

Foreign News.

ARRIVAL OF THE EUROPA.
FREE DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.
The London market was slightly easier, with a less demand.



THE AMERICAN.

SUNBURY.
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1857.

H. B. MASSEY, Editor and Proprietor.

TO ADVERTISERS.—The circulation of the Sunbury American upon the different terms of the subscription is not extended (regardless of any paper published in North or South America).

The mails from Harrisburg have not been brought over by way of the Ferry for a week past. What is the matter?

RECORDED ADVERTISEMENTS.—Almost every week we are compelled to reject advertisements sent us by mail. Some on account of their indelicate character, others on account of the terms and want of responsibility.

AN EDITOR PROMOTED.—Our old friend and neighbor, Israel Grottel, Esq., of the "Union Democrat," published at Solingrove has been appointed Associate Judge for Snyder County, in place of Judge Winters, elected to the legislature. We may now truthfully say, in the language of scripture, "a new Judge in Israel"—and we have no doubt he will make a good one.

SPECIE PAYMENTS.—The Banks of New York have resumed specie payments. The Philadelphia papers think it rather early and intimate that the Philadelphia Banks would be ready also, if the Country Banks were prepared.

WE have only to say in regard to the Northumberland, Danville and Lewisburg Banks, that they are ready and willing, perhaps more so than the City Banks. The City Banks therefore need only say the word "go."

LARGE HOGS.—Our neighbors of the Gazette have entered the list of competitors, in raising heavy hogs, and killed two, a few days since, one weighing 506 the other 450 pounds. Mr. E. Y. Bright, has, in his pen, two trunkless elephants, which he calls hogs, which are to carry the palm in this porcine contest. As for ourselves, we have an almost Jewish aversion to hogs of all kinds, big and little, and believe with the editors of the Journal of Health, that this pork devouring propensity of us Americans, is gross, debasing and unwholesome.

THE BLOOMSBURG AND LACKAWANA RAILROAD.—The last rail was laid down Saturday last. By the completion of this road we now have a continuous Railway communication to Scranton, and Great Bend on the New York and Erie road.

GOODY FOR JANUARY 1858.—The Lady's Book for January is a gem in its way. It is literally filled with engraving and beautiful illustrations. Goody improves on every successive number, and never promise without fulfilling.

A GENEROUS OFFER.—A Philadelphia publisher sends us a prospectus advertisement, worth five dollars, for the publication of which he generously offers us an "exchange." Now, as we do not wish to be outdone in generosity, and consider our paper the most valuable of the two, we will agree to exchange with him on condition that he inserts our advertisement, which is not more than half the length of his own. Can it be possible that we have any editors green enough to be caught with such a bait?

GEN. PEMBER F. SMITH.—While in Washington last week, we had the pleasure of seeing and hearing this distinguished military commander. He made a friendly visit to Gen. Cameron, and in the course of conversation gave his views in regard to the military operations in Utah. He thinks large reinforcements from California and Oregon necessary to the subjugation of the Mormons. Gen. Smith is a Pennsylvanian by birth. His snow white locks and bland countenance between the high toned gentleman and gallant soldier. Gen. Smith was one of the most distinguished officers of the Mexican war.

JOURNAL OF INDUSTRY.—This is the title of a new periodical started in Philadelphia by J. P. Sanderson, Esq., whose connection with the Daily News has given him considerable experience in these matters. Mr. Sanderson is a vigorous writer and is well posted in matters of political economy and commercial industry.

JUDGE DOUGLAS AND GOV. BIGLER IN THE SENATE.—It was our good fortune to occupy a seat on the floor of the United States Senate Chamber on the 9th inst. During the delivery of Judge Douglas' great speech on the President's message, in relation to the affairs of Kansas, after the reading of the message the day previous, Judge Douglas took exception to that portion which refers to the affairs of Kansas and stated that he intended to give his views on this important subject. Senator Bigler on the other hand, gave notice that he concurred in the views of the President, and intimated his readiness to defend him. The galleries and the floor of the Senate were crowded with anxious spectators.

In the ladies gallery, was seated the beautiful young wife of the little giant, which corroborated the rumor that Judge Douglas had married. The lady never seen or heard of the Illinois Senator, we will state, that in stature he is about five feet six inches in height, while his body is proportionally longer than his legs. In appearance he is robust without being stout, dark complexion with a bushy beard of dark hair, which he tosses unobscured with no mean significance in the excitement of debate. His voice is strong and powerful—his enunciation clear and distinct, and sometimes, a little hesitation in his propositions which are stated with almost mathematical precision.

His style of argument is methodical, clear and logical—his gentleness earnest and intense, indicating the indomitable energy of the man. In an off-hand debate or parliamentary skirmish, he has no superior. Judge Douglas took the broad ground of "popular sovereignty," and showed, conclusively, that the Lecompton Constitution was a fraud on the rights of the people, a mere trick of designing men. He declared that he never would sacrifice principle to expediency, and if the Constitution was the most perfect that could be made, he would reject it, unless sanctioned by the voice of the people.

