Continued from page 48.

If you do not by this concession successfully organize a State government for yourselves now, the day is not far distant when your foes will organize one over your heads, and organize it upon such terms as will ostracize your most honored citizens from public place, if it do not disfranchise the body of your voters. The political history of some of the reconstructed States lies legible to your perusal and for your warning. In politics as in finance the tendency of the age is to centralization The triumphant career of a great political party demonstrates to you that there is no government so strong as a government of opinion, that there is no law so powerful as the will of a people. It is a turbulent, a resistless torrent, constitutional barriers are swept down before it, laws are changed to accommodate it, courts are overwhelmed or carried away upon its crest, and institutions which lift up their voices against it are hushed by its mighty thunders.

Do no trifle with your opportunity. Do not wait the tardy action of Congress. Do not entail upon yourselves years of oppression. Do not play into the hands of your foes. Do not close the mouths and tie the hands of your friends. Believe rather that this is the hour for triumph, that this is the "tidein your affairs which taken at the flood leads on to fortune." Believe rather that out of the wise compromise, the wise concession, which may have a beginning here, a happy future shall grow, that from this home the lovely State of Deseret shall go forth, with her errors forgotten, with her virtues shining like rubies upon her breast, to clasp hands with her sister States and march with them along the highway of empire which stretches from sun to sun.

Ex-Governor Fuller followed Mr. Fitch in a brief speech against the motion to adjourn *sine die*, and giving some reasons for a State government for Utah. In reference to one of the reasons given for adjournment, that the people of this Territory had not taken the usual American means of manifesting their wishes for a State government, namely, public meetings, resolutions, petitions, &c., he thought one word would answer that objection, for the people of Utah had taken the course usually pursued where no enabling act existed—they had been called upon to express their opinions, and had responded by voting for delegates to this convention and if a constitution should be framed by this convention it would be submitted to the people for their approval or disapproval. The reason assigned that the population of Utah is insufficient is of no force, for that reason is based on the New Apportionment Bill, which does not go into force until 1873. The fourth reason assigned by the gentleman who moved for the *sine die* adjournment, was that the convention was called without any authority of law and that its action has no other merit than that which pertains to any meeting of citizens called to discuss public measures. In reply, he, the speaker, said he knew of no higher merit the convention could possess than that of being a meeting of citizens called to discuss subjects of general importance, and if his memory served him the first convention that met for a similar purpose in Nevada had no higher color of law than that; while in the State of California the first convention, having the same object in view, was called merely on the recommendation of the commander of the United States forces in that State, and he could think of no law more attenuated than that, and in such matters no legal enactments can be binding; even the enabling acts which have been passed by Congress for the admission of the various States have not made it binding on the people of the Territory to meet in convention to adopt a constitution under such enabling acts, but have merely been recommendatory and advisory, and have granted permission to do so. The act for the calling of this convention passed by the late Legislature and vetoed by the Governor, as well as the joint resolution of the Legislature, could in no sense be considered as binding, he therefore could not understand what his colleague meant when he said this convention met without color of law.

The speaker then reviewed the third reason assigned by the gentleman, that the sad experience of other States created without sufficient population, has taught us that it is wiser to remain a carefully cared for ward of the General Government than to impose upon ourselves an onerous burden of taxation, crippling the energies and retarding the development of the resources of the country. He, the speaker, felt it unnecessary to discuss that question. No imposition ever practiced by a monarch upon its subjects was greater than the wardship or guardianship exercised by the government of the United States and its Territories. It is a relic of the colonial system of Great Britain, and in all its essential particulars is the same as that which exists to-day between the government of Great Britain and its dependencies. The history of one of the Territories of the United States is the history of all, and it is a history of injustice, wrong, oppression, official corruption on the one hand and on the other, of suffering, and appeals for aid; granted spasmodically by the government in the removal of bad men and the appointment of worse ones. He believed that this system of tutelage, pupilage and vassalage which now exists in the Territories must soon cease to exist, and he ventured to predict that in five years the only Territorial appendage of the United States would be ice-bound Alaska. He said this not because he believed Congress would be any more willing to admit new States in the future than in the past, but because it would be impossible for a system so utterly vile to longer exist under our republican form of government. He had thought upon this subject long, and he was convinced that if there was a pernicious, vile, objectionable system known among the governments of the world, it was the Territorial system of the United States.

The honorable gentleman then briefly reviewed the early history of Nevada, and showed that the experience there in official corruption was very similar to that of Utah, and that one of the earliest efforts of the people to obtain deliverance of Territorial vassalage was owing to their hatred of the judiciary system as forced upon them; and though in Utah there had been more accusations and hard words passing from one side to the other, yet her history had been, substantially, the history of all other Territories, and for this reason he was in favor of a State government and opposed to the motion to adjourn *sine die*.

