

THE WESTERN GAZETTE.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY GEORGE FRYSLINGER, LEWISTOWN, MIFFLIN COUNTY, PA.

Vol. No. 2439.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1857.

New Series---Vol. III, No. 7.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.
ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM,
IN ADVANCE.
For six months, 75 cents.
All NEW subscriptions must be paid in advance. If the paper is continued, and not within the first month, \$1.25 will be charged for the first month, \$1.50; if not paid in six months, \$1.75; and if not paid in twelve months, \$2.00.
Papers addressed to persons out of the State will be discontinued at the expiration of three months, unless special request is made to the contrary or payment guaranteed by some responsible person here.
ADVERTISING.
Lines of notice, or their equivalent, count as a square. Three insertions \$1, and 25¢ for each subsequent insertion.

West Branch Insurance Co.
OF LOCK HAVEN, PA.
SURES Detach Buildings, Stores, Merchandise, Farm Property, and other Buildings and contents, at moderate rates.
DIRECTORS.
Hon. G. C. Harvey,
T. T. Abrams,
D. K. Jackson,
W. White,
Thos. Kitchen.
Hon. G. C. HARVEY, Pres.
T. T. ABRAMS, Vice Pres.
Sec'y, Kitchen, Sec'y.

CONTINENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY.
Authorized Capital, \$1,000,000.
No. 61 Walnut St. above Second, Phila.
Insurance on Buildings, Furniture, Merchandise, &c., generally. Marine Insurance Cargoes and Freight to all parts of the World. Inland Insurance on Goods, &c., by Rivers, Canals, and Land Carriage, by the Union, on the most favorable and consistent with security.
DIRECTORS.
Wm. Colladay, William Bowers,
M. Coleman, Joseph Oat,
G. V. Machette, Howard Hinchman,
GEORGE W. COLLADAY, President.
Agent for Mifflin county, Wm. P. EL-
LT. Esq. feb19-1y

INDemnity AGAINST LOSS BY FIRE.
Franklin Fire Insurance Company
of Philadelphia.
Office 1634 Chestnut street, near Fifth.
Capital of Assets, \$1,827,185 80
January 1st, 1857.
Insured agreeably to an act of Assembly, bearing date, 1835.
Mortgages, amply secured, \$1,519,932 73
Real Estate, (present value, \$109,000) 89,114 18
Insured (present value, \$83,881 12) 71,293 97
Total Assets, 64,121 56
Total Liabilities, \$1,827,185 80
Insured or Limited Insurances made on every description of property, in Town and Country, as low as are consistent with security.
When their incorporation, a period of twenty years, they have paid over Three Millions of Dollars, losses by fire, thereby affording evidence of the advantages of Insurance, as well as the ability and disposition to meet with business all liabilities.

Losses by Fire.
Paid during the year 1856, \$301,638 84
DIRECTORS.
N. Bancker, Mordecai D. Lewis,
Wagner, David S. Brown,
Grant, Isaac Lea,
Smith, Edward C. Dale,
W. Richards, George Fales,
CHARLES N. BANCKER, President.
G. Bancker, Sec'y.
Agent for Mifflin county, H. J. WAL-
MAR, Lewistown.

Foundry and Machine Shop.
The public are hereby notified that I have opened the Foundry and Machine Shop in the Borough of Lewistown, known as the "Junior Works," and the large and general assortment of Patterns, late the property of Wm. Willis, now of John Sterrett & Co. and Wm. Willis, and that I am prepared to do all kinds of
Casting, Turning, &c.
The shortest notice and in the best and most complete style.
JOHN ZEIGLER.
Lewistown, April 17, 1856--1f.

NEW TOYS
AND
FANCY GOODS
CHEAPER THAN EVER!
Best Assortment Ever Offered.
New and Beautiful Styles now opening of French Mechanical TOYS, Richest Dressing Dolls and Fancy Pieces; Wax, Crying and China Dolls; China Toys, Jewel Boxes, and Boxes, Vases and Fancy Articles, Caskets, Bags, &c.
Fancy Boxes of Willow, &c., over 150 patterns; German Toys, over 1000 patterns; and an endless variety of other goods of the most desirable styles, for sale in quantities to suit at very low prices.
W. TILLER, Importer,
No. 24 S. Fourth St., Philadelphia.
December 5, 1857--6f

THE MINSTREL.

