THE DAILY BEE.

Saturday Morning, Oct. 8, 1853.

For Congress:
FIRST DISTRICT.
THOS. G. MACKEY.
SECOND DISTRICT.
T. G. HUNT.

STATE SENATORS.
M. C. EDWARDS.
JULES LAVERGNE.

For State Treasurer,
J. H. HAWTHORN.
SHERIFF.
JAMES P. FRERET.
CORONER.
JOHN YOUENES.

For Auditor Public Accounts,
JOHN R. KING, of St. Landry.

For Superintendent of Public Education,
A. S. LAMOS, of W. Baton Rouge.

CLERKS OF COURTS.
First Court—Alfred Hagerman.
Second do. Thomas C. Peale.
Third do. C. A. Lafontaine.
Fourth do. J. H. Hopkins.
Fifth do. Samuel J. Hitch.
ASSESSORS.
First District—John Webb.
Second do. U. Chevalier.
Third do. C. H. Bagot.

The Fourth District Delegate will effect a nomination hereafter.

COLLECTORS OF STATE TAXES.
First District—Thomas Ashow.
Second do. Lafayette Guyel.
Third do. No nomination yet made
Fourth do. do. do. do.
JUSTICES OF PEACE.
First Justice—L. U. Gelasnis.
Constable—J. Hoppe.
Second Justice—C. V. Jones.
Constable—William C. Quick.
Third Justice—William H. Hagan.
Constable—Jules Delarue.
Fourth Justice—E. A. Nichol.
Constable—John McClelland.
Fifth Justice—No nomination.

The Northern Mail came through yesterday with the latest dates.

THE MARCY LETTER.

In one of MARCY's sen tences he indirectly describes the character of an old quarter master who is remarkable for acting very rigorously, while speaking with the most delicate observance of the proprieties of life. Whenever an application of the rope's end is requisite, "Old Bloody Politeness," for thus is he dubbed by the sailors, accompanies the *fortiter in re* by a superabundance of the *suaviter in modo*. He flogs his men half to death, but secures them in most courteous style that he is only carrying into effect the spirit and penalties prescribed by the articles of war. Something of the same spirit may be observed in Mr. MARCY's letter to the unfortunate Chevalier HULZEMANN, doomed to be first pounded by WEBSTER, and then pulverized by his successor. Mr. MARCY performs the operation like a courtier of the old school. His urbanity, self possession and undevisting politeness are in exquisite contrast to the crushing violence of his mallet. He speaks gently but smites unsparingly. It is "Old Bloody Politeness" again, with a vengeance.

It has been our destiny to read many State papers, and innumerable expositions of the policy of our Government, but we do not think that we have ever perused a more powerful and masterly assertion of American doctrine, and vindication of American right than is embodied in the reply of the Secretary of State. Upon almost every point it is alike complete, full, perspicuous and unanswerable. In tone and style, this able paper is most commendable. It is distinguished by a sustained gravity and force of argument, a transparent lucidness of explanation, a weight of authoritative citation, and a pregnant power of connected reasoning that have been rarely equalled. Mean bamboozle it to the head that conceived and the hand that traced it. We should despise ourselves if we suffered our political differences with the Administration to distort our judgment of this massive and luminous production—massive as granite, luminous as sun light. We regard it as marking a new era in the history of our political relations with transatlantic powers; and as furnishing a text book, which the future public men of the country may appropriately consult, to determine the true principles which should regulate the action of the Government hereafter.

The points established and enforced by Mr. MARCY, merit more than passing notice. He has shown that the citizen or subject may voluntarily release himself from the obligations of allegiance, freely quit the land of his birth or adoption, and seek a home elsewhere—that treaties of extradition have been framed upon the express recognition of this right, no nation having a claim for the surrender of a citizen or subject, upon another power, unless the demand is authorized by express treaty stipulation. He has proved that no such treaty existed between Austria and Turkey—that when Turkey refused to give up the Hungarian refugees upon this express ground, her conduct was approved by England and France, and Austria was herself constrained by the force of international obligation to acquiesce. He meets the pretext of Mr. HÜLSEMANN, that ancient treaties and stipulations with Turkey justified the violent measures of KOSSTA, by citing the complaints of the latter country that her neutrality had been violated by Austria, while no dissatisfaction has been expressed at the course pursued by the United States. He overwhelms the Austrian Minister by demonstrating beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the banishment of KOSSTA had released him from the bond of allegiance, and that therefore he had ceased to be an Austrian subject. We cannot forbear republishing the passages in which this view is comprehensively and critically

