

EDITORIALS

PROPOSED ADMISSION OF COLORADO.

THE Washington correspondence, May 27, of the New York Herald, has the following—

"The House Committee on Territories, to-day, after fully considering the claim of Colorado to admission as a State, decided unanimously to report in favor of its admission and will on Monday next present the report, and it is expected the bill will pass under a suspension of the rules, the same strength being claimed as was shown when New Mexico was under consideration on Thursday last."

Some of our contemporaries in the East do not appear to be in favor of the admission of any more Territories. The arguments offered are somewhat selfish, being of this kind—the Territories are doing tolerably well as they are, their admission as States would be no gain or advantage to the Union, and we do not want them to come in, as we can do without them.

It is also suggested that the Senate is not very favorable to the admission of New Mexico.

It is a rather narrow-minded, greedy policy to act upon—what advantage will it be to us to do it? Fully followed out, that would banish from any nation all such things as magnanimity, generosity, liberality, justice and equal rights, and the "consent of the governed" would soon become an utterly obsolete idea.

As Congress is now considering this matter of admitting Territories as States in the Union, the best thing that could be done would be to admit promptly New Mexico, Colorado and Utah, all thriving commonwealths, all well capable of self-government, and the people of all deserving of the full rights of citizenship, as much so as the people of any State in the Union.

TERRITORIES AND STATES.

THE subject of Territories and new States appears to be exciting considerable attention in the East. The New York Herald of May 29, in an article upon the subject, says—

"We had an interesting debate in the Senate yesterday on the motion to admit the new Territory of Pembina. The Senators seemed disposed to develop a general policy in dealing with the Territories and the admission of new States."

"The vote in the House of Representatives on the admission of New Mexico was one of the most conclusive that have been passed during the session. There were one hundred and sixty yeas and fifty-four nays. Among those who favored the measure we note men like Dawes, Nesmith, Orth, and opposed to it such members as E. R. Hoar, Tremaine and Ellis H. Roberts; so that the vote cannot be called partizan or sectional. The discussion was thorough, those taking part being Mr. Elkins, the Delegate from New Mexico; Mr. McKee, of Mississippi; Mr. Potter, of New York; Mr. Kasson, of Iowa; Mr. Fort, of Illinois; Mr. Maynard and others. In this debate it was said that New Mexico now claimed a population of one hundred and thirty-five thousand—a population larger than that of fifteen other States at the time of their admission to the Union—and that more votes had been given in the last canvass than had been cast for any one of forty members of the present Congress. Among the States which came into the Union with less population than New Mexico now contains were Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa. Mr. Kasson made the point that when a part of the Mexican Republic New Mexico had a representation in its Congress, with all the rights of State sovereignty, and that annexation should not work disfranchisement. It was shown also that in 1846, when General Kearny, at the head of an American army, occupied Santa Fe, he stated, in the name of the government, that 'it was the wish and intention of the United States to provide a free government with the least possible delay, similar to those in the United States. It was alleged that Europeans had settled in this Ter-

ritory a hundred years before the landing of the Pilgrims, that its capital was the oldest town in the United States except St. Augustine, and that in domain it was three times as large as Ohio—larger than New England and New York. The impressions these statements made upon the House are indicated by the vote, and we presume they led to the action of the House Committee on Territories, in favor of the admission of Colorado as a State, which was reported yesterday. The friends of the admission of Colorado, inspired by the success of New Mexico, now mean to press their case to a vote on Monday. So that the whole question of these Territories, and, perhaps, of others like Montana and Washington, will come up before Congress for discussion.

"We believe in dealing with our Territories in a liberal spirit, and the whole question should be discussed, not so much as affecting the domination of one party or the other, but as a question of the gravest public concern. If the welfare of these Territories is to be served by their admission into the Union as States let them be admitted. But we have seen no argument showing this to be so."

If our contemporary has not, we have. We have not only seen arguments showing that, but have felt them, because we live in a Territory, and we ought to know where the shoe pinches.

The Herald considers that "it would be much better for the interests of the Union if this whole question of senatorial representation were to be carefully revised," that the Senate should be reconstructed and made more republican in tone, and that no higher reason than this, for the non-admission of New Mexico, appeared in the recent congressional discussion upon the subject.

Then, as Mr. Maynard remarked, the argumentation was projected on a low plane. In the discussion in the House it was well stated by Mr. Hoar, that equality of senatorial representation was one of the principles upon which the federal constitution was framed, and by Mr. Hereford, that it was in accordance with the theory upon which the federal government was founded, that upon that point the great fight took place at the formation of the Constitution, and that it was maintained that each State should have two Senators in the federal Senate, to represent the sovereignty of the State. Thus Congress may be considered a sort of compromise body, the Senate representing the sovereignty of the States, and the House the sovereignty of the people. Mr. Potter, the New York Herald, and others would destroy this equality of State representation in the Senate, and base the Senate representation, as is the House representation, upon the ratio of population.