Mr. Jennings followed in opposition to the motion, and in a short speech adverted to the past history of the people of Utah. He referred to the fact that in the early days of California, Nevada, and other portions of the West their supplies of the necessaries of life had been the result of the labors of the people of Utah, and that without the latter the settlement of Territories of the Rocky Mountain region would have remained unaccomplished and their resources undeveloped for an indefinite period. He referred to the dreary march of the people of Utah from the Missouri to these valleys, their arrival here in poverty, their heroic struggles to live, their ultimate prosperity, their excellent system of government, attested by the fact that the Territory, and every municipality it contained were perfectly free from debt; all demonstrating that the people of Utah were amply capable of self-government, and still; after giving such incontestible proof of the fact, one man, delegated by the general government, against the wishes of the people, had absolute power to veto any and every law passed by the representatives of the people of the Territory. These and many other abuses to which they were compelled to submit, proved the necessity of a change from a Territorial to a State government, hence his opposition to the motion under discussion.

Honorable Z. Snow addressed the Convention briefly in opposition to the motion. He was in favor of the people of Utah respectfully demanding and not slavishly begging their rights of the parent government. As an American citizen he had inalienable rights; he had enjoyed those rights at some portion of his life, while residing under a State government, and it was a flagrant wrong to be deprived thereof simply because he had passed the boundary lines of a State into a Territory. He recognized the United States government as the supreme power in, and the United States Constitution as the supreme law of, the land, but while doing so, he knew that as a citizen of the Republic he had rights and privileges of which no legitimate exercise of power could deprive him.

Mr. Miner referred to Michigan, which instituted its own State government and elected its own officers and was admitted. He read from and commented on the Federal Constitution and contended that the people had the constitutional right to assemble and petition for what they desired, and claim a State government.

Mr. Rowberry was strongly in favor of a State government, because under it the grants of public land made by Congress in aid of educational and other purposes could then be made available. It would also confer upon the people the power to elect their own judges and other officers, which, in the light of the past and present experience of the people, would bring about a most desirable change in their condition.

Hon. Orson Pratt addressed the Convention briefly in opposition to the motion. He considered that a Territorial form of government was unconstitutional, and that Congress had no right by virtue of the Constitution to impose such a form of government upon any people within its jurisdiction. That form of government had been forced upon the people of Utah contrary to their desires, and he thought it was high time that the people demand, not ask as a matter of grace, the right which belonged to them as American citizens. Under the present system the people of the Territory were deprived of the privilege of enacting one single law for their benefit. The hundred thousand citizens might vote and send their representatives to the legislature, and the latter might toil and labor for the good of their constituents, and a single stroke of the pen of one man, not elected by the people, could annihilate all they could do. This was not Republicanism, it was despotism, and therefore he was opposed to the motion and in favor of a change of government. He did not believe in the people crouching at the doors of Congress and begging for their rights, but in asking, demanding the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to every American citizen. When the people came from the Missouri river and penetrated these arid wilds, they did not come for the purpose of being disfranchised and to lose their American citizenship, or to receive a form of government that would deprive them of all the rights of American citizens. They had been compelled to submit to a form of government that had done so, but they desired to have this yoke of bondage broken, and they had met as the representatives and delegates of a free people to claim those inalienable rights guaranteed by the instrument framed by our honorable ancestors.

Adjourned till Wednesday, 10 a. m.

THE UTAH GOVERNOR'S VETO.

The veto by the Territorial governor of Utah of the legislative act for holding a constitutional convention preliminary to an application to Congress for the admission of Utah as a State, develops another phase in the policy * * * * which guides the Washington administration. The Utah governor, Woods by name, is a political parasite. * * * He tells the vassals * * * the inhabitants of Utah:

"To become a State in the Union is not a right, but a privilege. Good judgment would therefore, require that, before any convention should be called, Utah should place herself in harmonious relation with the general government. The first and highest duty of citizens is obedience to law. All violations of the laws of Congress should cease. Polygamy should be abandoned and laws should be enacted by Congress upon that subject until it is done. The people of Utah cannot expect, nor should they ask, admission as a State."

