From the Federal Republican.
Cur opinion is requested upon the following points:

I. Whether Mr. Hanson and his friends.

hader the circumstances in which they found

themselves in Baltimore on the 27th of July hill, were justifiable in law in repelling by fuce the attack made upon them, and in killing the assailants upon the ground of self-delence.

H. Whether the present out against Mr.

Hanson for man-flanghter, and the indict-

Then which will be found on it, can disqualed him in law for a feat in Congress.

On the first point we hold it to be clear law:

I. That Mr. Hanson had a complete legalight to exercise in Baltimore the bosiness of

publishing a news-paper, or to distribute it there, when published elsewhere; being liable to indictment if he published any thing

ontrary to law.

II. That every man, in the profecution of his lawful business, has a right to defend his house and person by force if necessary, against unlawful violence; and to provide himself-before band with the means of defence, if he hould have good reason to apprehend such should have good reason to apprehend such

violence.

III. That consequently, as Mr. Hanson had good reason, from what had happened to his office, to apprehend such violence, he was justifiable in law in furnishing himself with the means of repelling this violette should it be attempted.

IV. That the attack on Mr. Hanson's

IV. That the attack on Mr. Hanson's house having been made with stones and other dangerous weapons, and with the avowed purpose of breaking and entering it, for an unlawful object; and the house having heen actually broken, and in part entered beheen actually broken, and in part entered be-fore any relistance was made, or any provoca-tion given from within, he and those with him had a legal right to kill the assailants in telf-defence; that being the sole remaining mean of protecting their own persons from violence, and indeed of saving their own lives.

The second point is too clear to admit of the least doubt. The constitution is explicit. It prescribes the qualifications, for a feat in congress, and consequently the disqualifications. To those found in the constitution none

can be added; and to be under presentment or indictment for any crime whatever, is not one of the disqualifications to be found in the constitution. Even conviction for an infamous crime would not be a disqualification; though if the crime were committed, and perhaps if the conviction took place, after the election, it would be a good ground of exputfion.

But an indictment is only an accellation, the truth or fallehood of which is bhackablished at the trial. To admit a mere accufation, which may on trial appear to be falle, as a disqualification for a citizen to be elected as a member of congress, would be equally contrary to every principle of justice, law and common sense. It would be also of a most dangerous tendency. Very slight testimony will often indure a grand jury, and properly too, to put a man on his trial, by finding a bill against him. No defence can be made before them. The party accused cannot appear or produce his witnesses. Consequently, the grand jury, for the most part, can hear but one side. Even where they send for witnesses to explain the matter more fully, it will often remain doubtful; and if the factor the law appear doubtful to them, they have a right, and perhaps it is their duty, to find a bill; to the end that a more complete investigation of both may take place, in the trial before the court and petty investigation of both may take place, in the trial gation of both may take place, in the trial

pation of both may take place, in the trial before the court and petty jury.

It is easy therefore, to perceive, how readily a candidate might be excluded by a profligate competitor, if an indefiment were a disqualification. A lingle falle witness, take the might indicate bricating a plaulible tale, might induce a grand jury very honeftly to find a bill, and this bill would desqualify the candidate. Noth-

this bill would ariquality the candidate. Nothing of this fact has taken place; or can be fulfacted in the present case, but a principle so liable to abuse might out to be admitted.

It is however, sufficient to flate, which we do with confishence, that the constitution and the laws preclude every idea of such a different action. qualificacion.

Robert G. Tiarper, Philip B. Key, Walter Dorsey, Thomas Buchanan. Baltimore, Sept. 3d., 1812.