This is a matter which Congress can attend to by constitutional amendment, if it has the disposition to do so. But on whichever of these systems Senators may be chosen, it is no reason why the people of the Territories should be deprived of the common rights of American citizens, as they are under present regulations, for a Territorial government is not "by consent of the governed," their consent is not asked nor regarded; they are taxed without representation; they do not choose their own officers; Congress can annul all the laws of a Territory, reduce the limited rights already enjoyed by the people thereof, and rule them absolutely by officers not chosen by, but inimical and hateful to them, as is now much the case in Utah. There is nothing in the Federal Constitution nor in any principle of the American government to warrant such unequal rights, such rank injustice as this. The people of the Territories have no voice in either house of Congress, no absolute voice even in their own local legislatures, no voice in the choice of their rulers. The people of the States have absolute voices in all these things, and the only shadow of injustice to them as to representation, woman suffrage excepted, is this very slight one of State equality in the Senate, which is nothing to be compared to the political inequalities and various disabilities inflicted upon the people of the Territories. Hence the right of a Territory to admission as a State, to rectify these glaring inequalities and remove these oppressive and unjust disabilities.

NEW MEXICO.

[CONTINUED.]

Mr. Whitehouse, referring to Mr. Potter's objection to the Mexican population, asked where Mr. Potter would draw the line of demarcation—by language, blood, or wealth. He (Mr. Whitehouse) believed that the greatness and glory and power of the American nation resulted from the intermixture of races and blood.

Mr. Potter did not object to the admission of New Mexico because of difference of language and race, but he thought it not conducive to rapid growth.

Mr. Crouse wished to ask if Mr. Potter meant to say that the legislatures of Western States were more apt to be purchased than the legislature of New York.

Mr. Potter did not make personal applications, but as a general thing small communities holding the Senatorship in their gift offered more inducements than large ones for the control of men of wealth.

Mr. Maynard said the matter of the admission of new States was not a new question. The principle had been long established of admitting any Territory as a State when it was found to have a population equal to the ratio of Congressional appointment for the time being; and no Territory prior to Oregon was admitted with a less population than the then existing ratio of representation. Florida was an apparent, but not a real exception. At the time she made her application, Florida had a population equal to the then existing ratio; but her application was delayed until a new apportionment was made, which established a ratio greater than her population, so that the principle which had been observed was not violated in the case of Florida. It was violated in the case of Oregon; it had been violated in one or two instances since—notably in the case of Nevada. He asked Mr. Potter whether he was prepared to depart from that principle, and whether he controverted seriously the statement that the Territory of New Mexico had at the present time a population more than equal to the present ratio of representation.

Mr. Potter did very seriously controvert the statement that New Mexico had any such population as represented, and he controverted the other principle to which Mr. Maynard alluded. The usage was in some cases as Mr. Maynard had stated, but it was departed from. He (Mr. Potter) was not satisfied with the present law. He objected to the admission of new States unless there was some reason for it, and there was promise of their future rapid development.

Mr. Cobb asked if Mr. Potter was not cognizant of the fact that within the last four years the Kansas and Pacific, the Rio Grande, and the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe railroads had all gone out towards New Mexico, and even to its boundary, all carrying a large amount of emigration into the Territory since the census of 1870.

Mr. Potter said he had no doubt it was so, if Mr. Cobb said it was so.

Mr. Crittenden asked if Mr. Potter said he would not consent to any other Territories being so admitted.

Mr. Potter said he certainly should oppose such admission.

Mr. Crittenden asked if Mr. Potter would be willing to have any Territory go into the Union as a State even with a population of 200,000.

Mr. Potter said not upon equal terms with the great States without some special reason for the admission.

Mr. Crittenden. "Would you exclude a Territory having a population of a million?"

Mr. Potter. "That would depend entirely on circumstances and the general interest of the whole country at the time."

Mr. Maynard. "Shall we who have had the good fortune to get into the partnership shut the door against the admission of any other?"

Mr. Potter asked Mr. Maynard if, when he had built up a great business, he would admit an associate on the same terms as he would before his business had become a great success?

Mr. Maynard said Mr. Potter was

arguing the question on a low plane.

Mr. G. F. Hoar. "Is not the gentleman's whole argument, considering what the States were when the Constitution was formed an argument against the principle on which this Constitution itself was formed?" "Did not our fathers frame this Constitution on the principle that little States should meet as equals in the Senate?"

Mr. Potter said they did as to the States then existing, because no other principle would have been tolerated. It was the best thing they could do, but the resulting inequality was vastly less than now.

Mr. G. F. Hoar. "Then does not the gentleman think that in admitting new States Congress ought to act upon that principle on which the government was originally framed?"

Mr. Potter thought not unless the circumstances were the same.

Mr. G. F. Hoar, though opposed to the admission of New Mexico, was very sorry to hear Mr. Potter's arguments.

Mr. Potter. "If you put the government back to the State-rights constructions in which I believe, put the Federal Government under such limitations as it ought to be put under, then you can safely go on annexing Territory to Territory and adding State to State, and it will make little difference whether they are big or little. But it is precisely because you have centralized power in this government and increased the range of its legislation that things are not in the same situation as when the government was formed."

