

STATE RIGHTS.—The following correspondence has been published in the New York papers: the New York Standard introduces it thus:

“We are not of those who deny to the Supreme Court any jurisdiction granted by the Constitution; but a state may *dispute* the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in cases, and yet be far from desirous of violating the Constitution; and indeed very far from *having* violated it. The conduct of Georgia, in the case of Tassels, is not singular. The State of New York has refused, and still refuses, to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over *her*; as will be seen in the extracts given below from Attorney General Bronson’s letters, respecting the controversy between the states of New York and New Jersey; and New York is as justly chargeable as Georgia, with having dissolved the Union.”

UTICA, New York, July 27th, 1820.

WILLIAM THOMAS CARROLL, Esq.

Clerk of the Supreme court of the United States.

“SIR—The Governor and the Attorney General of the State of New York were recently served with the copy of a bill in equity, said to have been exhibited in the Supreme Court of the United States by “the State of New Jersey vs. the people of the State of N. Y. & with a subpoena in that cause to appear on the first Monday of August next.

I beg leave respectfully to say, that *such service* is regarded on the part of the State of New York as *utterly void*, because the mode adopted is unknown to the *common law*, is not authorised by any *statute* of the United States, nor warranted by any existing rule or order of the Court out of which the process issued."

"Whether the Court has been clothed with the power to *compel* the appearance of the *State* as defendant in an original suit or proceeding, is a question, among others, which will no doubt receive from that high tribunal all the consideration that its importance demands, before any order shall be made in the premises."

(Signed) GREEN C. BRONSON.
Attorney General of New York.

WASHINGTON CITY, Jan. 8th, 1830.

"To the Honorable, the Chief Justice, and his Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

A bill has been exhibited in this Court by the State of New Jersey, against the people of the State of New York, concerning the boundary line between the two States, and the subpoena to appear and answer, with a copy of the bill, has been served upon the Governor of the State of New York.

A notice has recently been served that on the 18th inst. the Court would be moved to take the bill *pro confesso*, and proceed to a decree for the want of an appearance.

I beg leave respectfully to say, that the opinion is entertained on the part of the State of New York, that *this Court cannot exercise jurisdiction in such a case, without the authority of an act of Congress for carrying into execution that part of the judicial power of the United States which extends to controversies between two or more States.*"

(Signed) GREEN C. BRONSON.
Attorney General of New York.

"So far from New York having acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in the case between her and New Jersey, it will appear from the following Letter which accompanied Gov. Throop's Message to the Legislature, that her views are unchanged."

Letter from the Attorney General, concerning the Boundary Line between this State and the State of New Jersey.

Albany, December 27, 1830.

SIR—In a former communication to your excellency (Legislative Documents of 1830, No. IV.) I mentioned the commencement of a suit by the state of New Jersey, against the people of this state relative to the question of disputed boundary between the parties. The Supreme Court of the United States, at its last term, decided that the process previously issued in the suit, had not been duly served; and without disposing of the question of jurisdiction awarded further process. This has subsequently been served upon the Governor and Attorney General, and is returnable on the first day of the next January term of that court. It is probable that the counsel for New Jersey will then move for some order or decree in the cause, which will make it necessary for this court to decide whether it can exercise original and compulsory jurisdiction over a state. Upon this question, I have seen no cause to change the opinion expressed in my former communication.

I am, with great respect, your Excellency's obedient humble serv't.

GREENE C. BRONSON,
Attorney General.

His Excellency Governor THROOP.