

she is any more value to the community than if she lavished one or two hundred thousand dollars a year upon her own person and comfort.

WORSE THAN SAVAGES.

If it be true, as stated in a dispatch from Tacoma, Washington, that the cuticle of a notorious criminal has been tanned for the purpose of furnishing material for pocketbooks, and that there is great demand for the horrible souvenirs, there can be but one opinion among people whose sense of decency has not been helplessly blunted—that all concerned in the disgusting business should be prosecuted, if there is a statute under which legal proceedings can be instituted; or else ostracized by civilized society. To make pets of baby crocodiles and use rattlesnakes' skins as neck ties seems bad enough to anyone who is not initiated into the mysteries of fadism, but, surely, the line must be drawn somewhere, and when it comes to immortalizing murderers by transforming part of their bodies into keepsakes, thus giving an opportunity of recounting again and again the details of their brutal exploits and that in the hearing, no doubt, of innocent children in whose souls those stories will fall as crime-producing seeds with the probability of a future rich harvest, it is time to protest and to stop, if possible, the nefarious practice.

Savages have always been the object of pity. Travelers have told of their habits of collecting scalps as trophies; of making drinking bowls of human skulls and ornaments of the teeth and bones of their slain victims, and this has properly been looked upon as evidence of a moral development but little higher than that of brutes. Yet, it is known that even the lowest savages generally keep such things as evidences of valor in battle against enemies. Their trophies are marks of success in services rendered their country in the defense of home and family, intended, perhaps, to inspire others to deeds of bravery in a similar cause. But the spectacle of sane people carrying about pieces of a condemned murderer is, if we are not mistaken, without a parallel. If it is not a symptom of insanity, it is a mark of retrogression in civilization which, if allowed to go on, would lead to a point below that of the inhabitants of the darkest continent.

NOT ART BUT RELIGION.

In the notorious case of Oscar Wilde, now on trial in London, a lesson is offered that should not be lost on the present generation. This is an age in which it is often maintained that man by his own strength is fully prepared to rise to enormous heights of moral excellence and that the aid of religious influences, consequently, is superfluous. The case referred to is a direct contradiction of this assumption, and as it comes with the force of a fact it cannot be set aside by any amount of theoretical reasoning.

Ever since Oscar Wilde appeared on the horizon of society he startled the world by idiosyncrasies and amused

it by his ideals looked upon as "odd." He is now a man thirty-nine years of age, possessed of much talent. He is described as a hard worker, notwithstanding that he poses as an idler; he is said to be unusually honest towards his creditors and a kind husband and father, as the world goes. His genius secured him admittance to the most exclusive social circles where he was accounted an interesting conversationalist. Of his accomplishments may be judged from the fact that he has written a tragedy in French, which Sarah Bernhardt pronounced truly great. If the question is asked, how such a clever, industrious, apparently good and gifted man can be found in the horrible quicksand of scandal from which he is now endeavoring to extricate himself, the reply is that all these qualities if not strengthened by the gift of the Divine Spirit are powerless to keep men and women from falling. The principle announced by the greatest of men, that without regeneration and reception of the Holy Ghost, no man is fit for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven is well exemplified in the lives of such mortals.

The trouble with Oscar Wilde, as with many others, was that he prostrated himself before the altar of art and beauty without any other object, apparently, than the adoration and glorification of those deities for their own sake. In his cult there was no room for an earnest effort to find and to know the Creator through His admirable works. It was nothing more than a species of idolatry, none the less pernicious because designated as the worship of "art for art's sake;" it was a veiled effort at the revival of that spirit which prevailed in ancient Greece and Rome when the religious instinct was nearly extinguished in the wonderful arts and sciences that were substituted. The results were similar, for on reliable authority we know that those nations at the very height of their culture were morally rotten to the core. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." This was Wilde's fate. Even "artistic instinct," if not sanctified to the honor of the Creator, stands in danger of becoming the veil for all that offends and outrages morals and propriety. Something more than love of art is needed in the struggle for purity of the soul—something to be found only in that which our age is too apt to overlook—in an acknowledged and personally accepted dependence on God.

HAS LEARNED MUCH, BUT NOT ALL.

The Rev. Mr. Momerie, one of the King's College, London, professors in metaphysics, is in San Francisco, and has been giving lectures on alleged scientific and religious subjects. Mr. Momerie is quite a clever man, and a fairly good speaker; he also has had chances for acquiring a great deal of information such as is to be derived in college experience, and in some respects has made good use of his opportunities. At the same time he places such an exalted value on his own abilities and qualifications that many people feel constrained to look upon him as conceited. This faculty

has led him to be very free in his criticisms and assaults on those who differ with him in their views, and in his polemic warfare he has not been overcareful to state truthfully the attitude of those who were the object of his attack.

About a week ago he delivered a discourse on "Medieval science with a reference to medieval geography," in which he made a rather vicious attack on the Catholic church. In doing so, by his habit of uttering statements of an extreme if not inaccurate character, he laid himself open to a return blow, which was administered with great force on Sunday night, by Rev. M. D. Connolly, the Catholic priest at St. Paul's church. The report of the meeting says that "the professor was handled without gloves by the priest," and then goes on to show that the handling was of a vigorously militant character. It was pointed out how Mr. Momerie had "bied him to the pages of the Infidel Draper, whose Conflict of Science and Religion is the idol of the half-educated and the laughing-stock of serious historians," and had drawn largely therefrom for his supposed facts, which the priest reviewed from the standpoint of history and logic, and made a tolerably good showing that, as the priest expressed his conclusion, "nothing could be farther from the truth."

The drubbing which this Protestant clergyman-professor got may do him good in making him more careful in his assaults upon others while in this country; at any rate it should warn him that while the Catholic preachers in his own land may not have deigned to notice him in discussion, he is likely to find a few of them here who are more outspoken and militant than in a country where the professor's church is the dominant ecclesiastical institution; he may also realize that whatever weakness is on the Catholic side of the question, as a rule their priests who take up Protestant challenges exhibit strong indications of being thoroughly trained debaters on the points at issue between the Roman church and those sects which broke away from it.

Prof. Momerie made some reference of local interest also; not for the accuracy of his statements, but because he set forth certain alleged religious ideas which he described as "Medieval Mormonism." Since these have no connection with Mormonism, there is no occasion to discuss them in that relation. Their mention, however, suggests that possibly Mr. Momerie's special antagonism to the Mormons might have some connection with an event three or four years ago in England, when humble Elders of that faith had occasion to uphold the Christian doctrine of the resurrection against the gentleman's assaults, and to his discomfiture. As it is probable, however, that he will pay Utah a visit before returning to his native land, it is to be hoped that he will learn sufficient of the Mormons while here so that he will not mistake their religious views. Although he has the scholastic attainments which entitle him to be a fellow of Cambridge, he still has something to learn in the way of stating correctly the doctrines of the Scriptures and the views of his fellowmen on religious matters.