Mr. Hoskins. "The Constitution of the United States declares that 'Congress may admit new States into the Union.' Of course this is a discretionary power, and in the wise exercise of that discretion should we approach the consideration of the bill now before us. There are but just two propositions connected with this matter, so far as my mind has been led to investigate it. The first is whether the people of the Territory of New Mexico that now come here asking to be admitted into this Union as a State represent the requisite population to entitle them to a Representative on this floor. The other question is whether the population of the Territory of New Mexico is of a character which entitles it to consideration, and which would indicate that they are in a condition for self-government."

Mr. Hoskins showed that the population of New Mexico increased fifty per cent. from 1850 to 1860, and 30 per cent. from 1860 to 1870. In New York it was charged that the census of 1870 was not properly taken, and, if not there, was it fully and thoroughly taken in a sparsely populated Territory like New Mexico? There was not a gentleman on that floor who did not know that it would be utterly impossible and impracticable to reach the population of all the minor districts for the purpose of taking a census. It was fair to suppose that the present population of New Mexico was not less than 130,000. There were also in that Territory over 10,000 civilized Indians, many of them men of wealth, a long time engaged in agricultural pursuits, and among the best citizens in the country. If it were a fact that in that Territory there was a population of at least 130,000, why, in the name of common sense, should Congress deny the appeal when they went there asking to be admitted into the sisterhood of States. In that Territory there were over 40,000 people American-born or of European descent, the descendants of those who had occupied the soil for centuries, were among the most energetic and enterprising people on the globe, had long been engaged in agriculture, many were men of wealth. All these Mexicans and Spaniards under twenty-five years of age could speak the English language. The children were being educated in 150 local public schools, and were fast learning the English language.

Mr. Hoskins concluded thus—

"Sir, as one of the thirty-three Representatives of the great State of New York, I desire to say to this Congress of the American people that in my judgment the State of New York is ready to take by the hand these struggling settlements in the western country, and admit them on an equal footing with the original States whenever they present themselves with the requisite

population and a Constitution republican in form. We in the State of New York are a great people; we have vast population and vast wealth; and I believe from my soul that the people whom I represent would favor the admission of this new Territory into the Union as a State.

"Before closing I wish to call attention to one significant fact: that at the last election for Delegate in Congress more than seventeen thousand votes were cast in New Mexico. This number is much in excess of the votes cast in many congressional districts in the States, and goes to show that the population has not been overestimated.

"In view of the fact that this Territory has a much larger population than many States heretofore admitted and the requisite number for a Representative in Congress, and that her people are believed to be fully capable of self-government, and the additional fact that that whole country is filled with mineral wealth—lead, copper, silver, iron, and coal—which can only be developed when the people shall be allowed to throw off their territorial form of government, emerge from her pupillage, and assume the condition of a sovereign State, I for one am willing to vote for this bill, and allow her to come into the Union with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of a free and independent State."

Mr. G. F. Hoar was opposed to the admission of New Mexico, because many of the population could not read nor write nor speak the English language. But as regarded the question of relative population, he did not at all agree with Mr. Potter. He (Mr. Hoar) did not find fault because Delaware or Nebraska, or Rhode Island had an equal vote with Massachusetts or New York in the U. S. Senate. That was in pursuance of the constitutional provision and in his judgment it was a provision to which the glory and prosperity of the country were largely due. He utterly repudiated the ground taken.

Mr. Kasson referred to the fact that in most of the Southern States of the Union where an immense proportion were unable to read, the very party of which he was a distinguished representative had said over and over again they would not make that a test of qualification for exercising the right of suffrage.

Mr. Kasson said—

"The effect of the statement is this: The people of whom a large proportion cannot read or write ought not to be represented by votes upon the floor of Congress. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say the republican party can take no such ground as that without going back upon their entire record; and it is enough to say that it impeaches the record made by that party during the entire period since the war in respect to the Southern States of this Union.

Again, as to the equality of good citizenship on the part of the people of New Mexico. Who are the people who are making the fights, the dissensions, the riots if you please, in the States of the Union and in the great cities? Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. G. F. Hoar] or any other gentleman point to one instance in the record of twenty-six years of occupation of New Mexico by Federal authority in which one building has been destroyed, one church or school-house assailed, one single violation by any part of that community of the laws of sobriety and good order? Educated or uneducated, let no injustice be done to an orderly, law-abiding, and law-abiding people like those of the Territory of New Mexico. They may justly come here and say, 'Compare us with those of Anglo-Saxon descent in respect to our obedience to law and our observance of order.'

"Uneducated if they be, do not they know whom they are electing to the floor of this House? If that be ignorance which characterizes New Mexico when they send a Delegate here like him to whom we have listened to-day, then let us beware we do not charge excessive ignorance upon a people who have had sense enough to send such a representative.

"Let me turn for a moment to the argument of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Potter). I ask him whether what he has said touching the representation of new States with small populations is just to the people of the West? I