

of the representatives of the people, favours which are denied to the balance of the community? He who *owes a bank*, is to be allowed time to redeem his liabilities; but he who may have at an usurious interest perchance, borrowed of a neighbour a small sum, is to be subject to direct and immediate execution. Such legislation, to the understanding of your committee, is a violation of the rights of the many. Special legislation is not only contrary to our republican institutions, but destructive of the equal rights of the mass. A debtor to a bank should in justice be placed upon the same footing with the debtor to an individual. Already have the debtors of the former in derogation of the immutable principles of right, been permitted to enjoy exclusive privileges. This system ought to be uprooted and contemned. Man, so far as his political rights are concerned, is equal: and all legislation which has for its aim a discrimination, is improper and not in consonance with what has been heretofore, now, and for ever should be, considered equal justice.

An able writer has in a few words, exhibited in an intelligible light, the difference between the individual man and a corporation. The committee prefer the use of his language to explain the odious features of that difference, to anything they can succinctly offer. He says, alluding to monied corporations, "they are exempted from liabilities to which individuals are subjected. If a poor man cannot pay his debts, his bed is, in some of the States, taken from under him. If that will not satisfy his creditors, his body is imprisoned. The share-holders in a bank are entitled to all gains they can make by banking operations, but if the undertaking chances to be unsuccessful, the loss falls on those who have trusted them. They are responsible only for the amount of stock they may have subscribed." This difference in condition is owing to special legislation. Is it right then, that those who have been so much benefitted should be released from the liability to meet their engagements? It is thought not. Public morals as well as a respect for equal justice, require that corporations should be compelled to comply with their obligations as well as individuals.

Already have corporations in this country been permitted to violate with impunity the laws of the land. An example not only discouraging to all who desire to see the laws impartially and fearlessly administered, but incompatible with an equality of rights. Why those who have been specially benefitted shall be permitted, in addition to the exercise of chartered privileges, to deny the binding effect of the laws, is, it is thought, difficult to be shown.— Though in effect, the right is now claimed by corporations, common sense has uniformly rejected all arguments in its support, however ingeniously they may have been framed. If the laws are binding at all, they should bind alike the rich and the poor,—the favored few and the individual man.

A careful examination of the past history of this country must,