OLD WINTER IS COMING.

BY HANNAH F. GOULD.
Old Winter is coming again--alack!
How icy and cold he is!
He cares not a pin for a shivering back--
He's a saucy old chap to white and to black--
He whistles his chills with a wonderful knack,
For he comes from a cold country.

A witty old fellow this Winter is--
A mighty old fellow for gloom!
He cracks his jokes on the pretty sweet miss,
The wretched old maiden unfit to kiss,
And frosts the dew of their lips--for this
Is the way with such fellows as he!

Old Winter's a fellowsome blade, I wot--
He is wild in his humor, and free!
He'll whistle along for the "want of his thought,"
And set all the warmth of our fires at naught,
And rumbles the lace by pretty girls bought--
For a frolicsome old fellow is he!

Old Winter is blowing his gust along,
And merrily shaking the tree!
From morning till night he will sing his song--
Now moaning and short--now howling and long--
His voice is such for his lungs are strong--
A merry old fellow is he!

Old Winter's a wicked old chap, I wot--
As wicked as ever you'll see!
He withers the flowers so fresh and green,
And bites the pert nose of the miss of sixteen,
As she triumphantly walks in mately shewn--
A wicked old fellow is he!

Old Winter's a tough old fellow for blows,
As tough as ever you'll see!
He will trip up our trotters, and rend our clothes,
And stiffen our limbs from fingers to toes--
He mauls not the cry of his friends or his foes--
A tough old fellow is he!

A cunning old fellow is Winter, they say,
A cunning old fellow is he!
He keeps in the crooked dice to day,
To see how we're passing our time away,
And marks all our doings from grave to gay--
I'm afraid he is peeping at me!

MISCELLANEOUS.

FROM ARTHUR'S TEMPERANCE TALKS.

"THOU ART THE MAN!"

"How can you reconcile it to your conscience to continue in your present business, Mr. Muddler?" asked a venerable clergyman of a tavern-keeper, as the two walked home from the funeral of a young man who had died suddenly.

"I find no difficulty on that score," replied the tavern-keeper, in a confident tone: "My business is as necessary to the public as that of any other man."

"That branch of it, which regards the comfort and accommodation of travellers, I will grant to be necessary. But there is another portion of it which, you must pardon me for saying, is not only uncalled for by the real wants of the community, but highly detrimental to health and good morals."

"And pray, Mr. Mildman, to what portion of my business do you allude?"

"I allude to that part of it which embraces the sale of intoxicating drinks."

"Indeed! the very best part of my business. But, certainly, you do not pretend to say that I am to be held accountable for the unavoidable excesses which sometimes grow out of the use of liquors as a beverage?"

"I certainly must say, that, in my opinion, a very large share of the responsibility rests upon your shoulders. You not only make it a business to sell liquors, but you use every device in your power to induce men to come and drink them. You invent new compounds with new and attractive names, in order to induce the indifferent or the lovers of variety, to frequent your bar-room. In this way, you too often draw the weak into an excess of self-indulgence, that ends, alas! in drunkenness and final ruin of body and soul. You are not only responsible for all this, Mr. Muddler, but you bear the weight of a fearful responsibility!"

"I cannot see the subject in that light, Mr. Mildman," the tavern-keeper said, rather gravely. "Mine is an honest and honorable calling, and it is my duty to my family and to society, to follow it with diligence and a spirit of enterprise."

"May I ask you a plain question, Mr. Muddler?"

"Oh yes, certainly," as many as you please.

"Can that calling be an honest and honorable one which takes sustenance from the community, and gives back nothing in return?"

"I do not know that I understand the nature of your question, Mr. Mildman."

"Consider then society as a man in a larger form, as it really is. In this great body, as in the lesser body of man, there are various functions of use and a reciprocity between the whole. Each function receives a portion of life from the others, and gives back its own proper share for the good of the whole. The hand does not act for itself alone--receiving strength and selfishly appropriating without returning its quota of good to the general system. And so of the heart, and lungs, and every other organ in the whole body. Reverse the order--and how soon is the entire system diseased! Now, does that member of the great body of the people act honestly and honorably, who regularly receives his portion of good from the general social system, and gives nothing back in return?"

tem into that limb, and a constant giving back of disease that gradually pervades the entire body; and, unless that body possesses extraordinary vital energy, in the end destroys it. In like manner, if in the larger body there be one member who takes his share of life from the whole, and gives back nothing but a poisonous principle, whose effect is disease and death, surely he cannot be called a good member--nor honest, nor honorable."

