

SECOND EDITION. THE LATEST NEWS BY MAIL. THE GREAT GALE.

Disasters on Sea and Land.

Eleven Lives Already Reported Lost.

[From the New York Tribune, Dec. 22.] Sandy Hook, Dec. 21-10 A. M. A schooner, laden with wood, dragged her anchor and drove in against the wharf here...

The French brig Prosper, of Bordeaux, is dragging ashore inside the Hook, and is thumping heavily.

A large schooner is ashore near Green's Hotel, and is a total wreck. Two of the crew are saved...

The schooner James J. Orndall, of Fall River, is ashore on Dell Beach, with a cargo of coal...

The schooner Edwin Hickey, of Philadelphia, is ashore on the beach at Long Branch and has gone to pieces.

The bark Evergreen, from Buenos Ayres, is ashore under the lee of Fort Hamilton.

It is the schooner Dorothea, from Virginia with wood, bound to New York, that is ashore here.

Sandy Hook, Dec. 21-11 A. M. The French brig Prosper lies with her side on the beach, the sea making a clean breach over the main shore...

The wind is blowing a severe gale with a high sea.

The Brig John Lewis, Tracy, master, from Philadelphia, bound to Boston, is ashore at Horse Shoals, Sandy Hook.

The vessels reported ashore remain in the same position except the schooner. She has come up on the main beach.

The schooner Union, from New York for Machias, both laden with corn, got ashore on Wood End this morning...

The Gale Along the Hudson. The recent cold weather has had its effect on the Hudson river, by closing that stream with ice from Troy to Hudson...

The Gale at Buffalo. Buffalo, Dec. 21. The following are some of the effects of last night's gale: St. John's church turret damaged and windows broken.

The smoke-stack and part of the roof of the Buffalo steel works was blown down.

Five Men Suffocated. CHICAGO, Dec. 26. Five men were suffocated at the Bremen House, in this city, on Saturday night by the escape of gas in the room where they were sleeping.

From Boston. Boston, Dec. 22. The formal reception of the battle flags of Massachusetts regiments to-day was the occasion of a very imposing and interesting display.

Collisions in the Chesapeake. The steamer Carroll, Capt. Lennox, from New York, collided with two schooners, on Thursday night, in the Bay.

The first was the schooner Elijah Sheldon, from Georgetown, with coal, bound to New York, which was sunk in six fathoms water, and right in the channel-way of vessels.

Her mast and bowsprit are out of the water. The second was the schooner Loom, of and from Baltimore, bound to Hog Island (James river). She was struck and capsized off Point No Point.

LOCAL INTELLIGENCE.

Christmas. Owing to the vigilance of Mayor Dawson and Chief of Police McGree, with the timely assistance rendered by the military, the quiet of the town was tolerably well preserved throughout Christmas day.

A disturbance was reported in the middle of the forenoon in the dry pond region, at which the fire arms were used to have been used.

A disturbance was reported in the middle of the forenoon in the dry pond region, at which the fire arms were used to have been used.

John Kooser was out in all his glory, and paraded the streets in various directions, attracting large crowds of little nigs, and some of greater growth.

Many social gatherings were held in various parts of the town, of a private nature, at which the Christmas pie was partaken of with the customary accompaniment of egg-nog and grand-dad's story of Christmas fifty years ago was repeated.

Wholesale Arrests.—A disturbance occurred at an early hour on Christmas morning in the lower part of Market street calling for the interference of the police, when one or two of the disturbers, young negroes, were arrested.

A New Pastor.—We understand that Rev. H. L. Singleton, of Baltimore, Md., has received and accepted a call as pastor of the first Presbyterian church of this place and will enter upon his duties the first Sabbath in January.

Affairs in Georgia and Alabama. Savannah advices of the 20th say that the citizens are forming a regiment for the purpose of suppressing the murders and robberies now so prevalent.

Fire in the Oil Regions. PHILADELPHIA, Dec. 26. A fire in the Shaffer House oil regions, in this state, on yesterday, destroyed four hotels and most of the buildings in the place.

