

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE ADMISSION OF IOWA INTO THE UNION

The Territory of Iowa had scarcely been established and its government put into operation when there sprang up an agitation in favor of statehood. Indeed, in his message of November, 1839, Governor Robert Lucas gave his hearty support to the movement; but the Legislative Assembly refused to act upon his suggestions. Nevertheless, the advocates of admission into the Union were so insistent that at an extra session of the legislature in the summer of 1840 an act was passed submitting the question to a vote of the people. Little interest was manifested in the election, but a decisive majority against the proposition indicated that the people of Iowa were not yet ready for statehood.

In spite of the fact that the following year witnessed a change in the office of Governor of the Territory — John Chambers, a Whig, taking the place of Robert Lucas who was a Democrat — the proposal to form a State government was not allowed to remain long in the background. Governor Chambers likewise espoused the movement, another act calling for an expression of the popular will was passed, there was a vigorous discussion, and again the statehood propagandists met defeat. This was in 1842. Two years later they were successful. A constitutional convention met and drew up a constitution under which it was confidently expected that Iowa would soon be admitted into the Union. Once more all hopes were dashed to the ground. Congress reduced the boundaries of the proposed State, cutting it off entirely from the Missouri River. As a result the people indignantly refused to adopt the constitution when it was

submitted to them. In fact it was not until December 28, 1846, that the long campaign for statehood culminated in the signing of the act of Congress which made Iowa a member of the Union of Commonwealths.¹

The following article is copied verbatim from the *Iowa Capitol Reporter* (Iowa City) of July 23, 1842. It is one of the most comprehensive and detailed arguments in favor of statehood that appeared in the newspapers of Iowa during the course of the agitation. The reasons adduced in support of the proposition in 1842 were substantially the same as those relied upon throughout the period of discussion by the friends of the movement. Incidentally there is in this lengthy plea a reflection also of the arguments used against the abandonment of the Territorial status.

Furthermore, the article throws some light on conditions in the Territory of Iowa in 1842 with respect to the rapidity of settlement, the physical resources of the Territory, the development of commerce and industries, the amount of local revenue, the salaries and fees of county and township officers, and the efforts that were being made to eliminate extravagance in the administration of public business; and it indicates the ideas of the period concerning suitable salaries for State officers. While it should be remembered that the article is a brief for statehood, it appears to be substantially free from any distortion of the facts. It is an excellent statement of one side of the principal public question before the people of Iowa from 1838 to 1846.

DAN ELBERT CLARK

THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY IOWA

¹ For accounts of the movement toward statehood in Iowa see Shambaugh's *History of the Constitutions of Iowa*, Chs. IX-XVIII; Pelzer's *Augustus Caesar Dodge*, Ch. VIII; and Parish's *John Chambers*, Ch. XIII.

To the Voters of Iowa!

At the ensuing August election the Voters of Iowa will be called upon to vote for or against a "Convention" to form a Constitution preparatory to the admission of the Territory into the Union as a free, independent and sovereign State. As this is one of the most important questions which it may ever be their duty or privilege to decide, it behooves them that they should possess a full understanding of the whole subject. We have hoped that it would not be a fruitless labor on our part if we should endeavor to give a hurried statement of the arguments for, as well as the objections to, voting for the Convention at the coming election. We hope too that no one will be deterred from perusing this address by its length, but that they will give it their patient attention. We desire to lay the subject before our fellow citizens in a plain, comprehensive manner, fitted to the humblest intellect, so that he who runs may not only read, but understand also. We have also shut out from view all partizan feelings, believing that the question to be decided will in no wise be connected with the party politics of the day, but [that it is a question] of a higher nature, and more important in its results to the people of Iowa than all their petty elections for county or Territorial officers.

It would be great vanity in us to suppose that we could, if we even felt disposed, examine this subject without frequently recurring to many arguments which have heretofore been used. This we do not affect or pretend to do, the chief object of our address being to collect and lay before the people of the Territory all the information we have in our possession on the subject.

And as an additional preliminary remark, we would warn our fellow citizens to beware of the sophistry and wiles of individuals who now hold office under the present administration, as well as of those who expect situations under a

State government, for all such are moved more or less by selfish motives, and their support or opposition to the "Convention", emanates from the same source. Again we say to the people look at the question of *Convention alone, and its consequences.*

In order that we direct our steps aright we here insert a synopsis of "An act to provide for the expression of the people of Iowa", &c., under the provisions of which the citizens of the Territory are required to vote at the ensuing August election.²

Sec. 1st. Provides that a poll shall be opened at the general election *in August next*, at each electoral precinct in the Territory, to obtain an expression of the people upon the subject of the formation of a Constitution and State government for Iowa.

Sec. 2d. Provides that the voters shall be interrogated by the judges on the subject and answer "Convention" or "No Convention" as they may deem proper.

Sec. 3d. Shows the manner in which the Clerk shall write down the number of votes, gives the mode of returning a statement of the votes to the county Commissioners of the proper county, and the manner in which abstracts of the same shall be forwarded to and examined by the Governor.

Sec. 4th. Provides that if the "Convention" prevails, an election shall be held for delegates *on the second Monday in October next*, and also the manner of giving notice of such election.

Sec. 5th. Fixes the whole number of delegates at 82 and apportions them among the several counties of the Territory.

Sec. 6th. Provides how the returns of delegates election shall be certified, &c.

² *Laws of the Territory of Iowa, 1841-1842, pp. 70-73.* The entire law contained fourteen sections.

Sec. 7th. Provides that the delegates *elect* shall meet at Iowa City *on the first Monday in November next*, and then proceed to form a Constitution, &c.

Sec. 8th. Provides that when the Constitution is so formed, it shall be published and submitted to the decision of the voters of the Territory, at the general election for members of the Council and House of Representatives, which, if the election is not postponed until October, will be *in August 1843*. The voters will vote "For the Constitution" or "Against the Constitution" as they desire. This section further provides for the manner of transmitting to the Governor the returns of this election, and the manner in which he is required to announce the result.

Sec. 9. Provides that qualified electors may vote for or against a Convention *in any county* in the Territory, whether *residents of the county or not*; but it is provided that in the election for *Delegates* the electors shall *not* vote out of the county where they have their residences.

This we believe is the only section of the law of *immediate* interest to the people.

It will be well to say here that this law does not provide for *immediate* admission into the Union as some erroneously suppose, and as others falsely assert. The course of progress under this act, if the "Convention" question was successful, would be about as follows, viz: Delegates would be chosen in October next, who would meet and most probably remain in session for four or five weeks — the Constitution formed by these delegates in Convention would then be submitted to the people for their adoption or rejection, in August 1843; then it would, if accepted, be forwarded to Congress, and an act passed admitting the Territory into the Union. And in the ensuing spring or summer of 1844, the citizens of Iowa would proceed to the election of their State officers; and from that date — *two years hence* — we

would be entitled to all the privileges which *Freemen* enjoy, and subject to all the burdens, *if you please*, with which the opponents of a State government endeavor to alarm the voters of this Territory. This we repeat would be our progress toward a State government under the most auspicious circumstances.—It will be important, therefore, that all should remember that *Iowa will not under the law above recited be enabled to procure admission into the Union in less than two years.*