"And pray, Mr. Mildman," asked the tavern-keeper, with warmth, "where will you find, in society, such an individual as you describe?"

The minister paused at this question, and looked his companion steadily in the face. Then raising his long, thin finger to give force to his remark, he said with deep emphasis--

"Thou art the man!"

"Me, Mr. Mildman!" exclaimed the tavern-keeper, in surprise and displeasure. "You surely cannot be in earnest."

"I utter but a solemn truth, Mr. Muddler: such is your position in society!-- You receive food, and clothing, and comforts and luxuries of various kinds for yourself and family from the social body, and what do you give back for all these?"

"A poison to steal away the health and happiness of that social body. You are far worse than a perfectly dead member--you exist upon the great body as a moral gangrene. Reflect calmly upon this subject. Go home, and in the silence of your own chamber, enter into unimpassioned and solemn communion with your heart. Be honest with yourself. Exclude the bias of selfish feelings and selfish interests, and honestly define to yourself your true position."

"But, Mr. Mildman--"

The two men had paused nearly in front of Mr. Muddler's splendid establishment, and were standing there when the tavern-keeper commenced a reply to the minister's last remarks. He had uttered but the first word or two, when he was interrupted by a pale, thin-dressed female, who held a little girl by the hand. She came up before him and looked him steadily in the face for a moment or two.

"Mr. Muddler, I believe," she said.

"Yes, madam, that is my name," was his reply.

"I have come, Mr. Muddler," the woman then said, with an effort to smile and affect a polite air, "to thank you for a present I received last night."

"Thank me, madam! There certainly must be some mistake. I never made you a present. Indeed, I have not the pleasure of your acquaintance."

"You said your name was Muddler, I believe?"

"Yes, madam, as I told you before, that is my name."

"Then you are the man. You made my little girl, here, a present also, and we have come with our thanks."

"You deal in riddles, madam. Speak out plainly."

"As I said before," the woman replied, with bitter irony in her tones, "I have come with my little girl to thank you for the present we received last night; a present of wretchedness and abuse."

"I am still as far from understanding you as ever," the tavern-keeper said--"I never abused you, madam. I do not even know you."

"But you know my husband, sir! You have enticed him to your bar, and for his money have given him a poison that has changed him from one of the best and kindest of men, into a demon. To you, then, I owe all the wretchedness I have suffered, and the brutal treatment I shared with my helpless children last night. It is for this that I have come to thank you."

"Surely, madam, you must be beside yourself. I have nothing to do with your husband."

Political.

MR. DOUGLAS ON THE KANSAS QUESTION.

Mr. Douglas, after referring to the points assumed in the President's Message and quoting a number of precedents to show that Congress ought not to recognize the Lecompton Constitution, said--

The President of the United States tells us, in his message, that he had unequivocally expressed his opinions, in the form of instructions to Governor Walker, assuming that the constitution was to be submitted to the people for ratification. When we look at Governor Walker's letter of acceptance of the office of Governor, we find that he stated expressly that he accepted it with the understanding that the President and his whole Cabinet concurred with him that the constitution, when formed, was to be submitted to the people for ratification.

Then look into the instructions given by the President of the United States, through General Cass, the Secretary of State, to Governor Walker, and you there find that the Governor is instructed to use the military power to protect the polls when the constitution shall be submitted to the people of Kansas for their free acceptance or rejection.

Trace the history a little further, and you will find that Governor Walker went to Kansas and proclaimed, in his inaugural and in his speeches at Topeka and elsewhere, that it was the distinct understanding, not only of himself, but of those higher in power than himself--meaning the President and his Cabinet--that the constitution was to be submitted to the people for their free acceptance or rejection, and that he would use all the power at his command to defeat its acceptance by Congress, if it were not thus submitted to the vote of the people. Mr. President, I am not going to stop and inquire how far the Nebraska bill, which said the people should be left perfectly free to form their constitution for themselves, authorized the President, or the Cabinet, or Governor Walker, or any other Territorial officer, to interfere and tell the Convention of Kansas whether they should or should not submit the question to the people. I am not going to stop to inquire how far they were authorized to do that, it being my opinion that the spirit of the Nebraska bill required it to be done. It is sufficient for my purpose that the Administration of the Federal Government unanimously, that the Administration of the Territorial Government, in all its parts, unanimously understood the Territorial law under which the Convention was assembled to mean that the constitution to be formed by that Convention should be submitted to the people for ratification or rejection, and, if not confirmed by a majority of the people, should be null and void, without coming to Congress for approval.