By the consent and procurement of the Emperor of Austria, Kossta had been sent into perpetual banishment. The Emperor was a party to the expulsion of the Hungarian refugees from Turkey. The sovereign by such an act deprived his subjects to whom it is applied of all their rights under his Government. He places them beyond his protection. By such an act he releases the subjects thus banished from the bond of allegiance. Any other result would make the political relation so much between the subject and the sovereign a state of unmitigated vassalage, in which all duty lies on one side and no rights would be on one side, and all the rights and no duties would be on the other. Kossta must be regarded as having been banished by Austria; for he was one of the Hungarian refugees whom she proscribed, to be expelled from Turkey in 1851. They were released from confinement at Kutahia on condition of submitting to perpetual banishment, and she had two persons present at their departure "who claimed and obtained there an active share in the arrangements." Kossta could never thereafter be rightfully demanded as an Austrian subject.

The proposition that Kossta at Smyrna was not an "Austrian subject" can be sustained on another ground. By a decree of the Emperor of Austria of the 24th March, 1849, Austria subjects leaving the dominions of the Emperor without permission of the emigrants and release of Austrian citizenship, and with an intention never to return, become *contumacious emigrants*," and lose all their civil and political rights at home.—(Ency. Amer. Tit. Emigration, 3 Kent's Com., 36, 37.)

Kossta had left Austria, without permission, and with the obvious and avowed intention never to return; he was, therefore, within the strict meaning of the imperial decree, a "contumacious emigrant." He had incurred and paid the penalty of that offence by the loss of all his civil and political rights. If he had property, it had confiscated, and he was reduced to a condition worse than absolute alienage; for alien born, by right, the bosom of the civil laws for protection in whatever country they may be. Stripped by the imperial decree of civil and political rights, Kossta had, in America, no redress for personal wrongs, and abroad he had no claim to protection from the Government that would aid hold him as a subject. He was, in regard to Austria, an outlaw. What right can a government have to the allegiance of a person reduced by him to such a miserable condition? It is one that have been the very object of the Austrian decree to dissolve the previous political connexion, between the "unlawful emigrant" and the Emperor. In Kossta's case it was dissolved.

From these propositions Mr. MARCY's conclusions are unassailable. KOSSTA was banished, imprisoned and imprisoned without any right or authority by arbitrary sway, Greeks and Russians Turkey stood idly by and did not interpose. He was suffering grievous wrong—say one that could, would relieve him. Captain INGRAHAM acted in accordance with the laws of humanity, and no one can fairly take offence.

The right of the American government to consider Kossta as possessing the national character of an American, and to claim the protection of our Government is argued with striking ingenuity and skill. This proposition involves a question, on which we entertain some doubts, and is the only point in the letter which will not meet the unanimous concurrence of the people of the United States. We note no difference of the correctness of the position assumed by the Secretary of State. We make no reference to the case of KOSSTA. It is the broad principle with which we have to deal. It the doctrine that doubtful is practically equivalent to unmistakable, we know of the national rites arrayed in its favor are indisputably powerful—it must be taken with all its possible consequences. Of these the of the [illegible] is remove from the inchoate obligation [illegible] declaration to complete his protection, [illegible] the gravest, that it opens the door to implied allegiance and embarrassment, which may arise from the temporary residence outside of Europe of adventurers who take the oath of fidelity, and straightway go back to the dominions, subjection of their adopted sovereigns, sides which their vocation or imprisonment may prevent. Mr. MARCY acknowledges the force of this argument, but thinks it taken by assuming that a fraudulent purpose could be so conducted, and would therefore, hold, doubtful and indefinable. One objection is thus set at present. We do not propose either to question or deny the proposition put forth by Mr. MARCY. At all events his argument in favor of the intervention of Captain INGRAHAM, upheld not this view to render it perfectly unassailable.

The case of KOSSTA, of a citizen, or passport, from the American Legation at Constantinople, to another point primed bound upon Mr. HÜLSEMANN with extraordinary vigor. The fortitude, increased tenfold by self-pitying, if he had it felt before. He was placed under the protection of the representative of our Government in Turkey—a protection infamously violated and set at naught by Austrian bivouacs and ruffians. Austria was, therefore, the aggressor in every respect. She not only infringed the neutrality of Turkey, but trampled the authority of the United States. This is indisputably established in the annexed paragraph.

The first aggressive act in this case was the seizure of Kossta at Smyrna, committed by the procurement of the Austrian functionaries. The first improper use of a national ship, the imprisonment of Kossta therein, was made by the Commander of the Austrian brig Hussar. That ship was converted into a prison for the illegal detention of a person clothed with the authority of the United States, and guaranteed by the protection of the United States, and guaranteed by the protection of the United States, and guaranteed by the protection