opinion always held by the American Government, a case like that of Thomas Nash is a case for Executive and not Judicial decision.

The clause in the Constitution which declares that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury," has also been relied on as operating on the case, and transferring the decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from the Executive to the Judicial department.

The decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from New York has presented a dilemma, of a very wonderful structure indeed. He says that the offence of Thomas Nash was either a crime or not a crime. If it was a crime, the Constitutional mode of punishment ought to have been observed; if it was not a crime, he ought not to have been delivered up to a foreign Government, where his punishment was inevitable.

It had escaped the observation of that gentleman from New York that the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury, has also been relied on as operating on the case, and transferring the decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from the Executive to the Judicial department.

The clause in the Constitution which declares that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury," has also been relied on as operating on the case, and transferring the decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from the Executive to the Judicial department.

On the contrary, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has contended that the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury, has also been relied on as operating on the case, and transferring the decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from the Executive to the Judicial department.

The clause in the Constitution which declares that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury," has also been relied on as operating on the case, and transferring the decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from the Executive to the Judicial department.

On the contrary, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has contended that the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury, has also been relied on as operating on the case, and transferring the decision on a demand for the delivery of an individual from the Executive to the Judicial department.

The points of law which must have been decided, are stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to be, first, a question whether the offence was committed within the British jurisdiction; and, secondly, whether the crime charged was comprehended within the treaty.
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Constitution made in the resolutions of the gentleman from New York; and, in consequence of being so milled, his observations have the appearance of endeavoring to fit the Constitution to his arguments, instead of adapting his arguments to the Constitution.

When the gentleman has proved that these are questions of law, and that they must have been decided by the President, he has not advanced a single step towards proving that they were improper for Executive decision. The question whether vessels captured within three miles of the American coast, or by privateers fitted out in the American ports, were legally captured or not, and whether the American Government was bound to restore them, if in its power, was questions of law; but they were questions of political law, proper to be decided, and they were decided by the Executive, and not by the courts.

The *casus foederis* of the guaranty was a question of law, but no man could have hazarded the opinion, that such a question must be carried into court, and can only be there decided. So the *casus foederis*, under the twenty-seventh article of the treaty with Great Britain, is a question of law, but of political law. The question to be decided is, whether the particular case proposed be one in which the nation has bound itself to act, and this is a question depending on principles never submitted to courts.

If a murder should be committed within the United States, and the murderer should seek an asylum in Britain, the question whether the *casus foederis* of the twenty-seventh article had occurred, so that his delivery ought to be demanded, would be a question of law, but no man would say it was a question which ought to be decided in the courts.

When, therefore, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has established, that in delivering up Thomas Kasht, point of law were decided by the President, he has established a position which in no degree whatever aids his argument.

The case was in its nature a national demand made upon the nation. The parties were the two nations. They cannot come into court to litigate their claims, nor can a court decide on them. Of consequence, the demand is not a case for judicial cognizance.

The President is the sole organ of the nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations. Of consequence, the demand of a foreign nation can only be made on him.

He possesses the whole Executive power. He holds and directs the force of the nation. Of consequence, any act to be performed by the force of the nation is to be performed through him.

He is charged to execute the laws. A treaty is declared to be a law. He must then execute a treaty, where he, and he alone, possesses the means of executing it.

The treaty, which is a law, enjoins the performance of a particular object. The person who is to perform this object is marked out by the Constitution, since the person is named who conducts the foreign intercourse, and is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. The means by which it is to be performed, the force of the nation, are in the hands of this person. Ought not this person to perform the object, although the particular mode of using the means has not been prescribed? Congress, unquestionably, may prescribe the mode, and Congress may devolve on others the whole execution of the contract; but, till this be done, it seems the duty of the Executive department to execute the contract by any means it possesses.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania contends that, although this should be properly an Executive duty, yet it cannot be performed until Congress shall direct the mode of performance. He says that, although the jurisdiction of the courts is extended by the Constitution to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction, yet if the courts had been created without any express assignment of jurisdiction, they could not have taken cognizance of cases expressly allotted to them by the Constitution. The Executive, he says, can, no more than courts, supply a legislative omission.

It is not admitted that, in the case stated, courts could not have taken jurisdiction. The contrary is believed to have been the correct opinion. And although the Executive cannot supply a total legislative omission, yet it is not admitted or believed that there is such a total omission in this case.

The treaty, stipulating that a murderer shall be delivered up to justice, is as obligatory as an act of Congress making the same declaration. If, then, there is not a power in Congress to perform the contract, the Executive, declaring that a person who had committed murder within the jurisdiction of Britain, and sought an asylum within the territory of the United States, should be delivered up by the United States, on the demand of His Britannic Majesty, and such evidence of his criminality, as would have justified his commitment for trial, had the offence been here committed; could the President, who is bound to execute the laws, have justified the refusal to deliver up the criminal, by saying, that the Legislature had totally omitted to provide for the case?