Not only did the National Government and the Territorial Government so understand the law at the time, but, as I have already stated, the people of the Territory so understood it. As a further evidence on that point, a large number, if not the majority, of the delegates were instructed in the nominating conventions to submit the constitution to the people for ratification. I know that the delegates from Douglas county, eight in number, Mr. Calhoun, President of the Convention, being among them, were not only instructed thus to submit the question, but they signed and published, while candidates, a written pledge that they would submit it to the people for ratification. I know that men in high authority and in the confidence of the Territorial and National Government, canvassed every part of Kansas during the election of delegates, and each one of them pledged himself to the people that the constitution was to be submitted to the people, for acceptance or rejection; that it would be void unless that was done; that the Administration would spurn and scorn it as a violation of the principles on which it came into power, and that a Democratic Congress would hurl it from their presence, as an insult to Democrats who stood pledged to see the people left free to form their domestic institutions for themselves.

Not only that, Sir, but up to the time when the Convention assembled, on the 1st of September, so far as I can learn, it was understood everywhere that the constitution was to be submitted for ratification or rejection. They met, however, on the 1st of September, and adjourned until after the October election. I think it wise and prudent that they should thus have adjourned. They did not wish to bring any question into that election which would divide the Democratic party and weaken our chances of success in the election. I was rejoiced when I saw that they did adjourn, so as not to show their hand on any question that would divide and distract the party until after the election.

During that recess, while the Convention was adjourned, Governor Ransom, the Democratic candidate for Congress, running against the present delegate from that Territory, was canvassing every part of Kansas in favor of the doctrine of submitting the constitution to the people, declaring that the Democratic party were in favor of such submission, and that it was a slander of the Black Republicans to intimate the charge that the Democratic party did not intend to carry out that pledge in good faith. Thus, up to the time of the meeting of the Convention, in October last, the pretence was kept up, the profession was openly made and believed by me, and I thought believed by them, that the Convention intended to submit a constitution to the people, and not to attempt to put a government in operation without such submission. The election being over, the Democratic party being defeated by an overwhelming vote, the Opposition having triumphed and got possession of both branches of the Legislature, and having elected their Territorial Delegate, the Convention assembled and then proceeded to complete their work. Now let us stop to inquire how they redeemed the pledge to submit the constitution to the people. They first go on and make a constitution. Then they make a schedule, in which they provide that the constitution, on the 21st of December--the present month--shall be submitted to all the bona fide inhabitants of the Territory on that day, for their acceptance or rejection, in the

