

Mazzini, San Lorenzo's Cathedral, and, above all, the cemetery, *Cimitero Monumentale di Staglieno*.

One little incident, although trivial in itself, but, I am sorry to say, an everyday occurrence, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of recording here. As I perambulated the streets of Genoa one evening I noticed a drunken fellow who seemed very anxious to get himself into a bad scrape by starting a quarrel with a policeman. He would no doubt have succeeded very well, or rather very badly, had it not been for three young ladies of the genuine Italian type who stepped in and saved him at the very last moment. In my own mind I put the ladies down as his wife and sister-in-law. I shall not easily forget their eager pleadings and anxious supplications, and how they finally threw their arms around that young fellow and drew him away by gentle force; nor the inexpressible joy that beamed upon their countenances when they finally succeeded in saving the wretch from trouble. Woman, faithful woman! Who else can cling to a wretch of a man as if he were an angel, and find satisfaction in the mere consciousness of having done a good deed! No wonder that a double curse is the lot of those who crush hearts where such divine qualities dwell.

The drunken fellow just mentioned reminds me of the fact that the British Medical Association has lately proved (sic!) that we must drink in order to live long. The learned gentlemen belonging thereto have inquired into 4234 cases of death, and found that "habitually temperate drinkers" reach an average age of 63 years; "decidedly temperate drinkers" average 53, and "total abstainers" only 51 years. A total abstainer, consequently, shortens his life twelve years by not drinking a little once in a while. Thus far we have now gone. O, temporal O, mores! What cannot be proved by figures? That learned association will have to show some better figures than these or it may considerably shorten its own longevity.

In my intercourse with various persons, I have, when convenient, tried to ascertain what the feelings among the people are in regard to the political status of Europe. The expression of a gentleman from Baden may, I think, be regarded as a true representation of the opinion in Germany. I asked him if he thought there was any immediate danger of a new conflict between France and Germany. In our country, I added, it is generally thought that such a conflict must take place before long. "I do not think so," the gentleman replied. "There is no doubt that France would like to have *revanche* at any time; but she dare not try the experiment. As long as the political parties are so disunited she can do nothing; and the armies of Germany are at present so well trained and equipped that no foreign power dare attack them." This is no doubt true. And yet a peace that rests on bayonets

and cannon balls may easily tip over. The immense sums spent in Europe on standing armies must necessarily reduce the powers to bankruptcy, and wars must be engaged in, in order to refill the empty cashboxes.

However, there is One who rules supreme, and it is to be hoped that the new year may bring blessings abundantly to mankind. Farewell!  
J. M. S.

### OUR CHICAGO LETTER.

At this late date to refer to the year that is passed seems like trespassing on the domain of the antiquarian. However this may be, the year will prove a memorable one in the annals of American history. It will not be called the year of the Long Congress, though this term might with propriety be applied to it. The first session of the Fiftieth Congress lasted 321 days. The President of the United States appended his signature to over 1100 public and private measures and bills. He vetoed some 350 others. In all this mass of legislation only two bills were passed worthy of being classed under the head of national statesmanship. These bills are that for the establishment of a Department of Agriculture and that providing for a conference of American nations at Washington next autumn. To the people of Utah these are measures of great moment. Agriculture is the basis of their industrial economy, and it is hoped that it will continue so in the future as it has in the past. Americanism is the basis of their social and political framework; not an Americanism confined to a cabbage garden in New England, nor to a sugar patch in the South, nor to a corn-belt in the West, but an Americanism which embraces the whole continent from Alaska to Patagonia, and from Long Island to the Golden Gate.

This Americanism is not built on a Murchison letter, nor on a whisky trust, neither is it built on class privileges nor on discriminated industries, nor on politically favored, socially fashionable religions. It is an Americanism based on the Constitution of the United States, which is regarded as a sacred document, and on the lives and writings of the fathers of the Republic. I am sure it is the wish of every honest citizen and agriculturist in Utah that this Americanism may ultimately overspread this broad land.

Our public schools are not giving the study of the American continent the attention it deserves. You can find a pupil who will tell you all about Russia and Germany, but can't tell whether Mexico is a republic or a monarchy, and who thinks Patagonia is a fictitious synonym for Ireland. This is not the Americanism Utah practices, nor does she desire it. America first, the world after; this is Utahism.

Concerning the presidential vetoes of last year, the question might with reason be asked, "Were there

too many of them?" Mr. Blaine says there were. But the reasons for his saying so sound rather strange to an American. Among these reasons Mr. Blaine said the veto power was not exercised by the sovereigns of England only a few times since the accession of William of Orange. Did Mr. Blaine imply by this that all the legislation enacted by the British Parliament during all this time was so just, so equitable and so Christian-like that it did not need to be vetoed? No other construction can be placed on his utterances. Let me ask Mr. Lannan, of Salt Lake City, or Mr. West (See Tullidge's "Salt Lake City") formerly of Kentucky, as to the correctness of Mr. Blaine's justification of innocuous desuetude in the royal veto of Britain. Both these gentlemen are now in Washington working against autonomy for Utah, working against that which that glorious old man, W. E. Gladstone, is trying to obtain for the mother country. Mephistopheles laugh! Laugh heartily at Pat Lannan, a victim of the infamous penal code which was enacted within the period of British history mentioned by Mr. Blaine, and which was so just as not to require a royal veto; yes, laugh at Mr. Patrick Lannan, formerly butcher of Connemara, now in Washington before a congressional committee, making a plea against autonomy for Utah. Oh! spirit of Edmund Burke, if thou hast cognizance of earthly matters, feel not aggrieved because this creature Lannan is a native of Ireland. Remember that the sweet little isle grows weeds as well as shamrocks, and that even in this land there are other Patricks who uphold religious and political equality!

"The penal code had a vicious perfection—it was a complete system—full of coherence and consistency; well digested and well disposed in all its parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment and degradation of a people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." This is Edmund's characterization of the infamous code which according to Mr. Blaine did not receive a royal veto. It was the code established for the government of Mr. Lannan's grandfather. It is the code which Mr. Lannan now wants to impose on his fellow-citizens of Utah. Can such a man possess reason? Has such a man a heart? If he has religion he stands on it, he tramples it, he disgraces it.

As to the other co-laborers of Mr. Lannan, we can't well blame them. Poor blind wretches, forgive them, they know not what they do. As to the Governor of Utah, who is now in Washington for the purpose of defeating statehood, what can be said of him? I must admit that in criticizing these people one is engaged in a very delicate matter. And the very criticisms thus uttered are taken up and construed as treasonable acts against the Government of the United States. But as a certain favorite book of mine says: "Wherefore the things which are pleasing