

likewise 'in autumn—from May till October. 'Who,' asks one of the learned specialists, 'could endure such a state of things, living almost half a year without a roof? Who, except the Russian *mosshik*?' As for the dens they live in during the remainder of the year, they positively beggar description.

The conclusion justly drawn is that such conditions cannot remain. They must end in either violence or bankruptcy, and the foreign investors will be the losers.

It is further argued that every dollar lent to Russia is an addition to the taxes paid by the money lender himself. Russia borrows money for the purpose of increasing her army and navy. But every addition to her military strength is made a pretext by the other powers to increase theirs, which means increased taxes.

That the money is wanted to obtain means to break the European peace is strongly urged. "If Russia can find the money," says the *Moskovskia Vedomosti*, "and find it she will when ever it is needed, what will the present increase of the German army signify in comparison with Russia's forces?" And as if the time has now come when it is needed and has to be found, the announcement is made that a Russian Mediterranean squadron is to be formed and several new ships built at the same time new regiments are being organized.

These and similar arguments the Russo-Jewish committee employs to prove the necessity for capitalists to withhold their money. It is more than likely that they will have some effect and that the Russian autocrat will find that persecution for religious belief is poor policy.

AS TO FEMALE APPAREL.

Every now and then the daughters of Eve receive from the sons of Adam a "dressing down" for the manner in which the former are addicted to "dressing up." Sometimes these strictures are merited and then, if couched in proper language and flavored by a good temper, they ought to be given heed to. The object should be in every case to point out that which is objectionable from either a sanitary standpoint or as a mere matter of appearance and to encourage those features of attire which commend themselves to good judgment and good taste. In this line of thought is an excellently written article in a recent number of the *San Francisco Chronicle* which, among other things, asks why intelligent women continue to fetter and hamper themselves by wearing long skirts at times and in places where short ones would be so much more sensible, convenient and becoming? No one, it declares, who knows anything of woman's dress can defend long skirts for outdoor wear on any plea except that of custom and fashion, and we know very well that if the custom were to change the new dress would soon become quite as fashionable as the present one.

There are some hygienic arguments in favor of short skirts which are too well known to permit of repetition. There is a substantial agreement among all who have studied the subject of female apparel, from whatever

point of view, in favor of the shortening of the skirts and the discarding of much of the heavy underwear which must necessarily tax the strength of those who are compelled to carry it about. It is urged that the reform continue in this direction till superfluous skirts give way to more convenient, comfortable and healthful nether attire.

There is nothing that is bad but much that is good in such suggestions. It is peculiarly gratifying to us to know that criticism of useless and hampering attire has less application to the women of Salt Lake particularly and Utah generally than those of almost any other section of the country. They are not poorly dressed nor as a rule are they overdressed, which is just as it should be.

INTOLLERANCE AS TO RELIGION.

A gentleman discussing the exposures begun in the NEWS regarding the society called the Western Star or Amorines, and which have since been taken up by the press and public generally, expressed himself in a toneavoring somewhat of indignation. He thought, and properly, that a man has a right to his own views and inclinations on any subject whatsoever and that he has a right to combine with others holding similar views for the purpose of mutual understanding and concerted action, so long as such action is not forbidden by law; furthermore, it was pronounced a piece of bigotry on the part of the City Council or any other body or person to deprive or attempt to deprive the members of any such organization of their daily employment by reason of such membership.

The case is very adroitly stated, but is somewhat too much like the argument of a lawyer who has familiarized himself with but one side of a cause and given it too much attention that it has become measurably indoctrinated in him, whereby he can see little or nothing commendable in the other side.

There is no question regarding men's right to combine and form either secret or public societies so long as no intrusions of legal restraints are in view. They may even contemplate the overthrow of a law or of any number of laws so long as the proposition is to be controlled in their action by the recognized and customary procedure. There are also some things which they may do or intend to do that are not forbidden by the statutes but which make them amenable to public opinion and subject them to consequences which if not punitive are at least exemplary. For instance, the law does not forbid two or more persons uniting in such an object as the defeat of another or others who have an ambition in a certain lawful direction, and in compassing his defeat many shameful things which the laws do not forbid may be, as they often are, done. But while the courts and their auxiliaries are silent and motionless regarding such nefarious proceedings, it does not follow that that other and more powerful tribunal spoken of should not act, and its actions or conclusions when deliberately taken against the malefactor

seldom fail of justice in its most concrete and precise form.

It is the right of a man, or a number of men conjointly or separately, to array themselves against the Catholic church or any other religious organization. They have the undisputed and indisputable privilege of withholding social recognition from and suspending business relations with such or any organizations. They have also the right (so far as the public enactments are concerned) to use their separate or united influence to prevent the people they oppose from obtaining office or employment in the community. But, in exercising it they must not complain if the latter sentiment of the people shall prevail against them and if instead of finding the wool they went in quest of they return shorn. It is not altogether a question of their right to do the things spoken of; it is a question of the good taste not to say manliness of complaining when proscriptive measures prove to be a boomerang.

The United States is the land of freedom, physical and mental. What is freedom to one must under similar circumstances be freedom to another. The social code by means of which we find justification for giving blows extends no protection or consolation as a rule when we are subjected to taking them. It is a law of retaliation, of course, and thus not to be commended by itself; but when it is practiced in accordance with the higher law of self preservation the odium remains wholly with the aggressors. It is a poor business, to put it mildly, for any one to engage in, this hunting and hounding of a people because of their religious convictions or nativity; and when it is engaged in by those who have not only intelligence and learning of their own but the light of a dozen generations of steady and upward human progress to guide them, such proceedings become so assailable that they need not be surprised if the demon that they call up from the vasty depths of dark ages refuses to be exorcised on the terms and at the time they would prefer.

THE CHURCH CASES.

When the first proposition to escheat Mormon Church property came before Congress, upwards of six years ago, the *Tribune* declared against it. When the various proposals have come along from time to time for the waste and plundering of that property, this paper has, in so far as it had opportunity, denounced them. It has not at any time taken any pleasure in this sequestration of property from the purpose to which it was devoted by those who gave it. We have, of course, recognized the duty of the officials to enforce the law after it was passed, but have consistently opposed all raids upon the property. The final stages of the litigation are now progressing, and an important step therein was taken yesterday in the decision rendered by the Territorial Supreme Court.

We have no quarrel with any of the lenities of the suits, nor with any phase of them saves they have seemed to us unnecessarily expensive and wasteful.

The foregoing is from the *Salt Lake Tribune* of this (Friday) morning. We regret being unable to recall any very