The Executive is not only the Constitutional department, but seems to be the proper department to which the power in question may most wisely and most safely be confided.

The department which is entrusted with the whole foreign intercourse of the nation, with the negotiation of all its treaties, with the power of demanding a reciprocal performance of the article, which is accountable to the nation for the violation of its engagements with foreign nations; and for the consequences resulting from such violation, seems the proper department to be entrusted with the execution of a national contract like that under consideration.

If, at any time, policy may temper the strict execution of the contract, where may that political discretion be placed so safely as in the department whose duty it is to understand precisely the
state of the political intercourse and connexion between the United States and foreign nations, to understand the manner in which the particular stipulation is explained and performed by foreign nations, and to understand completely the state of the Union?

This department, too, independent of judicial aid, which may, perhaps, in some instances, be called in, is furnished with a great law officer, whose duty it is to understand and to advise when the casus fœderis occurs. And if the President should cause to be arrested under the treaty an individual who was so circumstanced as not to be properly the object of such an arrest, he may perhaps bring the question of the legality of his arrest before a judge, by a writ of habeas corpus.

It is then demonstrated, that, according to the principles of the American Government, the question whether the nation has or has not bound itself to deliver up any individual, charged with having committed murder or forgery within the jurisdiction of Britain, is a question the power to decide which rests alone with the Executive department. It remains to inquire whether, in exercising this power, and in performing the duty it enjoins, the President has committed an unauthorized and dangerous interference with judicial decisions.

That Thomas Nash was committed originally at the instance of the British Consul at Charleston, not for trial in the American courts, but for the purpose of being delivered up to justice in conformity with the treaty between the two nations, has already been so ably argued by the gentleman from Delaware, that nothing further can be added to that point. He would, therefore, Mr. MARSHALL said, consider the case as if Nash, instead of having been committed for trial, admitting even this to have been the fact, the conclusions which have been drawn from it were by no means warranted.

Gentlemen had considered it as an offence against judicial authority, and a violation of judicial rights to withdraw from their sentence a criminal against whom a prosecution had been commenced. They had treated the subject as if it was the privilege of courts to condemn to death the guilty wretch arraigned at their bar, and that to intercept the judgment was to violate the privilege. Nothing can be more incorrect than this view of the case. It is not the privilege, it is the duty of courts to administer criminal judgment. It is a duty to be performed at the demand of the nation, and with which the nation has a right to dispense. If judgment of death is to be pronounced, it must be at the prosecution of the nation, and the nation may at will stop that prosecution. In this respect the President expresses constitutionally the will of the nation; and may rightfully, as was done in the case at Trenton, enter a nolle prosequi, or direct that the criminal be prosecuted no further. This is no interference with judicial decisions, nor any invasion of the province of a court. It is the exercise of an indisputable and a Constitutional power. Had the President directed the Judge at Charleston to decide for or against his own jurisdiction, to condemn or acquit the prisoner, this would have been a dangerous interference with judicial decisions, and ought to have been resisted. But no such direction has been given, nor any such decision been required. If the President determined that Thomas Nash ought to have been delivered up to the British Government for a murder committed on board a British frigate, provided evidence of the fact was adduced, it was a question which duty obliged him to determine, and which he determined rightly. If, in consequence of this determination, he arrested the proceedings of a court on a national prosecution, he had a right to arrest and to stop them, and the exercise of this right was a necessary consequence of the determination of the principal question. In conformity to this decision, the court has left open the question of its jurisdiction. Should another prosecution of the same sort be commenced, which should not be suspended but continued by the Executive, the case of Thomas Nash would not bind as a precedent against the jurisdiction of the court.

It should even prove that, in the opinion of the Executive, a murder committed on board a foreign fleet was not within the jurisdiction of the court, it would prove nothing more; and though this opinion might rightfully induce the Executive to exercise its power over the prosecution, yet if the prosecution was continued, it would have no influence with the court in deciding on its jurisdiction.

Taking the fact, then, even to be as the gentlemen in support of the resolutions would state it, the fact cannot avail them. It is to be remembered, too, that in the case stated to the President, the Judge himself appears to have considered it as proper for Executive decision, and to have wished that decision. The President and Judge seem to have entertained, on this subject, the same opinion, and in consequence of the opinion of the Judge, the application was made to the President.

It has then been demonstrated—

1st. That the case of Thomas Nash, as stated to the President, was completely within the twenty-seventh article of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain.

2d. That this question was proper for Executive, and not for Judicial decision; and.

3d. That in deciding it, the President is not chargeable with an interference with Judicial decisions.

After trespassing so long, Mr. MARSHALL said, on the patience of the House, in arguing what had appeared to him to be the material points growing out of the resolutions, he regretted the necessity of detaining them still longer for the purpose of noticing an observation which appeared not to be considered by the gentleman who made it as belonging to the argument.

