

ing of Utah's people, and the necessary requirements and signs of our time, that it can and will be done. The people of Utah calculate to live under a pure government.

Is it reasonable to expect that the required ability of legislators and statesmen can be found amongst hirelings, serving only for the salary connected with the office? Or do these offices require a higher grade of men or women?

Is it not a fact, that we have intelligence, and enterprising and financial ability enough amongst the people to find leaders who would appreciate the privileges of spending the time necessary as legislators in behalf of the people, without craving money-rewards for it, at the hands of the community or the State?

Is true patriotism stimulated by the same quality of reward as the hireling?

Is the cradle of statesmanship rocked in lucre?

Is true and able patriotism ruled and dominated by greed?

Is practical love of country not generally woven in with financial ability, enough to enable such citizens to serve their country, at least a part of their time, for the honor and satisfaction of such service?

Is there not a standing desire and a noble craving in the true patriot to serve his country and people, without regard to salary?

Is not the general aspiration of a real statesman and lover of his people and country to keep himself above the necessity of taking money reward for his public services?

Are there not enough of such men and women in our State, without being under the necessity of cringing to unworthy office-seekers, to govern and legislate for the people?

Is the superior efficiency of a man to serve, legislate or govern in the state not also generally equipped with industrial sense enough to avoid being an expense to his country?

Is it not an experience of long standing that the most truly able servants of the people generally are in a situation and of a disposition to serve their country rather at a sacrifice of money and time than to draw from the public treasury in compensation for such service?

Is it not a political sin, a wrong and a misrule, to create, build up and encourage an office-seeking fraternity, subjected to degrading and corrupting evils, and which should not be countenanced in the State? To avoid these miserable consequences of office-seeking, should not the office seek the man; and not the man seek the office? And to this effect, should not that political maxim be forever established as the practice in Utah?

Is it a sign of patriotism when sometimes it happens that superior servants of the people seek to convert and put themselves up as masters of the people, and forget that they are and can be nothing more than the servants of the people? And that as such they live, exist, legislate and govern in behalf of and at the expense of the people, are elected and paid for their services by the toiling multitude, who earn bread for all; and without the fruit of whose labor and industry, common-wealths would die and become extinct?

Should it not be proclaimed hence forward through the State, that the dignity of labor is paramount to the existence of life and prosperity, next to

the divine power that upholds it? And that no public servant can be permitted to lift his head above those who placed him there?

Is it not an inferior grade of public officers who are not able to realize their true position (as servants) amongst the people? And is it not a common characteristic in chronic office-seekers, to gravitate towards masterships over the people?

Finally, is it not necessary to limit the term of office to prevent incumbents from sinking too deep in this approximate lunacy; for servants to imagine themselves to be masters?

The necessary hired and subordinate servants of the people, performing the ordinary public work, are in value, commonly classed with the noble earners and producers of the public wealth.

Would not a great deal of rubbish be cleansed out of the political Babylon if the state sought out both subordinate and superior officers amongst its most worthy sons and daughters best fitted for the office they were to fill?

Is it not a true principle in state or national economy, that the money value of labor is ruled by the general value of all kinds of labor within the state or states? If then, for instance, the general value of a day's, month's or year's labor is a certain amount of money, should that certain amount in money not rule the value of the labor of a hired hands? Has the state a right to discriminate in the value of labor, in a way by which the laborer who pays the salaries to his fellow laborer, the public officers, gives to them in pay for their labor often many times more than he, the laborer, the taxpayer, can earn himself? Have the legislators who legislate in behalf of the people a shadow of right to make such discrimination? Is it not now done through the effects of tradition, inherited from our monarchist forefathers?

Would it not be a valuable reform to institute a little more equity in our political economic machinery, in regard to salaries; reforms to be made gradually and with a steady eye on the mark?

Is not chronic tenantry or stationary servitude of questionable fitness for citizenship in our Republic? Why should a form of servitude, being an outgrowth of antiquated monarchy and within our Republic is a deformed social condition—why should it be tolerated, in any form within the State of Utah, only as a punishment for offenses against its laws? At the same time is it not admissible that servitude as a temporary condition, while its young citizens are making their way into industrial and economic independence, should be accepted as legitimate for a citizen of our republic, like Jacob of old received his economic independence from his father-in-law through honest work? But when servitude, instead of being a transitory state, comes to remain stationary, through legislative misdealing or other causes (as now the demonetization of silver) then such a condition of approximate slavery becomes a menace to the permanency of our Republic!

Why do people generally hire labor? It must be because they can use it to advantage. But why does not the laborer take that advance age himself or herself? To cut this question short—the ability to hire labor, and the willingness to be hired, have created the conditions of master and servant; which, to

excess, approach servitude, and will threaten the life of any republic. Modern tenantry is a system of hiring all kinds of labor, and at the same time furnishing the hired laborers with houses to dwell in, generally located near by where the labor is done, at or in the neighborhood of large industrial establishments. But this system is extended also to collegiate, ecclesiastical as well as to political, legislative and governmental institutions, which with few exceptions are more or less detrimental to ideal republican commonwealths.

This tendency is economic industrial leadership; to create and uphold a stationary serving and hiring system, in most instances we hold is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States; and its forced practice is treachery to our Republic. Traditionally it became a custom also to hire ecclesiastical services in all kinds of establishments where such devotions were considered proper and necessary; showing that voluntary services, free gratuitous, were out of question in the public domain, even in the ecclesiastical department; and it was and is not considered out of place even to have religious ordinances and rites attended to by hired hands.

It may be insisted that our grand Republic can endure and ride over unscathed, all kinds of monarchical and degrading abuses; but nevertheless it is held to be a most serious political, legislative and governmental mistake to hire or engage public service under conditions where it should be rendered for a grade of reward which is considered above money value. The apparent and approximate necessity for many kinds of occupations in public service, to take or receive wages, to a great extent may have its cause by labor not being honored; the dignity of labor not being acknowledged in the state as it ought to be, not being put continually before the people, with an expression of the dignity that must of necessity adhere to it in a republic. In fact the people are rather, at present, trained (under European influence) to indignify labor. Should there not be a yearly celebration which in an intense manner, and with all possible expression, should be given to the dignity of labor, as a state necessity in republics?

In most instances, superior servants of the people could make their living by honest labor, and enable them to serve their country for no other emolument than the satisfaction it gives to a patriotic mind and disposition.

It approximate servitude and its concomitant aristocracy should, through omission of proper attention to the training, yes constant training of the students in our schools, colleges, academies and university, in pure democratic republicanism, gain ascendancy in our Republic, then its days of existence may be counted.

The classic nations did inherit, from a yet mysterious source, a political eminence which in history has to be read between the lines, because the historian, through want of proper insight, did not exactly know what they were writing about, and hence could not give a full history. Our object now is to present as correctly as we can, the political medicine administered at those times to aspiring aristocracy. The classic remedy was "Usuricism." When, for instance, at best, a mediocre (high grade