A lame and impotent attempt has been made by some who are unwilling to argue this question fairly to connect it with party, by endeavoring to show that if a change had not taken place in the administration of the General Government, and consequently in many of the officers in the Territory, that no movement would have been made in favor of a "Convention."—This charge is not only gratuitous, but ridiculous in the extreme, when it is remembered that the subject of State government was brought before the last Legislative Assembly by the annual Message of Governor Chambers, the *present* Chief Magistrate of the Territory. This charge was evidently made with the vain hope of connecting the question with party politics; but additional evidence of its want of the semblance of truth is found in the fact that in 1839, Robert Lucas, *then* Governor of Iowa, in his annual communication to the Legislature, uses the following language in relation to a State government and this, remember, was more than *two years ago.*

"When we consider the rapidly increasing population, and advancing prosperity of the Territory, we may, in my opinion, with propriety proceed to measures preparatory to the formation of a Constitution and State Government, and for admission into the Union as an independent State. I know it is the opinion of some, that such measures would be premature at this time, inasmuch as our expenses are

defrayed by the U. States.— This consideration is entitled to weight — but when we consider the imperfect organization of the Territorial Government and the consequent embarrassment in the administration of its internal affairs — and by referring to past history, compare the condition of the inhabitants of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan, while under a Territorial Government, to their subsequent prosperity after their admission into the Union as independent States, the preponderance is much in favor of a State government — for the prosperity and improvement within each of the aforesaid States languished while Territories, but advanced with rapid strides from the moment of their several admissions into the Union as independent States. With these facts before us, I would earnestly recommend to the Legislative Assembly the early passage of a memorial to Congress, respectfully asking of that body the passage of an act, at their ensuing session, granting to the inhabitants of Iowa Territory, the right to form a Constitution and State Government, and to provide for their admission into the Union upon an equal footing with the original States.”

On the other hand a gentleman, who was afterwards twice the candidate of the whig party in this Territory for Congress, a member of the Legislature in the session of 1839, '40, made a report to that body from which we are tempted to make the following extracts — embodying, as they do, cogent reasoning and an ample refutation of many of the arguments now advanced in opposition to a State government. And we will also say that if this reasoning was good *two years ago*, how much more potent will it be when applied to the condition of the Territory *two years hence!*

“The new States which present to the world empty coffers and bankruptcy, have been reduced to that condition,

not by the necessary expenses of government, but by impolitic measures, and by unauthorized and visionary schemes of internal improvements."

"It may in truth be said, that the sooner the people of Iowa pass through the scene of confusion from a Territorial to a State government, the sooner they will be able to present to the world a civil organization worthy of the country in which they live. In our judiciary, the most important branch of government, we cannot expect anything like perfection, until the whole system is placed under the control of an independent State.

"The minority of your committee has also taken into consideration the standing that would be given to our State upon its admission into the Union. It is the received opinion that in Territories, there is less certainty in the laws, and less security for persons and property, than in State governments. By admission into the Union capital and enterprize would be brought into the State, commerce would receive an impetus, and new encouragement would be given to the agriculturist, and to the mechanic. The amount of taxable personal property would be greatly increased, and the value of property greatly enhanced. In addition to these arguments it may be said that the people, by admission, would secure to themselves many and important political privileges. They would then have a right to organize their judiciary and *fill the offices of the State with selections from among the citizens of the country.*"

"If our citizens wish to enjoy all the rights and privileges which appertain to FREEMEN, and give to their Territory the attributes of SOVEREIGNTY; if they wish to enjoy the elective franchise *without dictation from a superior*; and if they wish to enact their own laws *independent of a supervisory power from abroad*, they must ask for and obtain admission into the Union."

We have said this much about the former movement in relation to a "Convention" because we were anxious to show that it *ever* has been disconnected with politics, as gentlemen holding different political opinions acted together on this subject. And such we may add is the case at present.

Another feeble effort at opposition to the "Convention", has been made by referring to the vote of the people of the Territory in 1840, by which it is endeavored to be *indirectly* shown that because the citizens were opposed to a State government then, they still hold the same opinion. This argument, if it be properly so called, scarcely deserves a passing notice. If any one will take the trouble of examining the journals they will see that but a small portion of the voters felt interested in this question; so lukewarm were they that a large and populous district made no return whatever of votes for or against a "Convention". There was no excitement on the subject — there was but little effort made in favor of and but few objections urged against it. But even admitting that the *silence* of the people was an evidence of their opposition to a "Convention" *then*, does that evidence in any degree what ought to be their decision in relation to our admission *two years hence*? Why this would be to suppose that our young and fertile Territory was in a state of torpor and not striding with the steps of a giant rapidly onward to greatness and prosperity. But an argument of this kind is catching at straws, and is unworthy of serious consideration.

Assuming, then, the position that the "Convention" movement was originated with proper motives, and that the vote on the subject in 1840 is no evidence of what the people should do two years hereafter, and thus removing two arguments of the opponents of "Convention", let us inquire if the people here are competent to take upon them the admin-

istration of their own affairs. Have they the capacity which would enable them to furnish and select officers from *among themselves*—in a word are they capable of self government? We are aware that this interrogatory so directly propounded might almost be esteemed, and justly too, an insult to the intelligence of the people of Iowa, but we are induced to believe that an effort, a covert one 'tis true, is being made to inculcate this heresy, when we hear it uttered from high places, that the citizens of the Territory have “all the freedom and all the advantages of the residents in the most favored States.” This is in effect taking the ground that we should *never* emerge from our present provincial dependence, or that our judgments are too callow, our intellect not sufficiently fledged to enable us to sustain a change of government.

Are the people here minors; or are they afflicted with mental imbecility?

Are they not the same “kith and kin” of those who founded and sustained the enduring pillars of the Union? Are they not full grown men themselves,—nay are they not the very best *material* to form and sustain a substantial, economical, and republican government? There are numbers perhaps a majority of our citizens, who have left the neighboring state; they have there seen the extravagant and reckless schemes by which the funds of the people have been scattered to the winds. They have suffered themselves by this spendthrift improvidence, and they, above all other men, are the persons to whom the formation of a cheap and amply restricted State Constitution and government might be safely confided. And here we might notice that the opponents of state government frequently point to the bankruptcy of other states as a warning to us, lest we should suffer the same calamities by throwing off our present colonial dependence. To this the unanswerable response

may be given that it is from this very unwise legislation that we can and will be forewarned,—that the visionary systems of *internal* improvements in Indiana and Illinois are our beacon lights and that the very individuals who were loudest and most ardent in the support of these exploded schemes, and who consequently have been sadly disappointed and many almost ruined would be the very best pilots to steer us out of similar dangers. Experience, although sometimes extremely expensive, always furnishes the most useful teaching. Again it must be remembered that the bankruptcy of these states is the result of the legislation of a few years past; that such legislation did not necessarily follow the formation of a state government, but that on the contrary for a long time after their admission into the Union, their prosperity and progress to greatness and wealth were almost incredible. For the truth of this we appeal to their past history. It might be well also to dispose at present of the objections made by the opponents to a “Convention”, that the “*times are too hard*”, “*that money is too scarce*” to make a change to a state government under the provisions of the law above recited. To all this we reply, that the proper season for effecting this change is at hand, now is the time to found an economical government, and fix the salaries of the officers under it at rates proportioned to the “*times*”. What would now be the situation of the people of a Territory which had come into the Union in 1835 or 36, when fictitious money was as plentiful as the sands on the sea shore? Its officers would have been allowed extravagant salaries, every thing would have been measured by a standard of prodigality, and at present such new state would be utterly impoverished.— Suppose that we should delay our application for admission for eight or nine years — suppose in the meantime, that the country should again, (which heaven forbid,) be covered mid-leg deep with

