

SENATE.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report from the Secretary of the Senate, showing the names of persons employed in his office during the year 1856, and the amount of compensation paid to each; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report from Professor A. D. Bache, Superintendent of the Coast Survey, showing the progress of that work for the year ending on the 1st day of November, 1857; which was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Printing: Resolved, That the report of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey for the year 1857, be printed ten thousand copies—five thousand copies for the use of the Senate, and five thousand copies for distribution from the Coast Survey Office; and that the same shall be printed and bound with the plates in quarto form, and that the printing of the said plates shall be done to the satisfaction of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey.

MEMORIALS, PETITIONS, ETC.

Mr. SEWARD presented several petitions, praying indemnity for property destroyed by the enemy on the Niagara frontier in the war of 1812; which were referred to the Committee of Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the memorial and protest of W. F. M. Army, in behalf of several thousand citizens of South Carolina protesting against the Leocompton constitution, asking its rejection by Congress and the passage of a law to enable the bona fide citizens of Kansas to form their own constitution; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. EVANS presented the memorial of heirs of revolutionary officers praying the settlement of the claims of the officers of the revolutionary army to half-pay; which was referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. E. also presented the memorial of James A. Black, special agent of the State of South Carolina, praying that the same may be refunded certain sums of money expended in the "common defence" of the United States of America; which was referred to the Committee of Claims.

Mr. HOUSTON presented joint resolutions of the legislators of Texas in favor of placing Captain John C. Tod, late of the Texas navy, in the Coast Survey, together with a report of the committee on federal relations of the house of representatives of Texas on the same subject; which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. H. also presented a joint resolution of the legislators of Texas, praying for the reimbursement of the money paid by that State for the defence of its frontier; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill for the relief of William C. Jennings and others, reported it without amendment, accompanied by a written report.

Mr. SEWARD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the memorial of Nicholas D. P. Maillard, praying redress for injuries committed upon him by a mob in Ireland, submitted the following resolution, which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to: Resolved, That the petition and papers of Nicholas D. P. Maillard be transmitted to the Secretary of State for the consideration of the President of the United States.

NOTICES OF BILLS.

Mr. STUART gave notice that he should to-morrow, or on some early day thereafter, ask leave to introduce a bill to provide for the improvement of certain harbors on Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, St. Clair, and Erie, in the State of Michigan.

Mr. SEBASTIAN gave notice that he should to-morrow, or on some early day thereafter, ask leave to introduce a bill to extend the present graduation laws to the reserved sections within railroad grants, and a bill to authorize the building of a jail at Van Buren, in Arkansas, for the use of the district court of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED.

Mr. GWIN submitted the following resolution; which lies over until to-morrow, under the rule: Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be instructed to inquire into the expediency of providing for the appointment of a minister plenipotentiary to the empire of Japan.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED.

Mr. DOOLITTLE submitted the following resolution: Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to communicate to the Senate such surveys of harbors on Lakes Superior and Michigan, in the State of Wisconsin, as have not been hitherto communicated, together with such estimates as may have been made for the improvement of said harbors.

Mr. TRUMBULL moved to amend the resolution by including the harbors in the State of Illinois; which was agreed to.

Mr. JONES moved to further amend the resolution by including the harbors on the Mississippi and Missouri rivers; which was agreed to, and the resolution as amended was adopted.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BENJAMIN, in pursuance of notice, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to authorize the improvement of the Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, and Ohio rivers by contract, and making appropriations for the same.

Mr. POLK, in pursuance of notice, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to settle doubts in relation to the title of certain common field lots in the State of Missouri heretofore granted to the inhabitants of St. Louis for the support of schools; also, a bill for the relief of Manuel Lisa and Joachim Lisa, and others, and to provide for the location of certain confirmed private land claims.

Mr. THOMSON, of New Jersey, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to provide for the construction of a custom-house, court-house, and post office at Trenton, in the State of New Jersey.

The above bills were severally read twice and referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. SIDDELL asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to amend an act, entitled "An act amendatory of existing laws relative to the half-dollar, quarter-dollar, dime, and half-dime," approved the 21st of February, 1853. The bill simply provides that from and after the 1st day of June, 1856, the silver coins issued in conformity with the act hereby amended shall be legal tender in payment of debts for all sums not exceeding twenty-five dollars.

Mr. FESSENDEN, in pursuance of notice, asked and obtained leave to introduce a bill to provide for the ascertainment and satisfaction of claims of American citizens for applications committed by the French prior to the 31st day of July, 1801. Mr. F. moved his reference to a select committee of seven, stating, at the same time, that he desired to be excused from serving as the chairman of that committee, as he was personally interested in the subject.

Mr. MASON thought the bill ought to go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FESSENDEN replied that since that committee were known to be unfavorable to the bill, it ought not, according to parliamentary usage, to be referred to them.

Mr. SEWARD expressed the opinion that the matter more properly pertained to the jurisdiction of the Committee of Claims; but as both those committees had a great deal of business before them, and this claim had now been standing for more than half a century, he was in favor of referring it to a select committee.

The debate was continued by Messrs. HARRIS and BAYARD for some time; when the question being taken, the motion to refer the bill to a select committee was agreed to.

The following senators were appointed as said committee: Messrs. CUTLER, COLLAMER, THOMAS, HAMILTON, HENRY, DAVIS, and KENDRICK.

ARRIVAL IN KANSAS.

The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, Mr. DAVIS stated that as Mr. Brown was too weak to proceed with his remarks on Kansas affairs to-day, unless some other senator desired to occupy the floor, he would move that the further consideration of the subject be postponed until Monday next; which was agreed to.

ALEXANDER J. ATCHESON.

The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of the bill for the relief of Alexander J. Atcheson; which was debated at some length by Messrs. MASON, COLLAMER, BENJAMIN, SIDDELL, and others.