The subject introduced by this observation, however, was so calculated to interest the public feelings, that it must be excused for stating his opinion on it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania had said that an impressed American seaman, who should
commit homicide for the purpose of liberating himself from the vessel in which he was confined, ought not to be given up as a murderer. In this, Mr. M. said, he concurred entirely with that gentleman. He believed the opinion to be unquestionably correct, as were the reasons that gentleman had given in support of it. He had never heard any American avow a contrary sentiment, nor did he believe a contrary sentiment could find a place in the bosom of any American. He could not pretend, and did not pretend to know the opinion of the Executive on this subject, because he had never heard the opinions of that department; but he felt the most perfect conviction, founded on the general conduct of the Government, that it could never surrender an impressed American to the nation which, in making the impression, had committed a national injury.

This belief was in no degree shaken by the conduct of the Executive in this particular case. In his own mind, it was a sufficient defence of the President from an imputation of this kind, that the fact of Thomas Nash being an impressed American was obviously not contemplated by him in the decision he made on the principles of the case. Consequently, if a new circumstance occurred, which would essentially change the case decided by the President, the Judge ought not to have acted, but the new circumstance ought to have been stated. Satisfactory as this defence might appear, he should not resort to it, because to some it might seem a subterfuge. He defended the conduct of the President on other and still stronger grounds.

The President had decided that a murder committed on board a British frigate on the high seas, was within the jurisdiction of that nation, and consequently within the twenty-seventh article of its treaty with the United States. He therefore directed Thomas Nash to be delivered up to the British Minister, if satisfactory evidence of the murder should be adduced. The sufficiency of the evidence was submitted entirely to the Judge.

If Thomas Nash had committed a murder, the decision was that he should be surrendered to the British Minister; but if he had not committed a murder, he was not to be surrendered.

Had Thomas Nash been an impressed American, the homicide on board the Hermione would, most certainly, not have been a murder.

The act of impressing an American is an act of unlawful violence. The confinement on board a vessel is a continuation of the violence, and an additional outrage. Death committed within the United States, in resisting such violence, would not have been murder; and the person giving the wound could not have been treated as a murderer. Thomas Nash was only to have been delivered up to justice on such evidence as, had the fact been committed within the United States, would have been sufficient to have induced his commitment and trial for murder. Of consequence, the decision of the President was so expressed as to exclude the case of an impressed American liberating himself by homicide. He concluded with observing, that he had already too long availed himself of the indulgence of the House to venture farther on that indulgence by recapitulating or reinforcing the arguments which had already been urged.

When Mr. Marshall had concluded, Mr. Dana rose and spoke against the resolutions.

An adjournment was then called for and carried.

SaturdAy, March 8.

CASE OF JONATHAN ROBBINS.

The House resumed the consideration of the report made on Thursday last, by the Committee of the Whole House on the resolution of the President of the United States of the seventh ultimo, containing their disagreement to the motion referred to them on the twentieth ultimo; and the said motion being read, in the words following, to wit:—

Resolved, That it appears to this House that a person calling himself Jonathan Robbins, and claiming to be a citizen of the United States, impressed on board a British ship-of-war, was committed for trial in one of the Courts of the United States, for the alleged crime of piracy and murder committed on the high seas, on board the British frigate Hermione. That a requisition for the delivery of the said person (under the name of Thomas Nash) as a fugitive under the twenty-seventh article of the treaty with Great Britain, was determined on by the President of the United States did, by a letter written from the Department of State, to the Judge who committed the said person for trial, officially declare his opinion to the said Judge that he considered an offense committed on board a public ship-of-war on the high seas, to have been committed within the jurisdiction of the nation to whom the ship belongs; and, in consequence of such opinion and construction, did advise and request the said Judge to deliver up the person so claimed, to the agent of Great Britain who should appear to receive him—provided, only, that the stipulated evidence of his criminality should be produced. That, in compliance with such advice and request of the President of the United States, the said person, so committed for trial, was, by the Judge of the District Court of South Carolina, without any presentment or trial by jury, or any investigation of his claim to be a citizen of the United States, delivered up to an officer of his Britannic Majesty, and afterwards tried by a court martial and executed, on a charge of mutiny and murder.

Resolved, That, inasmuch as the Constitution of the United States declares that the Judicial power shall extend to all questions arising under the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States, and to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; and, also, that the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury, and such trial shall be held in the State where such crimes shall have been committed, but when not committed within any State, then at such place or places as Congress may by law have directed: And, inasmuch as it is directed by law that the offence of murder, committed on the high seas, shall be deemed piracy and murder, and that the trial of all crimes committed on the high seas, or in any place out of the jurisdiction of any particular State, shall be in the district where the offender is apprehended, or into which he