bank notes — suppose we should rush into the Union and to which course many who now prate about hard times would then make no objection; we say in view of all these things, what would be the situation of Iowa in a few short years, after we had assumed the dignity of a state government? Contraction and failure of many of the Banks would take place, for they follow expansion as “night the day”—times would again grow hard, and then most probably we would have an empty treasury and numerous officers with high fees. True, these salaries might be reduced, and our expenses curtailed, but it would be a long, long time, before we would be freed from the noxious influence of the spirit of extravagance, which an abundance of unreal money would beget in our legislation. To a remnant of this feeling induced by a plethoric state of the currency we may in part ascribe the expenditures of Wisconsin and Iowa for several of the past years. The most propitious time, we again assert, for the foundation of an economical government, is when men know and feel the value of money; when the bankruptcy of the surrounding states warns us of the causes of their ruin; when speculation has fled away upon bank note wings, when industry and frugality are again consuming their proper influence amongst us; when homespun is again becoming fashionable, when the simplicity of republicanism is daily more apparent in public and private life; when probity and integrity, are again acknowledged as virtues and when the whole people are again rising to the dignity of freemen. That such is the situation of the country at present no one with truth can deny.

If it cannot be denied, (and we presume no one will be hardy enough to attempt it,) that our citizens are competent to the administration of their own government, what credit for intelligence or patriotism shall we mete out to those who aver that “in entering the Union the people themselves

would directly have but very few privileges more than they now possess." It is no privilege to be entitled to cast our votes for the Chief Magistrate of the Union? It is no privilege to be permitted to select our own Governor and other officers from among our fellow citizens? Is it no privilege to have a stable Constitution formed by our *own people*, and one which our *own people* alone can alter or amend? A constitution not to be changed like our present organic law, on the mere pleasure of Congress without our interference, a constitution *restricting the legislation of the country from improvident loans and state debts*, and all the aggregation of evils that flow from a loose unsettled form of government. And would not our admission at once give us a character abroad which we do not now enjoy? Is it no privilege to be fully represented in Congress, where now we have only a delegate, who is placed in the humble situation of a mere mendicant for congressional favors? We would then demand and enforce as a *right*, what we *now* petition for as a bounty. We are now furnishing our proportion towards the revenue of the general government by the sums which we pay for our salt, sugar, molasses, iron, and many of the other necessaries of life, the amount of the tariff on imported articles being always paid by the consumer. We are therefore taxed in this way to support the general government; we are not *represented*, and yet are told that there are few privileges which we do not possess. Why, it was because our fathers would not submit to taxation without representation that they, unprepared as they were, incurred the expenses and horrors of a long harassing war — a war which finally terminated in the emancipation of the whole country from foreign thralldom. And shall we not esteem it a great, a glorious privilege, to be represented in our national councils; and can there be so degenerated a son of those noble sires who has the unblushing effrontery to say, that there

are very few privileges which we, not enjoying such representation, do not possess! If a Territorial government offers to its citizens "all the freedom and all the advantages of the most favored States", why should we ever change it? Why should we not continue from year to year the pensioners of the General Government? Why have other states come forth from their pupilage and taken upon them the right of self government? But it is useless to pursue this theme any further; it is not within the limits of probability that there is any one so blind to the permanent interest of the Territory who does not know that many important nay almost indispensable privileges of freemen, are not enjoyed under a Territorial Government. In the foregoing remarks we have not included the pecuniary advantages to which we would be entitled under a state government, but merely referred to those of a political nature — the former we will allude to hereafter.

It is but fair to admit that a majority of those who are opposed to a State Government freely confess that there are many inducements in favor of a change, but that at present we are unable to meet and defray the necessary expenditures, and therefore that our application for admission should be postponed. There was a time even in this country when an argument addressed as this is to the meanest passion of the human heart would have been condemned, and the trifling expenses of a new government would not have offered any obstacle to adopting it, when such government was productive of additional freedom. The expenses of a State government is the grand and only argument of its opponents, and they have never ceased to raise the cry of "taxation", "taxation", as a bugbear to alarm the timid friends of a change from our present state of tutelage. We say that the time was when wailings of this kind would have failed to effect anything; but the "age of bargaining has

come'', and we must endeavor to show these alarmists that even in a pecuniary point of view, we have nothing to lose by going into the Union — And first the Anti Conventionists say that our new state will be burdened with sundry debts, viz: the expense attendant on the meeting of a Convention, the arrearages for legislative expenditures, the debts due for the work done on the Capitol at Iowa City, and the amount owing to persons for labor done and materials furnished, on the Penitentiary. And first of the expenses of a Convention. A memorial was passed by the last Legislative Assembly praying Congress for an appropriation of \$20,000 to defray the expenses of this Convention. Now this is a very large amount required from the general government, and if such appropriation is made we can possibly have no objection, but we are assured that \$4 or 5000 would be amply sufficient to cover all the expenditures, but if no amount whatever is appropriated by Congress then the Delegates elect must be content to *defray their own expenses*. Their expenses will not be great, for we may be certain that a few weeks will suffice for the formation of a Constitution if the time and labor of the delegates are to be expended for "the public good". We know that this would bring into the field as candidates for Delegate, men who are filled with the desire to serve their fellow citizens and not those who are stimulated by mercenary motives. There will be no difficulty in ever finding men, sufficiently patriotic in every county of the Territory to take upon them the honorable and important office of Delegate, "without money and without price". There is no law of the Territory authorizing the payment of any expenses of the "Convention"; and if no appropriation is made by Congress for that purpose, none of the charges should be paid except the trifling amount which would be owing for stationery and clerk hire — *strike out therefore the expense of a Convention from the*

debts of the State of Iowa.— The excess of Legislative expenditures over and above the several appropriations made by Congress since the organization of the Territory has also been blazoned forth as a debt to be paid by the new State: The amount of these arrearages it was supposed was \$13,400. This debt has been liquidated in full by a late act of the present Congress appropriating the foregoing amount for the payment of the said arrearages. Subsequent to the passage of the above mentioned law it was discovered that the sum so appropriated fell short of paying all the legislative arrearages \$1 or 2000. This arose from some error or mistake of the proper officer here in making out his statements, but this small amount can easily be paid by a due exercise of economy on the part of the next legislature especially, as the number of their officers and pay of such officers has been reduced \$2,325 each session, (provided they sit the whole 75 days allowed by law) less than the expenses of former Legislatures, by an act passed at the last session of the Legislative Assembly. We may therefore safely assert that there will be no debt from the above sum against the State of Iowa.

Prominent in the array of liabilities of the Territory marshalled by the opponents of "Convention" stands the "debt created on account of the Capitol" at Iowa City. Let us examine this matter briefly.

From a statement furnished by the late Territorial Agent, we find that the amount borrowed from (and yet due) to the Dubuque Bank, of moneys expended on the Capitol is	\$5,500
Certificates, such as referred to in report to the last Legislature, outstanding and unpaid, about	3,000
Other arrearages not presented at date of report say	250
Total	\$9,000

The above he adds will not vary fifty dollars from the amount of arrearages at the date of my leaving the office of Agent', (Feb. 1842.)

It will be well here to remind our fellow citizens that the section of land on which Iowa City was laid out was donated by Congress and from the proceeds of the sales of lots in that place thus far funds have been supplied for work done and materials furnished for the Capitol, and that with the amount arising from the future sales it is expected to complete the building as is shown below.

