

trust that the newspaper is right and the complainant is wrong and that things will remain so as far as conditions are concerned. We confess to an inclination to class Chicago's prices during a drawing occasion along with some of her buildings, that is, higher than anywhere else; this opinion, to use the language of the bar, is not a fixed, definite and unconditional opinion, but is only based upon hearsay and what we have read in the papers; it would not require a great deal of evidence to remove the opinion, for two reasons—the disclaimer of our respected cotemporary has almost persuaded us to change our minds, and we are so willing that it be otherwise that but little more is needed to effect a complete effacement of the bad impression. Meantime, let Chicago read up on the fable of the goose and the golden eggs.

PROFESSORS IN POLITICS.

The faculty of some of the Eastern colleges are leading out freely in the matter of engaging actively in politics, and while this may not be called an innovation altogether, it is something in the nature of an awakening and is not without significance. It is claimed to be, and doubtless is, gratifying that men who are by profession trained thinkers have concluded to set an example in the matter of participating in the practical phase of politics, so that others, who may be either thinking or unthinking, can have the benefit of their reasoning and their conclusions.

But it is also shown, on the other hand, that it would be highly regrettable if any of these institutions should become, however indirectly, the particular friend or representative of a party. It would injure the schools—perhaps eventually nullify the effect of the professor's precept. In the reports now circulated it is stated, for instance, that President Eliot and four-fifths of the Harvard faculty are for Cleveland, and that a majority of the Cornell faculty are for Harrison. Also we learn that the proportion of Republicans to Democrats in Dartmouth is as seven to one, that twenty-three of the thirty-three professors at Amherst are for Cleveland, and that the "Cleveland men on the faculty of Yale outnumber the Harrison men four to one."

The source from whence this comes thinks, however, it would be grievous enough if the professors were to cloister themselves in their studies and refuse to take the interest which all citizens should feel in a political contest, and we are disposed to concur. "But unless they remain very steadfast to the purpose of sticking to principles and ignoring partisanship," it says, "there is a danger that the alma mater will be dragged into politics as an instrument for tactical maneuvers."

None of us desires so incongruous a result from the faculty's participation as is foreshadowed by the foregoing conclusion; but certainly if the professors permit their minds to be drawn out toward politics at all, they will naturally enough be themselves drawn toward the hustings and the ballot box as the newly awakened interest becomes stronger and stronger; and there would seem to be no sufficient reason

why it should be otherwise. The result would seem to be inevitable, however, that an active, aggressive share in partisan politics is incompatible with the calm, argumentative, studious duties required of college professors.

WE LIVE AND LEARN.

We keep on learning something about the land we live in, which goes to show that it will be some time yet before we know it all regarding America, if indeed such a state of information is at all possible. The Columbian Fair dedication at Chicago doubtless did more good than will ever be recorded or acknowledged, chiefly in the way of causing those who thought themselves posted to learn some new things by investigation and "brushing up," and those who were not to find out how very ignorant they really were; while to all classes and among every condition some new "pointers" were acquired by the force of comparison and association of ideas.

In these quadro-centennial days, says a cotemporary, it is worth while to recall the fact that the continent now named America has gone at one time or another by a great many names. The notion that Columbus held of finding a westward passage to India by way of the Atlantic is recorded by the names of New India and India Occidental, found upon old maps as indicating the land discovered by Columbus. America Mexicana was an old name of North America, as America Peruviana was of South America. Then Brazil was for a time the name applied to the southern continent.

Finally, says the same authority, the origin of the name America has been gravely disputed, though the weight of testimony leaves practically no doubt that it comes from the Christian name of Amerigo Vespucci. Some early authorities, however, gravely contend that the name came from the Peruvian word *Amaru*, meaning the sacred symbol of the cross, made of a serpent and a stick, and suffix *ca*, meaning country. Thus derived, America means the land of the holy animal. If those who named it that could only return from the shades and witness one of our great political campaigns, they would surely credit themselves with more foresight than occurred to them at the time.

THE NEW SCHOOL OF ACTORS.

James John Corbett, a young man hailing from California, and who recently acquired considerable fame and an immense amount of cash by battering and beating another bruiser who had never been treated that way before, is playing on the stage and making more money in a week than he ever made as a bookkeeper in a year. What a travesty on professional ethics all this is! Of course Corbett is not an actor, does not, perhaps, understand the rudiments of theatrical business; yet he commands a larger income than any of the great professionals now actively engaged in their calling. With John McCullough and Lawrence Barrett, the great

American actors of this generation, dead, and Edwin Booth, of the same school, going the same way very fast, it is natural that we seek new idols in the temple of Theatrics; and what more reasonable than that the scholarly acquirements and intellectual culture of the age should cause us to turn our eyes lovingly to John L. Sullivan and his conqueror! Physical culture and even the ability to slug right and left are not at all detrimental to the make-up of a great actor, in fact, they would be more likely an assistance to him, and a good physique is quite indispensable; but when the candidate for dramatic honors and profits has no other qualifications whatever and can still make more money than those who have toiled up the ladder and reached its top through the force of talent fully cultivated and merit properly applied, it is enough to engender "that tired feeling" as a chronic ailment.

A CARD.

In daily papers published in this Territory versions of remarks made at Provo, on Tuesday evening last, by Mr. J. L. Rawlins, the Democratic candidate for Delegate to Congress, have appeared in which he is credited with making certain statements concerning myself of a most grave character. One of the statements published is in relation to the bonds of \$45,000 which were forfeited when I did not appear in court on the 17th of March, 1886. Two of those bonds of \$10,000 each were not paid, but were carried by appeal of my sureties to the U. S. Supreme Court, and last spring I succeeded in effecting a compromise by which I was relieved, for a small consideration, from the necessity of paying them.

Concerning this compromise Mr. Rawlins is credited with saying: "It is whispered that a compromise had been effected, and it is said \$20,000 of the bonds were remitted, and it has been further said that the relinquishment of the \$20,000 bonds was in consideration of the Mormon vote being given to the Republicans." After making this statement it is said that Mr. Rawlins continued: "What do you think when I tell you that in consideration of his bond being reduced \$20,000, the Mormon people are to be sold into the ranks of the Republican party?"

Upon these statements being brought to my attention, I addressed a note to Mr. Rawlins, in which I asked him if he had made those statements; if he had not, I asked that he would be so kind, if he had made any allusion to me upon that occasion, to give me his version of that which he did say.

In reply to this, I have received a letter this morning from him, in which he states: "I did not charge in my Provo speech that in consideration of the remittance of the \$20,000 you had bargained away the votes of the Mormon people." He does not, however, comply with my request and state what he did say upon this subject, but branches off to inform me where my honor has been assailed in other directions, quite irrelevant to the point at issue between himself and me.

The same afternoon that I addressed this letter to Mr. Rawlins, I received