Five Men Suffocated. CHICAGO, Dec. 26. Five men were suffocated at the Bremen House, in this city, on Saturday night by the escape of gas in the room where they were sleeping.

From Washington. WASHINGTON, Dec. 26. The Star has a report of a riot in Alexandria yesterday between the whites and negroes, in which six negroes and four white men are stated to have been killed, besides a number wounded.

A Bloody Affair in Carroll County, Miss. We learn from a gentleman from the vicinity of Shongola, Carroll county, says the Kosciusko Chronicle, of the 4th instant, some particulars of an affair that proved in the end, rather serious to the freedmen:

The negroes paid no attention to the warning, but went on with their party, and when in full flames, they attempted to make their escape, but there being armed guards at the door to prevent their egress, were five of the number shot and afterwards thrown into the flames.

This kind of procedure we are compelled to condemn. It is true that the negroes did wrong in indulging in such disorderly conduct, and the one who fired into Mrs. Young's house should have been severely dealt with, but such a thing as mob law is dangerous under any circumstances.

General Kilpatrick is in Washington, receiving instructions from the state department, preparatory to his departure for Chili, which will be accelerated in consequence of the recent complexion of affairs in that state.

CONGRESS.

The President's Message in the House.

SPEECH OF MR. RAYMOND OF NEW YORK.

He Vindicates the President's Policy.

On the house, on Thursday, whilst that body was in committee of the whole on the president's annual message, Mr. Raymond, of New York, addressed the house as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should be glad, if it meet the sense of those members who are present, to make some remarks upon the general question now before the house, but I do not wish to trespass upon the disposition of those who may be present in regard to this matter. I do not know, however, that there will be a better opportunity to say what I have to say than in now offering it; and if the house shall indicate no other wish I will proceed to say it. (Go on.) I need not say that I have been gratified to hear many things which have fallen from the lips of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Finck) who has just taken his seat. I have no party feeling, nor any other feeling, which would prevent me from rejoicing in the indications apparent on that side of the house of a purpose to concur with the loyal people of the country, and with the loyal administration of the government, and with the loyal majorities in both houses of congress, in restoring peace and order to our common country.

THE CASE OF MR. GARLAND.

Argument of Hon. Reverly Johnson.

U. S. SUPREME COURT, WEDNESDAY DEC. 22.

Mr. Johnson, yesterday, concluded the argument in this case with an elaborate survey of the ancient and modern doctrine as to the effect of executive pardon, and in a review of decisions under the constitution relative to ex post facto laws. His points were similar to those submitted in print by the applicant, and argued orally by Mr. Carpenter. First, that the law is unconstitutional, because ex post facto, and for various minor reasons before published in the Intelligencer in reports of the case. Second, that it is not unconstitutional, still the applicant is relieved of all pains and penalties under it by virtue of the president's pardon.

In conclusion, Mr. Johnson spoke as follows, whilst the most impressive silence was preserved: "Will the court indulge me with a word or two more? Every right-minded man—every man who has within his bosom a heart capable of human sympathy—who is not dead to all the kinder and nobler feelings of our nature—who is not the slave of his own dishonesty—of low, degraded passions, of hatred of his countrymen, or of political partisanship, solely bent on its own wretched triumph—reckless of the nation's welfare; but must wish, and must make it the subject of his daily thought and of his prayers to God, that the hour may come, and come at once, when all the states shall be again within the protecting embrace and shelter of the union, enjoying alike its benefits, (and greater were never touched to man.) contented and happy and prosperous, sharing in its duties, devoted to its principles and participating in its renown. And when the people throughout our almost boundless domain may be seen coming together as brothers, with one love of country and one joy, and one hope, and one aspiration, welfare, and national glory, with one determination to achieve it by united efforts—inspired and strengthened by an equally pure and ardent patriotism, former differences forgotten, and nothing remembered but their ancient concord and the equal title they have to share in the glories of the past, and to labor together for the even greater glories of the future. And may I say, with truth, assure your honors that this result will be expedited by the bringing within these temples—the courts of the United States—a class of men now excluded who, by education, character, and profession, are especially qualified by their example to influence the public sentiment of their respective states, and to bring them, if any doubts yet exist, to the conviction which, it is believed, they unanimously entertain—that support and defend the constitution of the United States, and the government constituted by it, in all its rightful authority, is not only essential to their people's happiness and freedom, but is a solemn duty to their country and their God.

