

and narrower souls have seen in the present paralyzed condition of the railroad business a chance to make a corner on certain staples that every community must have—sugar, for instance. A great quantity of sugar is used every day in a city of this size, especially during the fruit season which is now upon us. The visible supply on hand was limited several days ago, and of course it has not increased any since. It is tolerably evident that an attempt was planned, when the strike first affected the freight trains, to buy up at wholesale the whole sugar supply in town. Z. C. M. I., which had been selling at \$5.75 per cwt., was suddenly offered \$7.00 per cwt. for its entire stock by the manipulators of the "corner." If other large dealers were not similarly approached, it was because the plotters resolved to await the result of their negotiations with the "Co-op," before trying anyone else—perhaps realizing that if that great institution did not join in their scheme, they could not make it work. They received from Z. C. M. I. an answer that sent them about their business in a hurry; a similar reply would have greeted them from other wholesalers we might mention. We do not give the names engaged in the would-be "corner," nor need we name all those who were on the other side. The point of chief interest to the public is that if the plan had worked, sugar would be selling today at ten or twelve dollars a sack; the plan failed and sugar is being retailed out at the usual prices—the selling of a large quantity to one person having been properly forbidden in order that what there is may be made to go as far and into as many homes as possible.

As to the prospect of a sugar famine, it may be of interest to know that there is nothing of the kind to be feared. The supply on hand is not by any means exhausted, and long before it shall be used up, even if the strike continues, teams can haul a few carloads down from Ogden, whose freight yards contain an abundant supply awaiting the resumption of traffic.

#### CHRISTIANS AND DANCING.

This is not particularly the season for dances, though lawn parties and like entertainments for summer are in full swing. Within comparatively few weeks, however, the time for balls will be again to the fore in the cycle of society seasons, and it is not out of the way now for people to give thought in advance to the class of amusements which then will prevail. As a form of recreation, dancing has been the subject of much discussion among the intelligent class of society everywhere, and its propriety has been seriously questioned in many places. Among some religious denominations it has been strictly forbidden, while in all which possess an elevated moral sense it has been placed under restraint, there being found some features which are beneficial and therefore commendable, and some which are so reprehensible as to demand their elimination.

In this situation it is interesting to

note the position now taken by leading denominational clergymen in the United States on the question, "Ought a Christian to dance?" propounded by the *New York World*. As representative of the leading religious sentiment of the New England center of culture and refinement may be quoted the expression of the great Boston preacher, Rev. Dr. C. A. Bartol, who says he can see nothing wrong in a properly conducted dance. He does not approve of the popular style of ball dress, or rather undress, which prevails, and of a number of forms of dancing for which there is an apparent craze in society. Outside of these objectionable features he believes the amusement is admissible for Christians, but adds that "by improper associations, improper places and excessive indulgence it may be made highly reprehensible. The question," he says, with him, "is not whether a Christian ought to dance, but how, when, where, and with whom and to what extent." The Rev. Thomas K. Beecher takes a similar view, and says that in his opinion "whether a Christian ought to dance or not must depend largely upon, first, the character of the dancing; second, the associates with whom and among whom the dancing is done; third, the place where the dancing is done; fourth, at what hours; fifth, how long at a time; sixth, with what toilet or dress; seventh, with what refreshments; eighth, at what money cost; ninth, with what after effect—recreation or depression." Of the same opinion is the late Henry Ward Beecher's great rival as a pulpit orator—the Rev. R. S. Orris.

Archbishop M. A. Corrigan, of New York, gives an authoritative Catholic view in which he advises "restraint in dancing as from any form of worldly amusement." He is emphatic in his antagonism to some forms of the amusement, however, and says: "All kinds of round dancing are contrary to piety. There can be no doubt about that. All young men and women who wish to betree, pure Christians should abstain from it and avoid its impure influences." The eminent divine, Dr. R. Heber Newton, discusses the subject at some length on about the same lines as Archbishop Corrigan. He recognizes two schools of dancing, just as there are theatrical entertainments that are ennobling and others that are demoralizing in their influences. He points out that where one professing to be a Christian indulges in dancing which may be harmless in itself, yet thereby gives example and encouragement to lead others to the adoption of objectionable forms or improper associations, such a course is sin; and concludes by saying: "With regard to dancing, I must say that I, for one, can see nothing objectionable in proper dances, in proper society, under proper conditions. I think that all forms of round dances are reprehensible. I strongly favor a return to earlier and more dignified forms of dancing, such, for example, as the stately and dignified minuet of the olden time. In fashionable society at the present time there is tolerated freely much against which I would draw a heavy black mark."

The Episcopal bishop of New York, John H. Vincent, would not permit

dancing except where "there are perfect home safeguards against possible evil," both as to companionship and the style of dances in vogue. He insists that modern "society" has no right to "dictate to Christian people what they should do. Take the so-called society of this world. What are its objects? The good of the race? The promotion of character. Of self-control? Of high ideals of purity and goodness? Certainly not. The key note of society is self-gratification. The radical element in it is pleasure. Preference has full swing. Conscience and its protests are silenced by popular verdicts, by usage, by the exuberant life of the crowd bent upon fun and frolic. Whatever gratifies the palate, the sense of beauty, the love of admiration and of conquest, is favored and defended by society. The world and the flesh riot in society. Extravagance and immodesty in dress, hypocrisy in conversation, affectation in deportment, rivalries in all things, petty jealousies and dishonesties riot in society. The poor are rejected, the rich courted and simplicity ridiculed. Shall the sneer of such society at modesty, good taste, true culture and Christian conscientiousness have weight with the followers of the Saint of Nazareth?" This latter question he answers at length in the negative, and adopts as his view an expression of a leading Congregational minister: "Fashionable dances are revolting to every feeling of delicacy and propriety, and are fraught with the greatest danger to millions;" advising his flock to keep their children away. While he is tolerant as to decorous forms of dancing as an amusement, he would exclude entirely the whole list of round dances. He conceives it to be an indecent act to engage in an amusement which "mingles the sexes in such closeness of personal touch and approach as, outside of the dance, is nowhere tolerated in respectable society;" denounces it for the opportunities it affords "on the part of the vile hearted;" and declares that "the round dance of fashionable modern society is undermining the safeguards of modesty and virtue."

The opinions herein quoted are those of men of extensive observation and experience in the field of moral research and instruction, and as such are entitled to thoughtful consideration. Rather than being the exposition of a theory they are the outcome of careful inquiry into cause and effect relating to the practice under discussion, by men whose comprehensive judgment, high educational attainments and keen perceptive faculties have raised them to a high place among their fellows. So far as the Latter-day Saints are concerned, they realize, or ought to, that there is a time to dance and a time to sing, a time to be grave and a time to be gay; and as there are kinds of food that are healthful and palatable, and others that are injurious and nauseous to the cultivated taste, so are there dances and songs that can be beneficially indulged in, and others that cannot be mingled in or associated with in any way because of the contamination which they bring as part of their nature. This principle is impressed upon the Saints by the divine word revealed in this age. And as to associations,