The question whether to become a State in the Union is a right, or only a privilege of the people inhabiting an organized Territory of the United States is one that in no way involves the question of polygamy, and that demands consideration independently of that question. The constitution declares that "Congress may admit new States in the Union." The language implies a discretionary power in Congress to admit or not to admit; and in other portions of the instrument the meaning and extent of this discretionary authority are fully exhibited. Congress shall see that the government of the new State is republican in form. Congress shall make all rules and regulations necessary for the government of the Territories, &c. In the exercise of these powers, Congress has passed acts organizing territorial governments; providing that a condition precedent of the admission of a new State should be a population sufficient to entitle such State to at least one representative in the popular branch of Congress, &c. Under the same general power of government in the Territories, Congress has passed "enabling acts," prescribing to the inhabitants of a Territory certain modes of procedure in applying for admission into the Union of States. But in none of these constitutional provisions, and nowhere in the character from which the Federal government derives its existence and all its powers, is there found any warrant of authority or right in Congress to positively deny to the people of a new State, formed from United States territory, admission into the Union, and to hold such people in a condition of provincial vassalage to the government of Washington. The whole theory and structure of our political system, and of every *republican* system or form of government of which it is possible to form any intelligent conception, negatives the idea of the existence of any such monarchical power in any part of its organism. The proposition is directly at war with the whole doctrine of self-government. It is wholly incompatible and irreconcilable with the most essencial fundamental principles of political liberty upon which the republic of the United States was established, and without which its government would be republican neither in form nor in fact.

Either the inhabitants of the Territory, comprising the requisite political numbers and conforming their political institutions to the requirements of the Federal constitution by agreeing upon a constitution republican in form, have not a right to be admitted as a new State into the Union, or they have such a right. If they have not such a right, then Congress *may not* admit them. If they have not such a right, then they have no right of self-government; but only a right to yield a passive and unquestioning obedience to whatever form of government or fashion of laws a power having its seat far beyond their own borders may think proper to send its agents to execute among them, and their only mode of rightful escape from the local dominion of a foreign power is in a successful rebellion against that power. It is necessary to consider them under one or another of three conditions: As having at some point, a right to be admitted to the Union as a self-governing State, or as having no right of self-government whatever, or as having the right to throw off allegiance to the United States and setting up an independent government of their own. If the Constitution of the United States can not be reconciled to either of the latter conditions, then it must be considered as recognizing the admission of a Territory to the Union as a State as a political right under the Constitution, and not as a mere congressional privilege.

But this question was ably and thoroughly considered, and the whole argument was exhausted, during the Kansas-Nebraska controversy. The inherent right of self-government then affirmed as an indefeasible and constitutional right, was not then, and has never been, successfully controverted.

It is probably a fact that Utah, not possessing the requisite population, has not yet *acquired* the right of admission to the Union as a State, under a constitution republican in form. But this fact has nothing to do with the assumption of an official parasite * * * that to become a State in the Union is not a right, but a privilege.—*Chicago Times.*

THE UTAH PROSECUTIONS.

To the Editor.—The press dispatch in the *Times* of yesterday from Salt Lake, relative to the action of the grand jury of that city, charging district attorney George C. Bates with unprofessional conduct in delaying the hearing before the jury of the Robinson murder case, conveys an erroneous impression to those not familiar with Utah affairs. Mr. Bates is on his way to Washington by order of the attorney general of the United States, for consultation upon these Territorial trials, as he announced in open court recently. U. S. Marshal Patrick has already incurred liabilities amounting to some $15,000 in the prosecution of various suits, which the law department of the government declines to pay without a special congressional appropriation, and in the meantime the important trials now pending have been postponed for want of funds to pay the expenses of the prosecution. Mr. Bates has appointed James L. High, Esq., a talented young lawyer of this city, who is temporarily residing in Utah, as deputy attorney during his absence, giving him instructions either to proceed with the business before the grand jury or to advise their adjournment until the March term of the court, when all the pending criminal business will come before them. It appears, however, that this * * jury, the validity of which is now pending before the United States supreme court, under the inspiration of the political ring of carpet-baggers and bummers, who have for the past year, disgraced the Territory and set justice at defiance, have taken a cowardly advantage of the absence of the district attorney to bring serious charges against him, which no man, familiar with the character and legal reputation of Judge Bates, will for a moment believe. All who have witnessed his official course in Utah will bear testimony to his faithfulness and energy in the discharge of his duties. True, he has not disgraced himself by the exhibition of a vindictive spirit, or the display of partizan prejudices against defendants on trial, as was the case with some of his temporary acting predecessors, and for this omission to carry out the ring programme he has been selected as a victim. One of the greatest wrongs perpetrated by the present administration is to be found in its relations with the territorial governments, which are alleged to support some of the scurviest carpet-baggers and scalawag politicians to be found in the country.

ONE WHO KNOWS.

Chicago Times.