following manner, to wit: Thus acknowledging that they were bound to submit it to the people, conceding that they had no right to put it into operation without submitting it to the people, providing in the instrument that it should take effect from and after the date of its ratification, and not before; showing the constitution derives its vitality, in their estimation, not from the authority of the Convention, but from that vote of the people to which it was to be submitted for their free acceptance or rejection. How is it to be submitted? It shall be submitted in this form: "Constitution with Slavery or Constitution with no Slavery." All men must vote for the constitution, whether they like it or not, in order to be permitted to vote for or against slavery. Thus a constitution made by a Convention that had authority to assemble and petition for a redress of grievances, but not to establish a government--a constitution made under a pledge of honor that it should be submitted to the people before it took effect; a constitution which provides, on its face, that it shall have no validity except what it derives from such submission--is submitted to the people at an election where all men are at liberty to come forward freely without hindrance and vote for it, but no man is permitted to record a vote against it. That would be as fair an election as some of the enemies of Napoleon attributed to him when he was elected First Consul. He is said to have called out his troops and had them reviewed by his officers with a speech, patriotic and fair in its professions, in which he said to them: "Now, my soldiers, you are to go to the election and vote freely just as you please. If you vote for Napoleon, all is well; vote against him, and you are sure to be shot." That was a fair election. [Laughter.] This election is to be equally fair. All men in favor of the constitution may vote for it--all men against it shall not vote at all. Why not let them vote against it? I presume you had better very large number of the gentlemen who framed the constitution, quite a number of delegates, and a still larger number of persons who are their friends, and I have received the same answer from every one of them. I never received any other answer. What is that? They say if they allow a negative vote the constitution would have been voted down by an overwhelming majority, and hence the fellows shall not be allowed to vote at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that may be true. It is no part of my purpose to deny the proposition that that constitution would have been voted down if submitted to the people. I believe it would have been voted down by a majority of four to one. I am informed by men well posted there--Democrats--that it would be voted down by ten to one; some say by twenty to one. But is it a good reason why you should declare it in force, without being submitted to the people, merely because it would have been voted down by five to one if you had submitted it? What does that fact prove? Does it not show undeniably that an overwhelming majority of the people of Kansas are unalterably opposed to that constitution? Will you force it on them against their will simply because they would have voted it down if you had consulted them? If you will, are you going to force it upon them under the plea of leaving them perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way? Is that the mode in which I am called upon to carry out the principle of self-government and popular sovereignty in the Territories--to force a constitution on the people against their will, in opposition to their protest, with a knowledge of the fact, and then to assign as a reason for my tyranny that they would be so obstinate and so perverse as to vote down the constitution if I had given them an opportunity to be consulted about it? Sir, I deny your right or mine to inquire of these people what their objections to that constitution are. They have a right to judge for themselves whether they like or dislike it. It is no answer to tell me that the constitution is a good one and unobjectionable. It is not satisfactory to me to have the President say in his message that the constitution is an admirable one, like all the constitutions of the new States that have been recently formed. Whether good or bad, whether obnoxious or not, is none of my business and none of yours. It is their business and not ours.

I care not what they have in their constitution, so that it suits them and does not violate the Constitution of the United States and the fundamental principles of liberty upon which our institutions rest. I am not going to argue the question whether the banking system established in that constitution is wise or unwise. It says there shall be no monopolies, but there shall be one bank of discount in the State, with two branches. All I have to say on that point is, if they want a banking system, let them have it; if they do not want it, let them prohibit it. If they want a bank with two branches, be it so; if they want twenty, it is none of my business; and it matters not to me whether one of them shall be on the north side and the other on the south side of Kaw River, or where they shall be. While I have no right to expect to be consulted on that point, I do hold that the people of Kansas have the right to be consulted and to decide it, and you have no rightful authority to deprive them of that privilege. It is no justification, in my mind, to say that the provisions for the eligibility for the offices of Governor and Lieutenant Governor require twenty years' citizenship in the United States. If men think that no person should vote or hold office until he has been here twenty years, they have a right to think so; and if a majority of the people of Kansas think that no man less than has lived there twenty years, it is their right to say so, and I have no right to interfere with them; it is their business, not mine; but if I lived there I should not be willing to have that provision in the constitution without being heard upon the subject, and allowed to record my protest against it.

I have nothing to say about their system of taxation, in which they have gone back and resorted to the old exploded system that we tried in Illinois, but abandoned because we did not like it. If they wish to try it and get tired of it and abandon it, be it so; but if I were a citizen of Kansas I would profit by the experience of Illinois on that subject, and defeat it if I could. Yet I have no objection to

their having it if they want it; it is their business, not mine. So it is in regard to the free negroes. They provide that no free negro shall be permitted to live in Kansas. I suppose they have a right to say so if they choose; but if I lived there I should want to vote on that question. We, in Illinois, provide that no more shall come there. We say to the other States, "take care of your own free negroes and we will take care of ours." But we do not say that the negroes, now there, shall not be permitted to live in Illinois, and I think the people of Kansas ought to have the right to say whether they will allow them to live there, and if they are not going to do so, how they are to dispose of them. So you may go on with all the different clauses of the constitution. They may be all right; they may be all wrong. That is a question on which my opinion is worth nothing. The opinion of the wise and patriotic Chief Magistrate of the United States is not worth anything as against that of the people of Kansas, for they have a right to judge for themselves, and neither Presidents, nor Senators, nor House of Representatives, nor any other power outside of Kansas has a right to judge for them. Hence, it is no justification, in my mind, for the violation of a great principle of self-government to say that the constitution you are forcing on them is not particularly obnoxious, or is excellent in its provisions.

