

great importance to the citizen. The courts have no power to create offences, but if by a latitudinarian construction they construe cases not provided for to be within legislative enactments, it is manifest that the safety and liberty of the citizens are put in peril, and that the legislative domain has been invaded. * * *

"These principles of law admit of no dispute, and have been often declared by the highest courts, and by no judicial tribunal more clearly than the Supreme Court of the United States. (U. S. *v.* Morris, 14 Peters, 464; U. S. *v.* Wiltberger, 5 Wheaton, 76; U. S. *v.* Sheldon, 2 *ib.*, 119; and see, also, Ferret *v.* Atwill, 1 Blatchford, 151, 156; Sedgw. *Const.* and *St. Law.*, 324, 326, 334; 1 Bish. *Cr. Law.*, Secs. 134, 145.)"

This rule for the interpretation of criminal and highly penal laws is applicable to laws in derogation or restraint of the liberty of citizens; as, for instance, laws prohibitory of ordinary trade and commerce.

These principles will, also, be found in—

Providence Steam Engine Co. *v.* Hubbard, 101 U. S., 188, 191, 192, and cases cited; Shaw *v.* R. R. Co., 101 U. S., 565; Brown *v.* Barry, 3 Dal., 367; Tiffany *v.* National Bank of Missouri, 18 Wallace, 409, 410; U. S. *v.* Strain, 17 Fed. Rep., 435, 437; U. S. *v.* Buchanan, 9 Fed. Rep., 689; French *v.* Foley, 11 Fed. Rep., 804.

We have referred to these familiar and settled rules for interpreting such statutes as these sections of the Revised Statutes, not because we are of opinion that the application of this rule is essentially necessary in order to reach a safe conclusion regarding the present question, because we do not think there is really any serious difficulty in reaching the conclusion that nothing in these three sections prohibits your receiving your said compensation; but we have appealed to this rule of construc-