The amount of notes given in payment for lots in Iowa City remaining unpaid at the date aforesaid was about	\$12,000
Amount of unsold lots valued at the present minimum price which is <i>fifty per cent below</i> all previous valuations is	\$54,200
	<hr/>
	\$66,200
Now deduct from this the indebtedness above mentioned namely,	9,000
	<hr/>
Balance	\$55,000 ³

This balance remains to complete the Capitol. That it is amply sufficient for that purpose will be seen by referring to a report made by the Superintendent of Public Buildings at Iowa City to the last Legislative Assembly dated "Jan. 5, 1842", in which he states that the sum of \$33,330.00 will be required to complete the building.—

From the above valuation	\$55,000
Deduct this amount	33,330

And it leaves a balance over and above the whole expenses of completing the Capitol of

\$21,670

Now it will be observed by an examination of the last recited report that a large amount of the expenses included in

³ Here, of course, is an error in subtraction; but it is an error to the disadvantage, rather than to the advantage of the argument.

the above estimate, say \$10,000, is to be incurred for building the porticos and dome of the Capitol, and "which may be dispensed with at present", says the superintendent "*and added to the building at any future time*". Without therefore injuring the usefulness of the Capitol, we could, if funds were not at hand, delay the finishing of the above ornamental portions of it, and thus reduce the amount actually required to complete it for all useful purposes to the sum of \$20 or 25,000.

It may also be necessary to state here, that we have understood that Mr. Snyder, the present Superintendent, intends to complete the building upon a cheaper plan, than was originally contemplated by the former officer, and consequently the amount required to finish the Capitol will be yet further reduced. To show that the above estimated value of the lots, viz: \$54,000, remaining undisposed of at the above date, is not too high, we may advert to the fact that in May last, a sale of Iowa City lots took place under the law reducing the price, and that those then sold brought \$12,177, their minimum value being only \$10,103. Thus showing to every unprejudiced mind that the lots will furnish a sufficient fund to complete the Capitol and leave a handsome sum in the Treasury. But [it] will also be proper here to say that the sum of only \$15,000 is required to put the Capitol in a situation for the occupation of the Legislative Assembly, and thus for all practical purposes the building will be sufficiently finished for the present. As soon as convenient we may complete it. This sum then (\$15,000) or nearly that amount is already due the Territory for lots sold in Iowa City; and therefore all the alarming calculations of the opponents of admission on this point fall to the ground. We conceive that they have been particularly unfortunate in referring to this subject. Next upon the list of bugbears held out by the antagonists of State government, stands the debt due for

labor performed upon the Penitentiary, &c. at Fort Madison. This is estimated by the Director in his report at *about* \$13,000. A bill has been introduced into Congress appropriating the sum of \$15,000, for this building, which will without doubt become a law. This will pay the above debt, and leave a surplus of \$2,000, and thus this item of indebtedness would be disposed of. But admitting for the sake of argument that no such appropriation would be made, in what *worse* situation will we be in regard to this debt under the *State* of Iowa than the *Territory* of Iowa. If the debt is to be liquidated will it be more easily paid by us as a *Territory* than as a *State*? Will it not be *two years* before we can gain admission into the Union, and may we not during that time memorialize Congress on the subject, and obtain an appropriation. In view of our application for admission the General Government would be *more* disposed to pay this debt, to enable us to come into the Union, than if we exhibited no disposition to do so, but remained like an overgrown adult in the house of an indulgent parent. And again our admission would not prevent us from seeking an appropriation from Congress to pay the debts off, and complete the Penitentiary. It is a great error to suppose that Territories alone receive liberal donations of land and money from the General Government. The very reverse of this is the case; and if any one will take the trouble to examine the appropriations made to Michigan, he will find that those which were made to her as a *State* largely exceed those which were made to her as a *Territory*. There is no definite time fixed for the payment of the sum so due; and will it not be in the power of the State of Iowa, if Congress should not liquidate the amount before we procure admission, to say *when* and [in] *what manner* the debt shall be paid? If the payment was postponed for any length of time the sum would be but slightly increased, a little more than

one half of the above stated amount only bearing an interest of six per centum per annum, and the remaining portion no interest whatever. We contend however that even if the appropriation which we have referred to, should not be made, yet the Penitentiary debt ought not to present any obstacle to application for admission, because we will be placed in no *worse* situation for paying it by going into the Union than we are at present. It has been said that the Penitentiary would require to be finished by the State of Iowa. Now this objection evinces how hard pressed the opponents of admission are for argument, but it is just that they should be treated fairly. If Iowa looks to the General Government to complete her Penitentiary, the fact of going into the Union will not change the result. If, on the other hand, Iowa intends to finish the building without the aid of Congress it can be done at any future time when it is found practicable. We say it can be done at any future time, because the Penitentiary is at present prepared to receive and safe keep convicts. These convicts are of but little expense to the territory, and we are assured by the Warden, that the labor of ten or twelve prisoners would be sufficient to pay for their guarding, clothing and boarding. The Penitentiary therefore may be used as a prison for years to come without any additional work being done on the building. The amount necessary to finish it may not be required (even if Congress should not appropriate a sufficient sum to finish it) until we may number 2 or 300,000 inhabitants. We have said more perhaps than was necessary about the completion of the Penitentiary and Capitol, because we believe that the very fact of having two such massive and well constructed buildings, but *half completed*, if you please, is an argument which goes rather to show our readiness for admission than otherwise. We say this because nearly all the other States, many with a less population than we will have two years

hence, went into the Union without a *single dollar* being appropriated by the General Government for their public buildings, whilst we have had appropriations sufficient to *half finish*, at least, our Penitentiary, and a grant of land *abundantly ample* to complete our Capitol. Who can deny that we are not in advance of the other Territories heretofore admitted, so far as public buildings are concerned?

But the chief and most frequently repeated argument of the opponents of a Convention is the annual expense of a State government, which the people of the State of Iowa will be required to pay, whereas the expense of the Territorial Government is now defrayed out of the National Treasury. This, we believe, is the length and breadth of this objection to admission. It will first be necessary to define as nearly as practicable the expense of a State Government. And here we will just say, that it is not of any importance to this argument to know what the General Government *now* appropriates annually for our expenses, for we have no doubt that we could manage to expend \$100,000 provided we did not furnish the money ourselves. We mention this because the friends of a Territorial Government always fortify themselves behind the annual appropriation made by Congress for our expenses, and the \$10,000 paid to our juries by the Marshal of the United States. Now we repeat that with these things we have nothing to do, because the friends and opponents of admission do not disagree as to the amount which we will of course receive from the General Government on going into the Union, but as to the amount which will keep the wheels of the State going, and how that amount is to be raised. Our inquiry, therefore, should be, how much money will it require to sustain a government, when that money *comes out of your own pockets*? If we can show that the people of Iowa are able, without oppressing themselves, to pay the expenses of a State Gov-

ernment, there is no one, we are confident, so mercenary, or if so, he will not avow it, as to oppose our admission into the Union as a sovereign State, notwithstanding we might be in the receipt of \$150,000 per annum from the General Government to pay our expenses. In illustration of this position, suppose that Iowa was now a sovereign State, and competent to defray the annual expenses of such state government, would the people exchange their privileges as a State, and go *back* to Territorial dependence for \$500,000 per annum? We feel confident that they would not. It is, therefore, we repeat, unimportant to all argument to know the amount necessary to defray our expenses when in the Union, and our resources for so doing.

The expenses of a state government have been variously estimated. The maximum amount which we have seen is \$37,503 per annum. As this is a statement given by an opponent of admission, we will annex the *items* of the sum and then scan and examine them.