"May it please your honors, depend upon it, that in that event they will be seen gathering around the altar of the nation, resolved to support it, under every exigency and at all hazards, as one man, and with one voice be heard invoking the blessings of Heaven for its maintenance and preservation till time itself shall be no more."

A Bloody Affair in Carroll County, Miss. We learn from a gentleman from the vicinity of Shongola, Carroll county, says the Kosciusko Chronicle, of the 4th instant, some particulars of an affair that proved in the end, rather serious to the freedmen:

It appears that several families of negroes were occupying an old house near the residence of Mrs. Young, and some time ago they had a dance, at which a number got drunk, and in the melee, several guns were fired, the shot from one passing through Mrs. Young's house. On last Saturday the negroes proposed to have another party, and certain parties learning this fact, pre-arranged with them, telling them finally that if they had the party they would be "burned out."

The negroes paid no attention to the warning, but went on with their party, and when in full flames, they attempted to make their escape, but there being armed guards at the door to prevent their egress, were five of the number shot and afterwards thrown into the flames. Those escaping took refuge in the old Methodist Church, which was also burned.

This kind of procedure we are compelled to condemn. It is true that the negroes did wrong in indulging in such disorderly conduct, and the one who fired into Mrs. Young's house should have been severely dealt with, but such a thing as mob law is dangerous under any circumstances.

General Kilpatrick is in Washington, receiving instructions from the state department, preparatory to his departure for Chili, which will be accelerated in consequence of the recent complexion of affairs in that state.

CONGRESS.

The President's Message in the House.

SPEECH OF MR. RAYMOND OF NEW YORK.

He Vindicates the President's Policy.

On the house, on Thursday, whilst that body was in committee of the whole on the president's annual message, Mr. Raymond, of New York, addressed the house as follows:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should be glad, if it meet the sense of those members who are present, to make some remarks upon the general question now before the house, but I do not wish to trespass upon the disposition of those who may be present in regard to this matter. I do not know, however, that there will be a better opportunity to say what I have to say than in now offering it; and if the house shall indicate no other wish I will proceed to say it. (Go on.) I need not say that I have been gratified to hear many things which have fallen from the lips of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Finck) who has just taken his seat. I have no party feeling, nor any other feeling, which would prevent me from rejoicing in the indications apparent on that side of the house of a purpose to concur with the loyal people of the country, and with the loyal administration of the government, and with the loyal majorities in both houses of congress, in restoring peace and order to our common country.

Mr. Raymond said, in conclusion, I cannot assent to the indications thrown out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Stevens) that the president concurred in the views he had expressed, or that he had handed the whole subject of pacifying the states lately in rebellion, and of restoring the states to the practical exercise of their functions as members of the union, to the hands of congress. I can find no warrant in his message for believing that he designs thus to abandon duties which are evidently in his judgment devolved upon him as the executive of the government, and as commander-in-chief of the armies of the United States. On the contrary, I find him rehearsing in clear and explicit language the steps he has taken to restore the rightful energy of the general government and the states. To that end, he says, provisional governors have been appointed for the states, conventions called, governors elected, legislatures assembled and