Perhaps, Sir, the same thing might be said of the celebrated Topeka Constitution. I do not recollect its peculiar provisions. I know one thing: We Democrats, we Nebraska men, would not even look into it to see what its provisions were. Why? Because we said it was made by a political party, and not by the people; that it was made in defiance of the authority of Congress; that if it was as pure as the Bible, as holy as the ten commandments, yet we would not touch it until it was submitted to and ratified by the people of Kansas, in pursuance of the forms of law. Perhaps that Topeka Constitution, but for the mode of making it, would have been unobjectionable. I do not know; I do not care. You have no right to force an unobjectionable constitution on a people. It does not mitigate the evil, it does not diminish the insult, it does not ameliorate the wrong that you are forcing a good thing on them. I am not willing to be forced to do that which I would do if I were left free to judge and act for myself. Hence I assert that there is no justification to be made for this flagrant violation of popular rights in Kansas, on the plea that the constitution which they have made is particularly obnoxious. But, Sir, the President of the United States is really and sincerely of the opinion that the slavery clause has been fairly and impartially submitted to the free acceptance or rejection of the people of Kansas, and that, inasmuch as that was the existing and paramount question, if they get the right to vote as they please on that subject they ought to be satisfied; and possibly it might be better if we would accept it, and put an end to the question.

Let me ask, Sir, is the slavery clause fairly submitted, so that the people can vote for or against it? Suppose I were a citizen of Kansas, and should go up to the polls and say, "I desire to vote to make Kansas a Slave State; here is my ballot." They reply to me, "Mr. Douglas, just vote for that constitution first, if you please." "Oh, no!" I answer, "I cannot vote for that constitution conscientiously. I am opposed to the clause by which you locate certain railroads in such a way as to sacrifice my country and my part of the State. I am opposed to that banking system. I am opposed to this Know-nothing or American clause in the constitution about the qualification for office. I cannot vote for it." Then they answer, "You shall not vote in making it a Slave State." I then say, "I want to make it a Free State." They reply, "Vote for that constitution first, and then you can vote to make it a Free State; otherwise you cannot." Thus they disqualify every Free State man who will not vote first for the constitution; thus they disqualify every Slave State man who will not first vote for the constitution. No matter whether or not the voters state that they cannot conscientiously vote for those provisions, they reply, "You cannot vote for or against slavery here. Take the constitution as we have made it, take the elective franchise as we have established it, take the railroad lines as we have located them, take the judiciary system as we have formed it, take it all as we have fixed it to suit ourselves, and ask no questions, but vote for it, or you shall not vote either for a Slave or a Free State."

In other words the legal effect of the schedule is this: All those who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--

"The friends and supporters of the Missouri law, who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--

"The friends and supporters of the Missouri law, who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--

"The friends and supporters of the Missouri law, who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--

"The friends and supporters of the Missouri law, who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--

"The friends and supporters of the Missouri law, who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--

"The friends and supporters of the Missouri law, who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--

"The friends and supporters of the Missouri law, who are in favor of this constitution may vote for or against slavery, as they please; but all those who are against this constitution are disfranchised, and shall not vote at all. That is the mode in which the slavery proposition is submitted. Every man opposed to the constitution is disfranchised on the slavery clause. Now many are they? They tell you there is a majority, for they say the constitution will be voted down instantly by an overwhelming majority, if you allow a negative vote. This shows that a majority are against it. They disqualify and disfranchise every man who is against it, thus referring the slavery clause to a minority of the people of Kansas, and leaving the majority free to vote for or against the slavery clause, as they choose. Let me ask you, that is a fair mode of submitting the slavery clause? Does that mode of submitting it particular clause leave the people perfectly free to vote for or against slavery as they choose? Am I free to vote as I choose the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for the Missouri law? Am I free to vote on the slavery question if you tell me I shall not vote until I vote for a bank? Is it a question depend upon the mode in which you are going to vote on some other thing which has no connection with the freedom of election? Is that the fundamental principle of self-government which we combined and struck body and throughout the country, and as the rule of action in all time to President of the United States has said in his remarks in his message which, if it would be very appropriate to connection. He says:--