Governor with a salary of.....	\$ 1,500
Secretary of State,.....	1,000
Six Judges, aggregate,.....	6,000
Attorney General,	800
Auditor of Public Accounts,.....	800
State Treasurer,	600
A Legislature of 75 members, annual sitting three months, including per diem mileage of members, and incidental expenses,	28,803
	Total, <u>\$37,503</u>

Now this it will be remembered is the statement of an opponent to admission, and we may be assured his estimate is as high as he could conveniently make it. That it is much too great will be seen at a glance. For instance, he sets down the salary of the Governor at \$1,500 when every man knows that \$1,000 would be ample compensation. It is as much,

may more, than many of the States give their Chief Magistrate, and will enable any one with economy to support his family. \$800 will be largely sufficient for the services of the Secretary of State. It is a matter of great doubt whether the State of Iowa will *immediately* require the services of six Judges; but admitting for the sake of argument, that that number will be requisite, we think that their salaries, \$1,000 per annum, is not extravagant. The office of Attorney General is most frequently a mere sinecure, and might be dispensed with altogether. If it is thought best to retain it \$400 is as much as his services per annum will be worth. Auditor of Public Accounts \$700, and Treasurer may stand as it is. We have heretofore found that the present number of members of the Legislature, (to wit: 39) was sufficiently large to transact the business of the Territory, and we do not believe that the State, for some time at least, will require an increase of members. However to be liberal, we will put down 60. The duration of the session should not exceed, generally, 60 days per annum, as every one who has been a member of the Legislature, especially, well knows. To be more economical we might have biennial sessions, as in the State of Illinois, and then the expense would be reduced one half. Let us recapitulate our statement.

Governor, with a salary of.....	\$ 1,000
Secretary of State,.....	800
Six Judges,	6,000
Attorney General,	400
Auditor,	700
Treasurer,	600
A Legislature of 60 members with annual sittings of 60 days, at \$3 per diem,.....	10,800
Mileage, incidental, and all other expenses,.....	10,000
	Total,.....\$30,300 ⁴

⁴ As a matter of fact the salaries of State officers and the compensation of members of the General Assembly as fixed by the Constitution of 1846 were even lower than those suggested in this estimate.— See Constitution of Iowa of

The above we believe to be a very liberal estimate, and we are confident that the state government could be sustained with an expense not greater than the foregoing.

Having fixed the annual expense of the state of Iowa, and admitting *now, for the sake of argument*, that it will be necessary to raise the whole sum by *taxation* — let us inquire into what the capacity and resources of Iowa will be, *two years hence*, the date of our anticipated admission, to pay the above sum of \$30,300 annually. To do this, it is necessary that we should come to some conclusion in relation to the population that the new state will have, at the time of coming into the Union. It will be recollected that when the census was taken in 1836, Iowa had only 12,000 inhabitants. Two years afterwards, (in 1838,) she numbered 22,000; and in 1840 there were 43,000 persons within its territory, thus nearly doubling the population every two years.

Take the same increase in *amount*, and which is the lowest estimate which should be made, and it would give us during the present summer 64 or 65,000 inhabitants, and "*two years hence*" we will have, by the same proportion of increase, the number of 85,000 inhabitants.⁵

It will be found that the foregoing calculation is based upon the increase of population in *amount* alone, and not in *proportion* to the former increase, which would be the proper mode of computation, and by which we would add greatly to our numbers; and upon admission into the Union, at the time before mentioned, we would have a population largely over 100,000 inhabitants.

It may be proper here to say that to judge by the past, the increase in population in Iowa will be in greater proportion

1846, Art. IV, Secs. 25, 34, in Shambaugh's *Documentary Material Relating to the History of Iowa*, Vol. I, pp. 198, 200.

⁵ This estimate was not much too optimistic, for the population of the Territory in 1844 was 75,152.

after admission, than previous to that period. This, at least, has been the history of the Western States. And this increased immigration is another potent inducement for us to hurry into the Union. This influx of immigration is doubtless caused by the belief that the laws are more stable in a State than in a Territory, and that property is more secure under the former than the latter. In connection with this subject of population we here give the statement of the increase of inhabitants in several States, furnished by a friend who has fully examined the subject.

“It is a curious matter of history to review the progress of population in the west, and observe the effect which a permanency in the laws and a fixed system of government has upon the increase and growth of the States, by comparison with the slower growth of the same country under the loose, unsettled and uncertain form of a Territorial Government. The following statement, from authentic sources, will give an idea of this increase, and will also show, at the same time, the relative numbers at the time of admission of each of them:

In 1790, Tennessee came into the Union with	77,262
In 1800, the population had increased	28,340
In 1790, Kentucky contained	73,677
She was separated from Virginia in that year and admitted into the Union in 1792	
In 1800, the population was	220,959
In 1800, Ohio had	45,365
Was made a State in 1802; in 1810 had	230,000
In 1815, Indiana had	60,000
In 1817 was made a State—in 1820 had	147,000
In 1817, Illinois was made a State, with	55,000
In 1830, the population was	157,575
In 1821, Missouri came in, with	45,000
In 1830, the population was	140,455
In 1834, Michigan had	84,000
Was made a State in 1836—in 1837, had	175,000

In 1817, Mississippi came in with a little more than the requisite number.

In 1820, she had	75,000
In 1830, she had	136,000 ⁶

Looking, therefore, to the foregoing statement, and observing the embarrassed situation of our neighboring States, and the fact that the fertility of the soil and salubrity of the climate of Iowa, is rapidly being known throughout the Union, we may without hesitation assert that in the summer of 1844, we will have a population of 100,000 or 150,000 inhabitants, a greater number than the States of Tennessee, Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, and Mississippi had when they were admitted into the Union, and a larger number of inhabitants than Delaware or Arkansas has at the present time.

It must also be remembered that our admission will bring into the country a more wealthy class of citizens than we have at present; men who have heretofore felt timid about entrusting their property in a Territory, and thus will the actual wealth of the country be greatly increased. We do not use this language in an invidious sense, for we know that there is no more honest and industrious people than the citizens of Iowa; but it is known to every one that the pioneers of a country, although hardy and persevering, are generally in moderate circumstances, and less loth to share the payment of taxes than their more affluent and less adventurous countrymen. So much for our population on admission.

It is proper that we should also briefly allude to the resources of Iowa, by which the abilities of the people to pay the expenses of a State Government will be apparent. This we confess it will be difficult to do with any accuracy.

⁶ The population figures in these tables are approximately correct. The dates for the admission of Tennessee, Indiana, and Illinois should be 1796, 1816, and 1818 respectively.

The surplus produce of Iowa — an infallible evidence of wealth — has been increasing almost beyond belief every year. The exports from Burlington alone in 1841, were 410 tons, and the probable amount for the present year will not be far removed from 600 tons. The different kinds of produce so exported are as follows: pork, bacon, beef, lard, wheat, flour, corn, oats, whiskey, live hogs, hides and furs, potatoes, beans and flaxseed. This produce was from Des Moines, Henry, and a part of Jefferson, Washington and Louisa counties. From Fort Madison, Montrose and Keokuck, not less than 600 tons have been exported during the past and present years. Skunk river has floated down large quantities of corn, wheat, flour and pork. The produce of Van Buren, collected principally at Farmington and Keosauqua, was carried down the Des Moines river, and the amount of which we have not been able to ascertain. The counties bordering on the Iowa and Cedar rivers, annually send off many boat loads of pork, corn, &c. The towns of Bloomington, Rockingham, Davenport and Dubuque, are all made depositories for large quantities of produce. Down every river, from every village and hamlet in Iowa, are the products of the soil poured to the Mississippi.

