REV. UTTER'S LECTURE.

Government a Compromise Between Liberty and Power.

THE COMMON FATE OF REPUBLICS.

The Speaker Unalterably Opposed to Universal Suffrage.

Rev. David Utter delivered the following interesting and instructive lecture on "Suffrage and Education," before Camp 3 of the Patriotic Order Sons of America last night:

SUFFRAGE AND EDUCATION.

Any government may be regarded as a compromise between liberty and power. One extreme would give absolute liberty to every individual, and then, there is and can be no government, a condition that some intelligent people in our time sincerely believe in, thinking that a higher and more perfect state of society would ensue under the regime of perfect liberty of all individuals than can otherwise be procured.

The other extreme would give control to absolute authority and all possible power to one man, head or king of the nation, and only such liberty to individuals as the central authority deemed wise and good. Such would be an ideal strong government—power at the maximum, liberty abolished or forgotten.

Between these extremes the pendulum of human society has been vibrating for more years and centuries than all history can count. It is conceivable that the pendulum will some day settle down to the golden mean of the greatest individual liberty consistent with a due regard for the rights of others and the successful carrying out of such public exercises as require united action and promote the general welfare; but as the world is already very old, it is a curious question why the pendulum still vibrates, why the golden mean or equilibrium has not been reached long ago. It seems reasonable to think that many a million would long since have reached perfection, or desire nest to it, in the way of adjusting the opposing claims of law and liberty, not for the fear of neighboring nations, or the condition of conquest. Men do not love tyranny, and they do not need much logic genius to know how to throw off the yoke, but they love their country and they love other people, and they endure much oppression rather than to see faction, or the power of their enemies, so to speak, to the detriment of their country. It has occurred that the lowest governments have been those most indulged and best protected from all outside foes by such barriers as mountains or oceans.

Neither a republic nor a constitutional monarchy has the military strength of an unlimited monarchy, other things being equal, and so a human government by a central and absolute rivals in a measure compelled to sacrifice liberty to power in order to preserve its existence.

The common fate of republics has been to prosper in time of peace, and furnish the best of soldiers for a brief early war, but when the great general delivered the country from foreign dangers he became dictator and then king. Our own republic, however, stands it views in the liberty-loving, law-abiding temper of the people who came here to settle upon our fertile lands, and the power of the central government that separate it from Europe and Asia.

The isolation delivers us from fears of foreign invasion and allows us in defending our free institutions unmolested.

We have the great experiment of building up a government of the people, for the people and by the people has been tried, under conditions the most favorable ever presented in human history. Has it been successful? Is it the triumphant success the fathers predicted and that their sons expected? This is not a Fourth of July oration, and our answer need not be a foregone conclusion. An optimistic view of the affairs of our country has its value, but truth has always the highest value. And truth compels us to confess that we have not with unexpected difficulties to the perfecting of the government of this American republic. No fear of a dictation, but even at the close of the war, when Grant was elected President. No fear of warlike invasion, requiring great standing armies, expensive conscriptions and burdensome taxation, and yet a danger very real and great threatens. A peaceful invasion from many lands simultaneous, silent, constant, has slowly changed the character of our sovereign whom we trusted, our sovereign the people, in whom our faith remained unshaken for near a century, our sovereign the People, has become so changed that our faith and loyalty are weakened. This weakening of faith in our sovereign may not yet be very widespread, but it is ominous because of the quarter in which it appears, for it is among the most intelligent, wise and faithful that the doubts are expressed. For instance, here is an extract from a review article that appeared some ten or more years ago, written by a Boston Parkman under the title, "The Failure of Universal Suffrage." The fathers of our republic had never a doubt of this kind. Universal suffrage was the passion for every soul. They believed in the people as the saint believes in God—unquestioningly—and perhaps they were right, considering the people to whom they believed, Parkman says:

A New England village of olden time, that is to say, forty years ago, would have been safely and well governed by the votes of every man in it. But now that the village has grown to a populous city with its factories and workshops, its acres of tenement houses, and thousands and tens of thousands of restless workmen, foreigners for the most part, to whom liberty means license, and politics mean plunder, to whom the public good is nothing and their own most trivial interests everything, who love the country for what they can get out of it, and whose ears are open to the promptings of every recently agitator, the case is completely changed, and universal suffrage becomes a questionable blessing.

A questionable blessing to himself and an unquestionable curse or terrors to the nation it surely is to give a vote to a man who is both ignorant of the first principles of good government and of history and education (history is all government). We have them here in our favored country, thousands of them, tens of thousands—ignorant of government, and we call them citizens and clothe them with votes, but there is the condition. It truly seems as though our people had made a fetich of universal suffrage.

