

On the other hand, equally influential men wanted some restraints on the popular will, some kind of balance wheel as it were, so that neither the people nor the chief magistrate would be entirely absolute. But the extreme wing of this party favored schemes antagonistic to republican or democratic government. Finally a compromise was effected, and the interests of the people, the State and the national government subserved. The election by State legislatures, as Madison says, fully met the public opinion of the time, and was the plan adopted.

Public opinion today may be somewhat different, and the masses may see no necessity for recognizing the organic individuality of the States, for it is evident that during the past few years the demand for electing Senators by popular vote has been growing. Charges of corruption and venality are being constantly made against State legislature. It is said that they are in many cases controlled by corporations and other improper influences. In 1890 in Illinois this question entered largely into State politics. The Democratic convention of that State endorsed Gen. Palmer for Senator, all the county, district and municipal conventions did the same. The result was that all candidates for both branches of the Assembly pledged themselves in the event of election to vote for Gen. Palmer as Senator from Illinois. This came as near to a choice by direct popular vote as could be possible under the present system.

Representative Miller of Wisconsin, before the House committee on the election of President, Vice-President, etc., a few days ago, urged a joint resolution in favor of a constitutional amendment more sweeping than that proposed for a direct popular vote. He would give a Senator to each State primarily and an additional Senator for each million of inhabitants, all to be selected directly by the people. Even this question was discussed one hundred years ago, and a large party then favored popular representation in the Senate. The method finally adopted, of equal representation of the States, no matter how large or small, is likely to prevail for another century at least. The smaller States would never consent to a change and it would probably be no improvement.

THE POPULAR TOPIC.

The attitude of President Harrison toward Utah is still claimed to be hostile, and it is therefore argued that any attempt to pass the Teller bill will be useless. We have already presented

the President's utterances on the subject of the Utah situation, given to them their full intent, and explained what can not be fairly deduced from them. But it is stated that he is a gentleman of strong prejudices, and the ground is taken that no matter if both Houses of Congress should prove in favor of the statehood bill, it "cannot become law" and to urge its passage "will be a waste of energy."

All this supposes that the present occupant of the White House is an unchangeable being and that "satisfactory evidence" to others would have no effect upon him. Therein lies the weakness of the position of the opponents of the Teller bill, who take the ground that the President's veto, in case of its passage, is a certainty. The President's words ought to be taken as they stand. All that he asks for on this question is "satisfactory evidence that the people of the State to be created would exercise the exclusive power of the State over this subject in the same way" as Congress would. Is not this what Congress wants? And if Congress received satisfactory evidence of this nature is it not reasonable to think it would be also "satisfactory evidence" to the President?

It does not appear to us very strong reasoning to assume that the President will not approve of a measure, and then proceed to the conclusion that it is useless to urge its passage because of the alleged certainty of his veto. In the discussion of this subject, the fact must not be lost sight of that immediate statehood is not contemplated in the Teller bill. It is postponed to a safe date, and with the safe provision that after the State constitution has been ratified by the people, it must be passed upon by Congress before the President is to issue his proclamation. This ought to satisfy those who think Utah should wait a while longer, and certainly ought not to alarm those who concede that the people are ready for statehood but say the country is not yet quite convinced of that fact.

One good purpose will be served by the Utah bills now before Congress. That is, they will "educate" both the legislators and the country in Utah affairs, and give an opportunity to the advocates of either measure to show whether they are her true friends or whether they have only personal projects in view. Let the citizens of this Territory be known for what they are, and the better portion of the people of the United States will not withhold their approval of a measure that will give to Utah full political liberty.

EDUCATION NEEDED.

MUCH of the talk about educating the "Mormons" up to statehood is nothing but talk. The masses of the people of Utah know at least as much on matters of government as the masses in any of the surrounding States, and Territories. We could bring from rural districts young men, raised in Utah who, could hold their own in debate on political and economic questions with many of those supercilious persons who want Utah "educated up to the point where they will be fit for self-government."

We are of the opinion that a little education is just as much needed among some of those who think the Territory ought to wait awhile in future bondage, as among the people whom they do not understand. Some of them need to learn the lesson of self-government in its personal sense—to learn how to control their passions and their tongues. Others ought to be educated up to the point where they can recognize the sincerity of other people and to practice it themselves. Not a few require education in the importance of the general welfare above mere party interests. Also in the subordination of personal ambitions to the public good.

There are Republicans who should be educated in Democratic doctrine, and Democrats who should be educated in Republican doctrine. For there are partizans on both sides who either do not understand what their opponents believe and aim to accomplish or they purposely misrepresent both.

All politicians who would punish in any way, whether by pains and penalties, or by disfranchisement, or by deprivation of church property, a body of people solely on account of their belief, need to be educated in the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, and until they learn this lesson are not fit to be entrusted with the powers of government.

Men who pretend that the "Mormons" are controlled by Church influence and who themselves are in abject servitude to the dictation of political bosses, require educating in the duties and rights of citizenship and the requirements of common manhood.

There are many other things in which some of the clamorers for the education of the "Mormon" people need training and culture, and when they talk about the needs of others they only expose their own defects.

The masses of the people of Utah are not so much behind the times as their would-be dictators make out, and if they are not all extreme partizans