It is impossible for us to say what is the aggregate quantity exported in the Territory, but from the amount shipped from Burlington alone, and the anticipated increase in one year, some estimate may be made of the amount raised in the whole Territory, and what will be the probable increase two years hence when we come into the Union? We are well aware that the low prices realized for produce in the southern market have made no money this year for our farmers but the prospect of the opening of the British ports to our provisions, by the new English tariff which has ere this become a law, will have a powerful influence on the buoyancy of the markets and the increase of prices — Our agricultur-

alists will also in the mean time have turned their attention from the raising of corn and pork, in which they are now too much engaged, and add to their former productions hemp, tobacco, wool, tame grapes and many other crops which will amply reward the toil of the husbandman. Who can tell how abounding in surplus produce of all varieties will Iowa be two years hence, if her farmers progress in improvement as they have done for the time past! But the wealth of our Territory is not confined to the surface, but is also deep hid in the bosom of the earth. Dubuque and many of the other northern counties are not only rich in extensive fields of grain, but produce annually immense quantities of lead from their inexhaustible mines. We regret that we have not in our possession any accurate statistical information on this subject. All that we can say is, that in addition to the mines now worked every day are new discoveries of rich lodes being made which promise to render that portion of the country the richest mineral region in the world. But the mineral wealth of Iowa is not confined to lead alone. Dr. Owen, in his geological report,⁷ says that there is a sufficient quantity of zinc ore in this Territory and Wisconsin to supply the whole U. States, and also for exportation. Iron ore, Dr. O. reports, is found in Iowa "of excellent quality and in unlimited abundance." He thinks that near the Maquoketa a sufficient quantity "of iron ore could be found on the surface alone to supply several iron furnaces for years to come." He adds that "more encouraging or more numerous surface indications of an abundant supply of this useful metal (iron) can hardly offer themselves to the notice of the geologist." Two years will not elapse until enterprise and industry will reap a rich reward from the zinc

⁷ This was doubtless Owen's report of his geological exploration in Iowa, Wisconsin, and Illinois made in 1839, which may be found in *House Executive Documents*, 1st Sess., 26th Congress, No. 239.

and iron mines of Iowa. In view, therefore, of these ample resources, and the prospect of their certain increase, shall we be told that a population of one hundred thousand, or more, inhabitants will be oppressed by a tax of 30,000 per annum? And here it might not be improper to add, that such taxation would be further lightened by being levied *in part* upon the real estate of non-residents not inhabited or cultivated, and which comprizes about the one twentieth of the land in the Territory.

It will be remembered that we admitted for the *sake of argument* the fact that the taxes would be increased on our admission into the Union as a State OVER WHAT THEY ARE AT PRESENT. We contend, however, and will endeavor to prove that our taxes for county and *state* revenue will not when we are admitted, be *greater* than those which we are now paying and have been paying for several years past; and for this we are indebted to the economical legislation of the last Legislative Assembly. We will strive to show *as nearly as practicable* what reduction has been *directly* and *indirectly* made in the *present* taxes of the people. This reduction takes effect fully in the month of August next.

There are, we believe, eighteen organized *counties* in the Territory. Five of them, we assume, levy \$5000 each annually for county and territorial revenue, making \$25,000. Eight raise \$3,000 per annum, amounting to \$24,000; and the remaining five about \$2,000 each year, being \$10,000. The sum total of the above is \$59,000. This is not a high estimate, for we are aware that several of the large and populous counties of the Territory have frequently raised \$6,000 revenue per annum; and all know that the expense of a small and sparsely settled county is in proportion to the population greater than those of a larger one, the number of officers and the machinery of its government being the same. We think, therefore, that 60,000 may be put down as

a low estimate of the amount of county and Territorial revenue raised by the several counties of the Territory, annually. Now heretofore the people have not been oppressed or felt burdened with taxes, and we assert that we can approve [prove] that if we are admitted into the Union as a State even during the present season our taxes would not be greater than they have been for several past years, the reduction of county and Territorial expenses throughout the Territory being at least 30 or 40,000 dollars each year, under the law of the last Legislative Assembly. This sum to wit: 30,000 dollars, we have before clearly shown, is sufficient to defray the charges of a State Government. In order to go partially into the detail we will take for an example one of the largest counties in the Territory. In this the assessment roll has not varied much from 5 or 6,000 dollars annually. Of this amount probably all was collected except the sum of 5 or 600 dollars. Now the fees which have been allowed in this same county to petit jurors in a single year out of the taxes collected off the people, and which are not under the present laws to be paid out of the county or Territorial treasury, were 400 dollars. Grand juries were annually entitled to about 400 dollars. From this deduct one third under the new law and it shows a saving of 130 dollars to the county yearly. The Clerk of the District Court has received out of the county treasury in one year in said county the sum of 350 dollars for services for which under the reforming act of the legislature he will be entitled to 30 dollars. The sheriff annually has been in the receipt of about 450 dollars from the same source in cases where he will hereafter be entitled to only 30 dollars. The sheriff being ex-officio collector of the county revenue was allowed by the law now in force 7 per cent for collection; he will be entitled under the new law for similar services to an average of 4 per centum. This, in the county we have re-

ferred to would be an annual saving of 3 per cent. in collecting. This on the amount above mentioned — 5,500 dollars — would be 165 dollars. In addition to this it will be recollected that the county revenue after the foregoing reduction takes effect will necessarily be of small amount and the charges of the collector much less than they are at present. There are miscellaneous services which the sheriff performs, and for which frequently large sums have been allowed by the county commissioners, but which are now restricted to a maximum of 50 dollars per annum. In the county before mentioned 300 dollars and upwards have been paid out of the county revenue in one year to the Judges and Clerks of the elections.— This amount will be now saved because those duties under the new laws are imposed on the trustees of the several townships, and for which no compensation is authorized. The county commissioners are so restricted by the new act relating to their courts in the number and duration of their sessions general and special, and their pay, that 100 dollars at least per annum will be cut off from the former expenses. The item, too, of “miscellaneous expenditures”—that vortex which has heretofore swallowed up so great a portion of county revenue, will be heard of no longer. Every item of expenditure must be set forth and published. A sum as great as 400 dollars has been allowed in a single year to the county commissioners’ clerk; but by the provisions of the new statute stating the exact amount he shall be entitled to for the duties he performs 200 dollars will be saved to the county treasury annually. The sum of 450 dollars has been paid out in one year to Justices of the Peace and Constables in criminal cases. This amount, which came out of the taxes of the people, will no longer be allowed after August next. These officers are entitled to no fees out of the county revenue except in cases where the officer goes out of his county

to arrest a prisoner. For this saving we may set down 400 dollars. The sums which the county has frequently paid for witnesses fees in criminal cases have been very great — 400 per annum would be a fair average amount. These, the law before recited provides, shall not be paid by the county.

There are many other items of expenditure out of the treasury of the county saved by the late laws, but which to examine would require too much time.— Those who desire full information on the subject may obtain it by referring to the acts passed by the last Legislative Assembly, and more especially examining the one relative to “costs and fees.”^s

Let us now recapitulate our statements, and see how much is saved annually to the county treasury of the county we before referred to.