At the conclusion there was great applause in the galleries and on the floor. Senator Mason, of Virginia, moved to clear the galleries, but was induced to withdraw his motion. Mr. Mason complimented the Senator from Illinois on having made a powerful speech, but contended that it was founded on fallacies, which he attempted to explain. Judge Douglas then settled the Virginia Senator. He then turned his attention to Gov. Bigler, who had intimated that the weight of the administration rested upon his shoulders, and attacked the views of Mr. Douglas. We do not wish to detract from Gov. Bigler, but his utter discomfiture in every encounter with the "little giant" was painfully evident to all who were present. One of the most striking scenes was when Gov. Bigler referred to some private interviews at Mr. Douglas' house, when, according to Gov. Bigler, it was resolved to prepare a Constitution for Kansas, which was not to be submitted to the people. Judge Douglas indignantly asked if he was present and participated in any such conversation, or was in any way privy to such an arrangement. Gov. Bigler's answer was still equivocal. Judge Douglas again persisted in having a direct answer, and asked the Senator from Pennsylvania not to insinuate that which he dare not avow. Mr. Bigler replied that it was in his house. Judge Douglas contemptuously asked, "What has my house to do with this question?" No language can describe the withering rebuke and scornful expressions of the "little giant" in this scene. We observed Lord Napier and the French Minister listening with great interest to the debate.

SPEECH OF JUDGE DOUGLAS.—The following is an extract of the great speech delivered by Judge Douglas, in the U. S. Senate, on the 9th inst. Judge Douglas took exception to that portion of the President's Message which relates to slavery. We regret that we have not room enough for the whole speech, which is an overwhelming argument in favor of his position and against the adoption of the Lecompton Constitution. It is sufficient for my purpose that the Administration of the Federal Government unanimously, by the adoption of the territorial government, in all its parts, unambiguously 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 convention to submit the constitution to the people for ratification. I know that the delegates from Douglas county, eight in number, Mr. Cahoon, President of the convention, being among them, were not only instructed thus to submit the question, but they signed and published, while candidates, a pledge to the people that they would submit to the people for ratification, in the confidence of the territorial and national government, every part of Kansas during the election of delegates, and each one of them pledged himself to the people that no snap judgment was to be taken; 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 first of September, so far as I can learn, it was understood everywhere that the constitution was to be submitted for ratification or rejection. They did, however, on the first of September, and adjourned until after the October election. I have already stated, that they should have adjourned, if they did not wish to bring up a 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, raising 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 he, as a member 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 proposition 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, adjourned, elected their territorial delegate, the convention assembled and then proceeded to complete their work.

Now let us step to inquire how they received the pledge to submit the constitution to the people. They first made a schedule, in a constitution. Then that the constitution, on the 11th of December—the present month—should be submitted to all the bona fide inhabitants of the territory on that day for their free acceptance or rejection, in the following manner; viz: that acknowledging that they were bound to submit it to the will of the people, conceding that they had no right to put it in operation without submitting it to the people; providing in the instrument that if it should be rejected, it should be null and void, and that if it should be accepted, it should be the law of the land, and that the constitution should be submitted to the people, and that if it should be rejected, it should be null and void, and that if it should be accepted, it should be the law of the land, and that the constitution should be submitted to the people, and that if it should be rejected, it should be null and void, and that if it should be accepted, it should be the law of the land.

There is no necessity for crowding this measure, so unfair, so unjust as it is in all its aspects, upon us. Why can we not now do what we proposed to do in the last Congress? We then voted through the Senate an enabling act, called "the Toombs bill," believed to be just and fair in all its provisions, and which would have been most perfectly carried out by the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. Hale) only he did not like the man then President of the United States, who would have to make the appointments.

Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a few additional provisions, so that it shall be a general law, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party.—You all voted, with me, for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Toombs, treat both those party movements as irregular and void, and pass a law, which we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit—have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days.

Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a few additional provisions, so that it shall be a general law, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party.—You all voted, with me, for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Toombs, treat both those party movements as irregular and void, and pass a law, which we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit—have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days.

Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a few additional provisions, so that it shall be a general law, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party.—You all voted, with me, for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Toombs, treat both those party movements as irregular and void, and pass a law, which we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit—have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days.

Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a few additional provisions, so that it shall be a general law, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party.—You all voted, with me, for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Toombs, treat both those party movements as irregular and void, and pass a law, which we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit—have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days.

Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a few additional provisions, so that it shall be a general law, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party.—You all voted, with me, for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Toombs, treat both those party movements as irregular and void, and pass a law, which we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit—have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days.

Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a few additional provisions, so that it shall be a general law, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party.—You all voted, with me, for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Toombs, treat both those party movements as irregular and void, and pass a law, which we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit—have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days.

Why can we not take that bill, and, out of compliment to the President, add to it a few additional provisions, so that it shall be a general law, requiring the Constitution to be submitted to the people, and pass that? That unites the party.—You all voted, with me, for that bill at the last Congress. Why not stand by the same bill now? Ignore Lecompton, ignore Toombs, treat both those party movements as irregular and void, and pass a law, which we framed ourselves when we were acting as a unit—have a fair election, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days. The people want a fair vote. They will never be satisfied without it. They never should be satisfied without a fair vote on the first of September, and you will have peace in the Democratic party, and peace throughout the country, in ninety days.

like it, not, in order to be permitted to vote for or against it. The constitution was 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, is not a constitution, but a mere promise, which provides, on its face, that it shall have no validity except what it derives from such submission—it is submitted to the people at an election where all men are at liberty to come forward, without hindrance, and vote for it, but no man is permitted to receive 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 instantly 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, if you please? For something many a man this question. I have asked a 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. Was it a fair election? For that matter, if 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 by a majority of four to one. I am informed by men well posted down by 10 to 1; some say by 20 to 1. But is it a good reason why you should declare it in force, without being submitted to the people, merely because it would be voted down? 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 it had been submitted to them? If you will, you are going to force upon them the plea of having been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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 impose on these people what their objections to it have been, and to say that they have been 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 them, and then to say, 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