During the entire history of our nation the tendency has been towards extension of the franchise, with hardly a single exception in the way of limiting it. Most of the states, and I think every one of the original thirteen, began with several limitations, among which was a property qualification. One by one these bars have been repealed, until to only six states is there any restriction of the franchise, except as to youth and sex, and time of residence in the country, state and precinct. Yet on exceptional states are Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Florida, Mississippi, Massachusetts and Rhode Island. In Delaware the qualifications of a voter are that he must have paid a poll tax and passed the age of twenty two years, in addition to being a citizen of the United States. In Florida one must have paid the tax for two years before he can vote. Connecticut and Massachusetts have an educational qualification. In Connecticut it is simply that the voter shall be able to read the Constitution of the United States. In Massachusetts he must do this and also be able to write, and must have paid the capitation tax for two years. In Mississippi the requirement is rather amusing; it is that the citizen proposing to vote shall be able to read or understand the Constitution. I have heard of a lawyer who said that he would be afraid to go to all if it was a close and to take it if it was a cow." The last clause of the Mississippi qualification is evidently intended to admit the citizen if he is not friend and to exclude him if he is our enemy. Rhode Island has a property qualification, the same that has been in but Connecticut for more than a hundred years, and many thousands of her citizens are thereby disenfranchised. The registrants is that one must own real estate to the value of $134, or an annual rental value of 17, before he can be allowed to vote. Very strenuous efforts have recently been made to repeal this law, but the smallest State in the Union, that begun by being the most radical and progressive, proves now to be the most conservative. Conservatism, however, in the case with very good reasons the thoughtful man is apt to believe. With her limited area and great manufacturing cities, the land owners would be in a hopeless minority if all the factory workers were allowed to vote. The best citizens, those most interested in good government, are undoubtedly the native born, the agriculturists and the owners of the factories and homes and business life in the city. The government is in their hands; as things are why should they give into the hands of demagogues and yard politicians as they would be to repeal the law or amend the constitution so as to remove the property qualification, as to voting? In the latter of extending the privilege of the franchise the work is done once for all. There is no going backward, for none will willingly relinquish a privilege and a power that he has once exercised. The constant widening of the privilege toward universal suffrage that has gone on during the entire history of our country, and not only here, but in most nations of the Old World as well, seems to have produced an almost universal conviction that the right to vote is one of man's natural and inalienable rights. This conviction, however, is one of those popular feelings that does not rest upon any solid basis of fact or philosophy. Equal rights for all is an excellent general idea, but to nothing and just application of it in a State, where men differ so profoundly as they do here, some regard should be had to character and condition. In the matter of the franchise, this principle has always been recognized. Paupers are usually forbidden to vote, and criminals in prison, children and imbeciles and insane persons, and until recently and still in general, women. To recognize the fitnesslessness of any one of these classes is really to abandon the idea that the right to vote is a natural right.

The right of suffrage belongs with those upon whom rests the responsibility of upholding and maintaining the government. To make this clear take a case of some nationless, corporate or society. Those who belong to the society, the members are the voters. If some members take more interest than others, no is more canny, it is a union to give them more power in the way of voting, to balance their greater interest and responsibility, and this is universally conceded to be just. A vote is an exercise of authority, and a right to it is derivable only from a sense of responsibility and interest. Now, our government is a society in which, while each citizen has a certain interest, some have naturally much more than others, and naturally must bear a greater responsibility. Where a man has no interest in the welfare of the nation, and feels none, he will feel no responsibility, and if a vote is allowed him he is apt to use it in some trivial and selfish way—apt to sell it, or give it as some friend shall dictate. There should be no hesitation in refusing the elective franchise to such as far as we can describe and distinguish them as a class.

But the greatest danger of all probably is the ignorant class. Good government in our day depends upon many other things besides good intentions. Commercial and economic questions, that seem at first to have no worldly or material bearing on them, are yet fraught with disaster and misery if not met and decided with adequate knowledge and wisdom. And yet in our day we have the totally illiterate man exercises the same power as the college graduate. There may be sound reason in giving every citizen a vote upon some questions, as, for example, for President of the United States or for governor, but that one who cannot read shall vote concerning all questions, or for men for all offices, seems an absurdity that ought to be remedied. But, as we said a little while ago, it will be difficult to apply the remedy in the way of disenfranchising any man or class of men who have been accustomed to vote. The lower in the scale of humanity they are the more difficult would be their resistance to any such attempt, for purchasable voter belong to demagogues and lobbyists and unscrupulous politicians by a natural law, and these men wield influences there which none are more potent. It would seem that the only hope for the present is in the enfranchisement of women, not universally because they are women, nor because of their natural right to the ballot, but, as we are doing it, discreetly, giving certain women the right to vote upon certain questions or in certain elections.

W. D. Bowers has removed to 55 E. First South Street, where he is carrying a stock of vegetables, fruits, groceries, fish and poultry, and would be pleased to have all his old customers call on him. 6146

THE FEDERATED TRADES.

Report of the Committee on Legislation Last Night.

VARIOUS SUBJECTS DISCUSSED.

A Mechanics' Lien Law—An Employers' Liability Act—"Labor Day."

At the meeting last evening of the Federated Trades Council, the committee on legislation submitted the following report:

To the Utah Federated Trades:

Your committee would respectfully present a special report of their labors, according to instructions received in a resolution presented during the summer.

Three members of the committee met at the parlor in the residence of Mr. E. L. Frank, one of the members, the two others present being Messrs. of the Cigarmakers' and Coopers' Unions, respectively. Upon the assembling of the committee it was deemed only necessary to draw up a memorial to the Legislature, which would submit to the welfare of the industrial interests of the Territory in their respective spheres of labor.

First—A mechanic's lien law, which would secure to labor first, and subsequently, in the order of time, the material men. The committee are in doubt as to the form which is the most perfect law for this object, and would request that the Council be so accommodate with the head of the Federation of Labor in Nevada and request a copy of that law which would suit Utah.

Second—An employers' liability act, providing for the security of life and limb of employees, and requiring them to use such changes where the Factory Act is not in force, and to repeal this law, which seems to extend only to factories and workshops, and to employers, parents and others who are required to be responsible for the welfare of the rising generation in schools, colleges and other institutions where are the persons with whom the employer, or whoever, through negligence, contributed to injure, maim and bury all within their ashes, as happened in New York recently.

Third—Provision for the appointment of a Factory Inspector, who shall constitute the duties of the Factory Act, with that of factory inspector. In this connection, the committee would request the Council to endorse the action of a bill prepared by Mr. A. J. Gibson, delegate from the Operative Plasterers.

Fourth—Making it a misdemeanor for any corporation or officer to be engaged in any business or occupation, or, if a corporation, or officer, or any person, or firm, or corporation, or officer, or any person, or firm, or corporation, or officer, or any person, or firm, or