Petit Jurors	\$400.00
Grand do.	130.00
Clerks' fees	320.00
Sheriffs' do.	420.00
Sheriffs' do. as collector	165.00
Judges and Clerks of Elections	300.00
County Commissioners	100.00
“ “ Clerk	200.00
Justices and Constables fees in criminal cases paid by county	400.00
Witnesses in same paid as above	400.00
	Total
	\$2835.00

From the foregoing statement, we may confidently assert, taking into consideration the reduction of other expenditures not here mentioned, that the saving annually to the county referred to, will not vary much from 3,000 dollars — being one half of the whole amount of former assessments.

^s *Laws of the Territory of Iowa, 1841-1842, pp. 51-56 . See also pp. 80, 81, 116-118 for laws providing for a reduction in the expenses of the Territorial government.*

For proof that the foregoing calculation is substantially correct, we call the attention of our fellow citizens to the laws above recited, and the records of the District and County Commissioners courts of the several large counties of the Territory. Now it is fair to say that the expenses of other counties will be reduced in proportion to those of the county to which reference has been made, to wit:— one half, and therefore estimating the whole amount of assessment in Iowa at 60,000 dollars per annum, we will have under the new laws a reduction of 30,000 dollars each year — a sum sufficient, as we have before stated, to support a State Government. Thus we think, we have shown that even if admitted into the Union *during the present year*, we would with our *present population*, be enabled to raise the revenues necessary for a state government, without increasing the taxes which we have been paying for years past without complaint. If this be so, how much more able and competent will we be, with the number of inhabitants Iowa will contain two years hence to defray all the requisite expenses after our admission into the Union?

It will be observed that in the foregoing statement, we have only alluded to sums paid out of the county treasury, and which consequently came directly off the people. The citizens of this Territory have heretofore been taxed enormously in the shape of officer's fees. These the last Legislature have largely reduced.— We will show how great this reduction is as an evidence of the ability of the people now to raise revenue by their having for years past paid large sums to the ministerial officers of the courts and others, and which they hereafter will not be required to do. We will again refer to the county before alluded to. In this county, the fees which the Clerk of the district court received from individual suitors, who compose the great body of tax payers, have been almost \$15 or \$1600 annually. This sum

under the new law is reduced at least \$700 per annum. The Sheriff's fees in the same county have been worth \$1800 or \$2000, and from this deduct 40 per cent, and it makes a change in the amount in one year of \$800; so that in these two offices we have a reduction of 15 or 1600 dollars annually in one county in taxes paid indirectly by the people. But these are not the only officers whose fees have been reduced. The fees of Coroners, Masters in Chancery, Justices of the Peace, Constables, Notaries Public, Judges of Probate and County Surveyors, have all been lowered at least 30 per cent. less than formerly allowed. About these offices, of course it is impossible to make any calculation. We cannot believe that it would be too high an estimate, were we to say 4 or 5000 dollars thus paid by citizens annually were cut off from their expenses in the county before mentioned. From the foregoing, some idea may be formed of the aggregate amount saved each year to individuals by the provisions of the new laws, and thus exhibit the means of the people, even at present to support a State Government, and foreshow what their abundant resources will be two years hence. We contend, further, in connection with this subject, that the laws passed by the last Legislative Assembly, and before referred to, were but the commencement of economy, and that county expenses may be yet further diminished. As an evidence that the fees prescribed by the late laws are not too low, we observe that many of those who held office under the high fee system are candidates again for similar places under the low fee laws. Now we are aware that it will be asserted by the opponents of a Convention, that as the reduction of the direct and indirect expenses of the people will be similar under a State Government, it would be well for them to remain free from the payment of the former high fees, &c., and the expense of a State Government also. This is a fitting and proper argument to be directed to men

who have no desire at all for political freedom, and would be as cogent when we have 300,000 inhabitants as at present. The true question to be propounded is this:— can the people of Iowa take upon them the expenses of a State Government two years hence without feeling that such expenses are oppressive? We have, in the foregoing statements, endeavored to show that [they] can, because they have been paying for several years past, without being burdened, taxes as high and perhaps higher than will be levied under a State Government. The man who is fully satisfied with this argument must have some sinister motives impelling him to a contrary course, or he is one who will ever be opposed to a State Government, and is deeply enamoured with our present situation of colonial dependence.

The distribution act of the last session of Congress, if not repealed, or the distribution under it suspended, promise[s] some pecuniary advantages to Iowa after admission into the Union. Let us inquire how far such promises will probably be realized. This act provides that several of the Western and South Western States shall receive “over and above what each of said States is entitled to by the terms of the compact entered into between them and the United States, upon their admission into the Union, the sum of ten per centum upon the nett proceeds of the sales of the public lands which shall be made within the limits of each of said States respectively.” By the provisions of the 5th Section of said act, any new State may receive the proportion of the proceeds of sales of public lands after their admission to which such State shall be entitled upon the principles of the act aforesaid. Under this act also, when, after deducting the ten per cent. aforesaid, sundry expenses are paid out of the proceeds of the sales aforesaid, the net proceeds are to be divided among the States and Territories according to their respective federal representative population. This

amount we receive as well while a Territory as after our admission into the Union as a State.

Now, provided the above recited act shall not be repealed, or the distribution under it suspended until our admission into the Union, Iowa will receive from the ten per cent. fund, at a low estimate about 10,000[0] per annum. This calculation is based upon the assumption that no new purchase will be made from the Indians, and therefore that only 100,000 dollars worth of lands will be disposed in the Territory annually after Iowa becomes a State. If a new purchase should be effected, and which is most probable, it would not be too high to say that 250,000 dollars worth of land would be sold in the Territory annually for six or seven years after it come into market. Ten per cent on this amount would yield 25,000 annually. The amount which we now, and will after our admission, receive according to our federal representative population, in common with all the states, on the above sums, to-wit, 100,000 and 250,000, would amount from 2,000 to 6,000 per annum. The amount thus due to the Territory for 1841 has been estimated at 2,375, and is payable to the Territory on the 1st of the present month. By act of the last legislative assembly the Treasurer of the Territory is authorized to receive the same.

The act above referred to further provides that each new State, on admission, shall receive the munificent donation of 500,000 acres of land for internal improvements. Lands might be selected even at present to make out the above amount worth at least 2 50 per acre. If a purchase of country was made from the Indians, the selected lands would be worth 3 50 per acre. This shows the great importance of gaining admission at an early date in order that we may have an opportunity of selecting the choice lands of any new purchase which may be made, and thus add 500,000, at least to the resources of the new State for internal improvements.

Now we are aware that it may be contended that we will receive the above mentioned 500,000 acres at any future day on our admission into the Union. This may be true, but are we not every day losing the use of this magnificent fund? Let us endeavor to make a practical illustration of our annual loss on this fund by not going [into] the Union and consequently not having it under our control.

500 000 acres of land at \$3 50 [\$2.50] per acre	\$1,250,000
	3

This amount at 3 per cent per annum	\$37,500,00
-------------------------------------	-------------

Thus we see that by a moderate estimate we decline to receive at least 37,000 every year we stay out of the Union.

It is but fair to say however that there is a possibility that the Distribution Act will soon be either repealed or its operation suspended, many of the statesmen of the country esteeming it only as a means of distributing money to the same people from whom the same amount is collected in the shape of prices paid for articles of consumption, adding thereto the fees for such collection. Others are desirous that the proceeds of the sales of the public lands shall be retained in the national treasury for the payments, so far as they may go, of the national debt, which has recently accrued. It is very probable, too, that the duty on imports will soon be raised higher than 20 per cent at which time, and in which event the distribution under the above named law ceases. On the other hand it may be said that a powerful party are determined to sustain the law and repeal the section suspending its operation. There is one thing certain, that if the act is repealed, Iowa will, on admission, receive the 500,000 acres of land for internal improvements. Missouri and Illinois are selecting or have selected their lands under the act aforesaid, and we presume Congress will not extend more partiality to one State than to another.

