"UNITED WE STAND."

Divided, We Shall for Many Years Only Totter.

PREST. KINGSBURY'S REJOINDER.

The Great Question of Uniting University and Agricultural College is Again Affirmatively Discussed.

Editor Deseret News:

I do not desire to enter into personalities in giving my views on the advantages and economy of uniting all the higher educational forces of the Territory. But I am compelled to state that President Barbour has at least been misinformed regarding certain matters involving myself. In the first place he states that I have been writing to "various members of the Legislature, probably all of them, asking their opinion of union in such terms as to imply a desire for their consential upon [sic] so-certain statement." This is untrue. I have not written to a single member of the Legislature asking or desiring his opinion on combining the two institutions. Furthermore, I have not talked with but one member on the subject and I did not ask him for his opinion regarding the union. I refer the gentleman to the legislator themselves in proof of the truth of this statement. Again, President Barbour has been misinformed in regard to my working in any way to form a union of the two institutions at Salt Lake City. Whether members of the faculty have been working to this end I do not know. Each one can answer for himself. What I have done has been for the promotion of the cause of efficiency in higher educational (over) interests of the Territory irrespective of sect or location. To me the great advantage to the Territory, socially, industrially and educationally in combining our university forces, over that of distributing them, is something of such vast importance that the question of location involved in the union of the Agricultural College and the University of Utah is a matter of secondary consideration. President Barbour's entering "the field in the interests of the industrial classes of this Territory" is commendable. In this I am ready to co-operate with him. My earlier years were spent in the canyons rolling and hauling wood, hauling coal from Coalville to Salt Lake City, and working on my father's farm. In my childhood in the early days of Utah, in the midst of poverty, I, with others, tasted the bitterness of privation, incident to pioneer life. I am in a position, therefore, to appreciate to some extent the sting of poverty, the condition of the masses and the absolute justice of promoting the interests of the industrial classes. It is my own history that makes me more sympathetic to them I otherwise would be in working to provide Utah with a University wherein every young man and every young woman of Utah that has an inclination to do so can obtain a scientific education without being forced to go East or West. This condition cannot be brought about without concentrating every force of higher education within the grasp of the state. Had an institution of learning existed here such as Utah is now capable of having by making proper use of her means, I could have obtained an education with ease as compared with the hard struggles it was necessary to undergo and the surmounting of difficulties seeming to me impossible at the time to overcome.

In regard to the salaries President Barbour has referred to I will say that I is a matter wholly within the provisions of the regents. The present incumbent of professors were fixed before my appointment as acting president. I was aware that the Agricultural College now a part of Utah University, was connected religiously with another institution, etc. This I had sold both my about. It has nothing to do with the question of uniting our higher educational institutions. That ex-President Willis's letter was not addressed to me is true. I never even intimated that it was addressed to me. In the pamphlet issued by myself it is there made plain what letters were addressed to me and what letters were addressed to people in Montana. If President Barbour is in search with ex-President Willis's position as given in the letter quoted, his views are the same as mine. Whether Salt Lake City will give all the young men and young women coming from places where there are no high schools a high school education, I am unprepared to state. Why all this matter has far referred to is gone over by President Babbitt, the readers may decide for themselves. It has nothing to do with the question of consolidation. Most of the points he presented in last Saturday's News touching the question of uniting the two institutions were already been considered in my letter of December 25. I am free to say that in dealing with the question under consideration I have had no intention with any selfish motive of antagonizing or conciliating Salt Lake City, Logan, the last Legislature or this Legislature. The only object I have in view is to advance and to push what I have conceived would be for the best good of the whole people of Utah, a consolidation of our higher educational institutions.

The following is a letter to me from President C. K. Adams, of Wisconsin University, after receiving the News containing my first paper and the News containing that of President Barbour:

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, December 26, 1893.

President J. T. Kingsbury, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah:

Dear Sir—Replying to your letter of December 18th, I would say that the position and experience now along extend the time I formerly thought would elapse before the university should be considered ripe for the consolidation of other educational institutions. The most thoroughly satisfactory system for uniting in one school all the university and other educational forces in the state, I think, is that all possible forces for a higher education should be concentrated, while by concentrating the primary work must be left to other institutions. I am very much in the dark in the matter, however, not knowing the conditions in your state, and therefore speaking from the general standpoint of experience in other states. In Iowa, Indiana, Michigan and Minnesota, I have had the opportunity of observing the effects of the different systems, and have come to the conclusion that the system of Michigan and other states is the best.

Some years ago, when Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota and Indiana were all in the throes of the question, I was in Michigan and had the opportunity of talking with the men who had been instrumental in bringing about the system there. I was then in the University of Minnesota, and I was there when the question was agitated in Iowa and Minnesota. In the latter state I was in close relation with the president, who made a separate report upon the subject, which I read with great interest. The conclusion reached was that the system of Michigan was the best one for the state, and that it was working to the advantage of the state. I have had no occasion to change my opinion, and I believe that the experience of Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa and other states, is in favor of the system of Michigan. I have not been in Minnesota for some years, but when I was there I was informed that the system was working well, and I have no reason to think it has not since. I have been in Iowa quite recently, and I know that the system is working well there. I know that the system of Michigan has been in operation long enough to show its results, and I know that the results are very satisfactory. The University of Michigan is the state university, and the agricultural college is a department of the university. The agricultural college is located at Lansing, the capital, and the university at Ann Arbor, about 60 miles from Lansing. The agricultural college is a department of the university, and the president of the university is also president of the agricultural college. The university has a law department, a medical department, a department of literature, science and the arts, and a department of pharmacy. The agricultural college has a department of agriculture, a department of mechanical engineering, a department of civil engineering, a department of mining and metallurgy, a department of chemistry, a department of domestic economy, and a department of military tactics. The university has a faculty of about 300 and the agricultural college a faculty of about 30. The university has 1,500 students and the agricultural college 500. The university has a library of 50,000 volumes, and the agricultural college a library of 5,000 volumes. The university has a revenue of about $300,000, and the agricultural college a revenue of about $100,000. The university has a revenue from the state of about $100,000, and the agricultural college a revenue from the state of about $50,000. The university has a revenue from students of about $100,000, and the agricultural college a revenue from students of about $50,000. The university has a revenue from other sources than students and the state of about $100,000, and the agricultural college a revenue from other sources than students and