the relation of the state adopting it to the national government, still less to accomplish the removal of that state from the sovereign jurisdiction of the constitution of the United States. Well, sir, did the resolutions of these states, the declarations of their officials, the speeches of members of their legislatures, or the utterances of their press accomplish the result? Certainly not. They could not possibly work any change whatever in the relations of these states to the general government. All their ordinances, and all their resolutions were simply declarations of a purpose to secede. Their secession, if it ever took place, certainly could not date from the time when their intention to secede was first announced. After declaring that intention they proceeded to carry it into effect. How? By war—by sustaining their purpose by arms against the forces which the United States brought to bear against it. Did they sustain it? Were their arms victorious? If they were, then their secession was an accomplished fact. If not, it was nothing more than an abortive attempt—a purpose unfulfilled. This, then, is simply a question of fact, and we all know what the fact is. They did not succeed. They failed to maintain their ground by force of arms, in other words, they failed to secede. Indeed the main feature which distinguishes the union under the constitution from the old confederation is this, that whereas, the old confederation did deal with the states directly, making requisitions upon them for supplies, and relying upon them for the execution of its laws, the constitution of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, made its laws binding on the individual citizens of the several states, whether living in one state, or in another. Congress, as the legislative branch of this government, enacts a law which shall be operative upon every individual within its jurisdiction. It is binding upon each individual citizen, and if he resist it by force, he is guilty of a crime and punished accordingly, anything in the constitution or laws of his state to the contrary notwithstanding. But the states themselves are not touched by the laws of the United States. A state cannot be indicted, a state cannot be tried, a state cannot be hung for treason. The individuals in a state may be so tried, and hung, but the state as an organization, as an organic member of the union, cannot, whether its individual citizens commit treason or not.

Mr. Kelly: Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. Raymond) yield to me a moment for a question?

Mr. Raymond: Certainly.

Mr. Kelly: I desire to ask the gentleman this question. By virtue of what does a state exist? Its relations to the union? What does a state of the union exist? Just by virtue of a constitution; and secondly, by virtue of its practical relations to the government of the United States. And further I would ask, whether those states acting by conventions of the people have not overthrown the constitution which made them parts of the union, and thereby destroyed or suspended the practical relations of the states to the relations which made them parts of the union?

Mr. Raymond: I will say, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Kelly), that it is not the practical relations of a state at any particular moment which make it a state or a part of the union. What makes a state a part of the union is the constitution of the United States; and the rebel states have not yet destroyed it.

Mr. Kelly: The question I proposed is, whether a state does not exist by virtue of a constitution—its constitution—which is a thing which may be modified or overthrown?

Mr. Raymond: Certainly.

Mr. Kelly: And whether these rebellious constitutions or states have not been overthrown?

Mr. Raymond: A state does not exist by virtue of any particular constitution. It always has a constitution, but it need not have a specific constitution at any specific time. A state has certain political relations to the government of the United States; but the fact of those relations being practically operative and in actual force at any moment does not constitute its relationship to the government or its membership of the United States. Its practical relations are one thing. The fact of its existence as an organized community—one of the great national communities of states—is quite another thing.

Mr. Kelly: Let me interrupt the gentleman one moment longer. I will ask him whether, if the constitution be overthrown or destroyed and its practical relations cease, there be any state left?

Mr. Raymond: Why, sir, if there be no constitution of any sort in a state, no law, nothing but chaos, then that state would no longer exist as an organization. But that has not been the case. It never is the case in great communities, for they always have constitutions and forms of government. It may not be a constitution and form of government adapted to its relation to the government of the United States, and that would be a matter to be remedied by the government of the United States. That is what we have been trying to do for the last four years. The practical relations of the government of those states with the government of the United States were all wrong and were hostile to that government. They denied our jurisdiction; they denied that they were states of the United States, and they never any time when their organizations as states were destroyed.

A dead state is a solecism, a contradiction of terms, an impossibility. These are, I confess, rather metaphysical distinctions, but I did not raise them. Those who assert that a state is destroyed whenever its constitution is changed, or whenever its practical relations with this government are changed, are not consistent. If we demand the surrender of their arms, they are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is due as an act of justice from the defeated party to the victors party. It is due also, and we have a right to demand it as guarantee for the future. Why do we demand the surrender of their arms, and yet we are obliged to make it, and perhaps I am a little more specifically and accurately than I did at first. Now there must be at the end of the war a similar surrender on the political field of controversy. That surrender is