We may therefore say that the only certain benefit which Iowa will receive under the law above recited is the 500,000 acres of land for internal improvements, and the use of which we are daily losing.

The control and *use* of the school lands it has been frequently and well said were great inducements for our admission into the Union. No system of common schools can go into healthful operation without a competent and substantial fund. We know it has been contended that common schools might be established under our present government, but a refutation is given to this assertion by the fact that although we have a law upon that subject, yet it has remained perfectly dead among our statutes. So well satisfied were the legislative assembly, too, of this fact that they, at the last session, abolished the office of Superintendent of Common Schools, and would, if it had been proposed, repeal the whole law upon the subject. The repeal of the statute providing for appointment of a Superintendent took place not on account of any objection to the officer, who was acknowledged by all to be competent and indefatigable in the discharge of his duties, but because the want of funds suspended the vitality of the system. The whole amount of school lands within the surveyed portion of the Territory is *about* 200 000 acres — two thirds of which are of the first quality. The whole is worth an average price of \$2 per acre — making a school fund within our present limits of \$400 000. Now, as we before observed in relation to the lands appropriated to the States under the *distribution act*, we admit that Iowa will be entitled to this amount of school lands *at any future time*, on admission into the Union but the *use* the *benefit*, arising from the sales, the rentals, &c., of these lands are lost to us as a *Territory*. Perhaps it would be going too far to say that we would receive any income from the above source for a year or two after admis-

sion — but it is certain, that every day we remain out of the Union so much the further in advance is placed the term when the benefits arising from the school lands will be realized. We said that the school lands of Iowa at present might be valued at \$400 000. Now it is a fair argument to say that the *use* of this amount is worth 3 per cent. per annum, which would give a yearly interest of \$12 000, of which we now are annually deprived. This, we know, is a *very low estimate*, but it would be a sufficient sum to constitute a *nucleus* for a permanent school fund, and would give life and activity to our present dormant system. Another estimate on this subject, much higher than the one which we have given, has been handed to us, but as it is from a gentleman who has fully examined the subjects, we here insert it. “The average worth of the 200 000 acres of school lands would at the end of two years from this time (the date of our anticipated admission) be not less than \$2 50 per acre, or \$500,000 in all. The amount would be all the while increasing with our successive acquisitions of Indian lands. This money might be made to produce a nett income of at least 12 per cent, or \$60,000 per annum — twice the annual cost of a State Government. Now the number of children in the Territory at the last census between the ages of five and fifteen years was 5,000, or less than 14 per cent of the whole population. At the time of our admission two years hence, our population being over 100,000, we shall probably have 14,000 or upwards between those ages within the limits of the Territory. Suppose them to number 15,000. The interest on the school fund will then amount to four dollars each — sufficient under a proper school organization, to afford the means of instruction to every child in the Territory for the period of ten years.”

None will hesitate to acknowledge the invaluable benefits flowing from common schools. The College and academy,

where the higher branches of learning are taught, fall far below the importance of that humble though more potent means of disseminating knowledge — the common school. The one, like the majestic river administering to the wealth and prosperity of one portion of the country, would soon fail if it were not for the innumerable rivulets — the common schools — which swell its waters, and, like the rains of heaven, irrigate alike the fields of the rich and the poor.

The several States on admission into the Union, have received by special compact with the United States, five per cent. of the proceeds of the lands sold within their limits. This, on \$250,000, the amount we have supposed would be realized if an Indian purchase was made, would be about \$12,000. This fund has heretofore been applied, by the compact above mentioned, to internal improvements and school purposes. As the 500,000 acres of land which Iowa will receive under the *distribution act* would be amply sufficient, if properly managed, for internal improvements, the portion of the said fund heretofore used for internal improvements, might be made subject to the control of the legislature of the State, and applied to the payment of the government expenses. The *use* of this fund we are also losing by remaining a Territory. It will be remembered, too, that even if the whole five per cent. fund should be applied to the improvement of roads, bridges &c. it will, *so far as it goes*, lighten the road taxes of the people, and thus render them more able to pay taxes for the support of a State government, if requisite. It has been contended by some of the opponents of a State government that the five per cent. fund was given to the States on condition that the lands sold within such States should not be taxed for five years after their sale to individuals, and that thus the amount of taxable property in the Territory would not be very great for that period. Missouri is pointed to as an example of this

fact. Now this argument was evidently used by one who did not understand the subject. Lands were exempted from taxation for five years after their entry at the land offices in Missouri, Illinois and Indiana, because at the time when those States came into the Union, the public domain was sold on a *credit* and the money was required to be paid in installments, which could not be accomplished in less than five years. In the event of any such instalment becoming due and remaining unpaid the land reverted to the United States. Of course therefore the general government made provision for the *nontaxation* of lands which might probably again become its property. This credit system was abolished twenty years ago, and the reason having ceased a similar enactment has never been made admitting States since that time. Neither Arkansas nor Michigan exempts land from taxation — but in both those States it is subject to pay taxes from date of sale.

To go into a detailed examination of the liberal donations made to the several States upon admission, and the *use* of which we are now daily deprived, would lengthen this address already too much extended. Those who feel, as every citizen should, an interest in this subject, can refer to the acts of Congress admitting Michigan, Arkansas, &c. into the Union, and satisfy themselves on this subject.

We have spoken at some length on the mere pecuniary advantages which would result to Iowa after admission. There are other benefits which would flow from a State organization much greater, and we deem them of higher importance than all others. These we are compelled, for the sake of brevity, merely to refer to. The character of the State abroad — the weight and influence of our representation in Congress — would be greatly increased by admission. This influence is of the greatest importance to us at the present time. It would aid us to effect a new pur-

chase of Indian lands. It would aid us to procure an appropriation to improve the navigation of the Mississippi over or around the Rapids, by canal or otherwise. It would aid us in effecting a permanent settlement of our southern boundary question. It would aid us in placing under the immediate control of the State Government all conflicting claims of boundary and title. It is impossible in a single address to refer particularly to all the advantages of a State, and the disadvantages of a Territorial government. A single illustration will prove the great hardships the people have to suffer under the present organic law. This law fixes the jurisdiction of justices of the peace at a maximum, of 50 dollars. The legislative assembly has petitioned Congress again and again, for the extension of this jurisdiction but in vain — The people are still compelled to bear all the expense of a suit in the District Court where their demand is over the sum of fifty dollars. From this single instance, learn all.

We have confined ourselves to an argument in favor of a State government two years hence, but we must not forget to state that if the people one year hence are dissatisfied with the Constitution adopted by the Convention, provided one should be called, and become convinced that it would be well to defer the application for admission, they can then vote against the Constitution and reject it.

Some of the counties of the Territory may not be so far advanced in wealth and prosperity as others, and may therefore feel disposed to oppose our admission — but if they can be assured that a large majority of our citizens, which is the fact, will be benefited by the change, they should not hesitate to give in their support. They should remember that our interests are the same, and that to use the beautiful language of another, “though divided as the billows, we are one as the sea.”

We have now arrived at the conclusion of our address, and we earnestly entreat our fellow citizens that they give the important question which they will be called upon to decide in August next a thorough investigation — and we know they will go unanimously for — “CONVENTION”

SUNDRY TAX PAYERS.