

or positive failures to prosecute that same program; and as the struggle progresses from one election to another with scarcely enough time in the interim to allow the currents of trade to recover their momentum for another blockade.

It was scarcely five years ago that the country was paralyzed over an attempted tariff reform. The party in power, though at the eleventh hour, had to do something in testimony of its good faith. So a tariff bill was introduced. Neither its framers nor any one else acquainted with the political situation had the faintest idea it would ever become a law, and it never did; but the wool crop tumbled from 17 to 12 cents just the same, on the strength of it. A few Boston and Philadelphia commission men made fortunes, and a lot of western woolgrowers went to pieces. There is no doubt that the depressed condition of trade now is in part the result of this ghostly expectancy of something in the dim if not quite impossible future.

In the final reckoning up of the evils of an irrational partisanship, we believe these seemingly innocent fictions put forth every four years in the form of party platforms will have much to answer for. It is not remarkable that gamblers and princes of speculation generally look with longing eyes toward election day. It is their natural harvest time.

SOME UNIVERSITY ECONOMICS.

The Ogden *Standard* is inclined to question the propriety of uniting the Agricultural College with the University of Utah. In suggesting such a course some days ago, we felt assured that the grounds for doing so were the very best; and while not disposed to rush voluntarily into a newspaper controversy on this or any other subject, we shall have to take occasion to mention a few important points which the *Standard* seems to have overlooked.

The grounds upon which protest against the union is made are: (1) that the schools "differ in aim and design," to an extent which renders impracticable the scheme of uniting them under one management and in one locality; (2) that the Agricultural College has now been established at heavy expense to the Territory, and to move it from Logan for the purpose of bringing the two institutions together would be bad economy.

We might have answered the first objection with more satisfaction if the *Standard* writer had been more explicit in defining what he considered to be the aims of the two schools. Here is his statement:

The Agricultural College is a special school, combined with an experiment station. It is, or should be, a place where the youth may receive manual training. It is a school for the masses, where the pupils should be taught matters pertaining to practical affairs and receive a training in every day utility.

The College is established for practical purposes, the University for classical.

We are unable to decide from this language just what is meant by manual training. If it is to teach the farmer boys, who go there with the

expectation of getting practical knowledge, how to hold a plow or harness a horse, we have only to say that either the *News* or its esteemed cotemporary is slightly off color as to college economics. If it is a school of technology which the *Standard* has in mind, while such could not consistently be assumed to be comprehended in the name agricultural college, we would still be prepared, if occasion required, to advocate the uniting of such an institution with the University, as unconditionally as we do the uniting of the Agricultural College. But that is aside from the point.

In every public transaction where a diversity of personal interests exists, there are sure to arise an array of many-sided arguments so vast as to preclude all possibility of disentangling them with profit. We believe the agricultural college question as discussed in other states besides Utah, has been more than usually fruitless of this sort of political product. But stripped of verbose definitions and other worthless attendants, we find that the only essential difference between an agricultural college which offers a competent course of study for the granting of degrees, and any other competent educational concern having the same grade of instruction, is its experiment station. All outside of that department is straight university work; and the greater part of the instruction inside is given in any capable institution of higher learning. For the sake of exact, we have been comparing the courses of study now offered by the Agricultural College. Four-fifths, if not more, of the studies exhibited in its register of courses are exact duplicates of work laid down in the University catalogues. If the latter institute was fitted up as it should be, with its courses and apparatus as complete as are afforded by several other western institutions of the same grade, the ratio of duplication would not be as four to five, but rather as nineteen to twenty. The greatest agricultural university in America supports not more than four instructors whose work is distinctively agricultural. Its entire corps of teachers would number one hundred and fifty or more.

As to the question of what studies are "practical" and what ornamental, we incline to the opinion that the only competent judge of such matters is the student. He, if anybody, knows what he hopes to do with himself in real life; and any study which, in his particular line, would aid in the pursuit of happiness we presume would be a practical study. And that definition would apply as well to the study of Greek in one case as to the chemistry of patent fertilizers in another. For this reason a university is not, as the *Standard* seems to think, simply an establishment for the application of a higher polish to persons whose sole end in life is to be cultivated, but for giving competent instruction in any of the higher branches of learning, which an earnest student might desire to pursue. And we will say further that whatever theory of practicality would tend to remove the science of agriculture from the plane of higher education, simply degrades the most noble of human pursuits. It

is not sentimentality that places agricultural science among the higher branches of learning. Its place there has been determined by the long line of sober and exacting labor in the class room and laboratory which every student must traverse before he is competent to begin the most essential branch of agricultural study. This may be "foregoing the advantages of academical education for the sake of practical training," but it does not so appear in the books.

The second ground of the *Standard's* protest we have heard nothing of in this quarter. The simple point of controversy, so far as we know, has been the uniting of the two schools. We will say this much, however, for the benefit of our opponent: When you come to place the mere cost of a college building of the dimensions of either the one at Logan or the one in Salt Lake City over against the constantly increasing expense of keeping such an institution abreast with the times, your building, cherished for what it cost, will very soon go out of sight. It is not only professors and buildings which you duplicate by such a scheme; it is libraries, museums, gymnasiums, laboratories, physical and engineering apparatus—all of which are quite as essential to a university as its professors or president. The Territory could better afford to put the torch to one of the extra buildings than to support it as a parallel institution of learning. In five years or less the treasury would be clearing good money out of the savings by such a destruction.

A CASE AT LAW.

To the following communication, there is necessity for only a few words of reply:

COALVILLE, Utah, Nov. 20, 1893.

Editor *Deseret News*:

I notice in your issue of the 18th inst. the following:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS.

In the case of U. P. Quakenbush vs H. B. Scott and W. B. Booth vs T. A. Davis et al—actions to quiet title to 160 acres of land at Brighton—Judge Zane has found for plaintiff in each case.

If I have traced this case correctly it runs as follows: Stevens secured patent to the 160 acres; he transferred to U. P. Quakenbush, and Quakenbush sold to W. B. Booth.

Mrs. Stevens, wife of Mr. Stevens, secured a decree for said 160 acres, through the [Probate] Court by reason of divorce proceedings. She, as also all other claimants, allowed the land in question to be sold for taxes, and she purchased the same at tax sale. She then sold to A. O. Smith and Smith sold to H. B. Scott and Scott sold to Davis and Dalton.

If I understand the decision, the land goes to W. B. Booth, by reason of his purchase from Quakenbush.

The points I now wish to reach are: 1st. Have I traced the case correctly? 2nd. Do I understand the decision correctly? 3rd. What figure does the sale of the land for taxes cut in the case?

Please favor us with the desired information. Yours respectfully,
ALMA ELDRIDGE.

A legal friend who followed the case closely and is thoroughly familiar with it and the decision, informs the *NEWS* that, to our correspondent's first question: "Have I traced the case correct-