Mr. HUNTER moved to refer the whole subject to the Court of Claims; which was agreed to—yeas 31, nays 15—as follows: YEAS—Messrs. Allen, Biggs, Bright, Broderick, Chand-

ler, Collamer, Davis, Doollittle, Durkee, Evans, Fessenden, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Fisk, Foster, Green, Hamlin, Harlan, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Pearce, Pugh, Sebastian, Simmons, Sill, St. Clair, Tombs, Trumbull, and Wadsworth.

NAYS—Messrs. Benjamin, Cameron, Clay, Crittenden, Dixon, Gwin, Hale, Houston, Jones, Kennedy, Mallory, Mason, Seward, and Thomson of New Jersey—15.

After the consideration of executive business, the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

After prayer, the journal of yesterday was read and approved.

The SPEAKER called the attention of the body to certain bills from the Committee of Claims that were not disposed of at the satisfaction of Congress. The law of 1855 required that these claims should be taken up and considered as if there had been no adjournment. In construing that law he was constrained to hold that where a bill had received a first and second reading at a preceding Congress, it would be incompetent to resume its consideration at the present session, unless it were re-introduced. Therefore these bills would have to be considered de novo, and he had instructed the Clerk not to place any of them on the journal. They would now be read a first and second time and referred to the Committee of Claims, so that they might be acted on in conformity to law. Several reports he had instructed the Clerk to put upon the calendar.

Accordingly various bills from the Court of Claims were read a first and second time by their titles, and respectively referred to the Committee of Claims and the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, as their nature seemed to demand.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey, showing the number of persons employed therein and the expenditures of that office for the past year; which was laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Also, the annual report of the Superintendent of the Coast Survey; which was laid on the table and ordered to be printed.

Also, certain papers in reference to the contested election case from the Territory of Nebraska; which was referred to the Committee of Elections and ordered to be printed.

KANSAS AFFAIRS.

Mr. GROW, of Pennsylvania, asked consent to submit a resolution requesting the President to communicate copies of his instructions to the officers of the Territory of Kansas, and correspondence with the officers of the same, not already communicated to the House; also, a copy of the constitution formed at Leocompton, the returns of the recent elections, with the number of votes cast, and copies of any official papers not already communicated to Congress; but objection was made.

THE NEUTRALITY LAWS.

On motion of Mr. J. GLANCY JONES, of Pennsylvania, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Pinnas, of Missouri, in the chair.)

Mr. J. GLANCY JONES submitted the following resolutions: 1. Resolved, That so much of the annual message of the President of the United States to the two houses of Congress at the present session as relates to our foreign affairs, together with the accompanying correspondence in relation thereto, and to the seizure of property of citizens of the United States by the republic of Paraguay, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to a loan, the public finances, the revenue, receipts and expenditures, the public debt, the tariff, paper currency, and bank credits, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to a uniform bankrupt law, and to the neutrality laws, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the navy of the United States, the raising of four additional regiments, and to the construction of a military road through the territories of the United States, be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the navy of the United States, and to the construction of ten small steamers, be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

6. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the Post Office Department, its operation and condition, be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the public lands be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

8. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the commerce of the United States and to the matter of the messengers. When its tributaries for navigation by steam be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

9. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to our intercourse with, and relation to, the various Indian tribes be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

10. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the Territories of Kansas, Utah, and of Arizona, be referred to the Committee on Territories.

11. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the District of Columbia be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

12. Resolved, That so much of said message and accompanying documents as relates to the subject of a Pacific railroad be referred to the Committee on Roads and Canals.

Mr. J. GLANCY JONES remarked that the message of the President had now been before the House for nearly a month, and the subject-matter of it had not yet been distributed to the appropriate committees. "Until this distribution was made the House could not properly take action on the subject of the message. When it was, the House might take into consideration the respective parts of the message that might be referred to them."

Mr. QUITMAN, of Mississippi, then moved to amend the third resolution by striking out the words "neutrality laws," and inserting in lieu thereof the following resolution: Resolved, That so much of the President's annual message as relates to the duties of an independent State in its relations with the members of the great family of nations to restrain its people from acts of hostile aggression against their citizens or subjects, and so much as relates to the present neutrality act of 20th of April, 1818; to the fitting out within the limits of our country of lawless expeditions against some of the Central American States; to the instructions issued to the marshals and district attorneys, and to the appointment of army and navy officers, together with the President's recommendation that we should adopt such measures as will be effectual in restraining our citizens from committing such outrages, be referred to a select committee to consist of five members, with power to report by bill or otherwise.

Mr. QUITMAN said that the resolution should be submitted to a select committee because there was no standing committee to whom it would properly and exclusively belong. The whole country demanded that something should be done. They might attempt to get rid of the question, but as much as they did it was forced upon them by the country. The people were calling for a modification of the existing neutrality laws. He had come to the conclusion that the greater portion of these laws should be swept from the statute-book, and he believed that a large portion of the House would come to the same conclusion, and untrammel the citizens from the restrictions which they imposed upon their enterprise. He would not be content until he could bring the members to vote upon the subject.

The proposition of the President to which he alluded in his resolution involved the most important considerations. It involved the consideration of the duties independent States owe to one another. He denied that the law nations required that independent States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might exist between States should restrain their citizens from hostile aggressions upon any power. Our government was a limited one, and there were rights which were reserved to the citizen, and those rights could not be invaded by the government. He would say that no government, though it might possess despotic power, was bound or obligated by the law of nations to protect individuals from hostility. On the contrary, a government, in its independent state, was only bound to restrain its authority in such conflicts between its citizens and those of friendly powers. It would be impossible to take up and make a national affair of every line of hostility that might