

1812.

Feb. 13th.

=====

Absent....Washington, justice.

The courts of the U. States have no common law jurisdiction in cases of libel against the government of the United States. But they have the power to fine for contempts, to imprison for contumacy, and to enforce the observance of their orders, &c

THIS was a case certified from the Circuit Court for the District of *Connecticut*, in which, upon argument of a general demurrer to an *indictment* for a libel on the President and Congress of the United States, contained in the *Connecticut Currant*, of the 7th of May, 1806, charging them with having in secret voted two millions of dollars as a present to Bonaparte for leave to make a treaty with Spain, the judges of that Court were divided in opinion upon the question, *whether the Circuit Court of the United States had a common law jurisdiction in cases of libel.*

PINKNEY, Attorney General, in behalf of the United States, and DANA for the Defendants, declined arguing the case.

The Court, having taken time to consider, the following opinion was delivered (on the last day of the term, all the judges being present) by JOHNSON, J.

The only question which this case presents is, whether the Circuit Courts of the United States can exercise a common law jurisdiction in criminal cases. We state it thus broadly because a decision on a case of libel will apply to every case in which jurisdiction is not vested in those Courts by statute.

Although this question is brought up now for the first time to be decided by this Court, we consider it as having been long since settled in public opinion. In no other case for many years has this jurisdiction been asserted; and the general acquiescence of legal men shews the prevalence of opinion in favor of the negative of the proposition.

The course of reasoning which leads to this conclusion is simple, obvious, and admits of but little illustration. The powers of the general Government are made up of concessions from the several states—whatever is not expressly given to the former, the latter expressly reserve. The judicial power of the United States is a constituent part of those concessions,—that power is to be exercised by Courts organized for the purpose, and brought into existence by an effort of the legislative power of the Union. Of all the Courts which the United States may, under their general powers, constitute, one only, the Supreme Court, possesses jurisdiction derived immediately from the constitution, and of which the legislative power cannot deprive it. All other Courts created by the general Government possess no jurisdiction but what is given them by the power that creates them, and can be vested with none but what the power ceded to the general Government will authorize them to confer.

U. STATES
v.
HUDSON &
GOODWIN.

It is not necessary to inquire whether the general Government, in any and what extent, possesses the power of conferring on its Courts a jurisdiction in cases similar to the present; it is enough that such jurisdiction has not been conferred by any legislative act, if it does not result to those Courts as a consequence of their creation.

And such is the opinion of the majority of this Court: For, the power which congress possess to create Courts of inferior jurisdiction, necessarily implies the power to limit the jurisdiction of those Courts to particular objects; and when a Court is created, and its operations confined to certain specific objects, with what propriety can it assume to itself a jurisdiction—much more extended—in its nature very indefinite—applicable to a great variety of subjects—varying in every state in the Union—and with regard to which there exists no definite criterion of distribution between the district and Circuit Courts of the same district?

The only ground on which it has ever been contended that this jurisdiction could be maintained is, that, upon the formation of any political body, an implied power to preserve its own existence and promote the end and object of its creation, necessarily results to it. But,

U. STATES without examining how far this consideration is appli-
 v. cable to the peculiar character of our constitution, it
 HUDSON & may be remarked that it is a principle by no means
 GOODWIN. peculiar to the common law. It is coeval, probably,
 with the first formation of a limited Government; be-
 longs to a system of universal law, and may as well sup-
 port the assumption of many other powers as those more
 peculiarly acknowledged by the common law of England.

But if admitted as applicable to the state of things in
 this country, the consequence would not result from it
 which is here contended for. If it may communicate
 certain implied powers to the general Government, it
 would not follow that the Courts of that Government
 are vested with jurisdiction over any particular act
 done by an individual in supposed violation of the peace
 and dignity of the sovereign power. The legislative
 authority of the Union must first make an act a crime,
 affix a punishment to it, and declare the Court that shall
 have jurisdiction of the offence.

Certain implied powers must necessarily result to
 our Courts of justice from the nature of their institution.
 But jurisdiction of crimes against the state is not among
 those powers. To fine for contempt—imprison for con-
 tumacy—inforce the observance of order, &c. are pow-
 ers which cannot be dispensed with in a Court, because
 they are necessary to the exercise of all others: and so
 far our Courts no doubt possess powers not immediately
 derived from statute; but all exercise of criminal juris-
 diction in common law cases we are of opinion is not
 within their implied powers.

1812. ALEXANDER SHIRRAS, JOHN BLACK, WIL-
 LIAM MILLIGAN, WILLIAM BLACKLOCK,
 Feb. 13th. & JOSEPH VERREES,

v.

JOHN CAIG & ROBERT MITCHEL.

Absent....Washington, justice.

A mortgage of
 land, made by
 one who has a ERROR to the Circuit Court for the district of
 Georgia, by Shirras and others original Complainants,