

they had interests at heart that are greater than mere temporary affairs.

The Republican party in Utah is certainly a permanent institution, notwithstanding the fact that the Democrats polled so large a majority of the votes at the general election. And that its cause is by no means a forlorn hope, will be proven, we believe, at a not distant date. There are thousands of Republicans who have not yet cast off the iron bands of so-called "Liberalism," and many citizens who have not yet determined which way they will turn to give their political allegiance, and the whole number will prove large enough to make it quite interesting for their now triumphant political opponents. The Republicans are organized to live and they mean to stay.

The resolutions adopted are in many respects admirable. The definition of popular rights and the relation of the powers of the Nation and the respective States will not be complained of by the most ardent advocate of popular sovereignty. Whether the Democrats will accept the definition given of their principles and aims, is a little doubtful. In that we consider lies the chief weakness of the resolutions. In attempting to define the position of an opponent, it is wise as well as just to make it as strong as he would himself. Then arguments against it are potent indeed, if they are rational and to the point, and if victory comes it is signal and to be recognized by all.

There is ample food for reflection in the resolutions, and a series of texts for orators and political educators. To them we offer this advice: In contrasting Republican theories and actions with those of an opposing party, do not overstate, or understate or distort the latter, but give them as they are. The same advice is gratuitously offered to the Democratic evangelists. Following it will promote good feeling, and do much more to convince the thoughtful and undecided, than any amount of cheap wit mingled with misrepresentation of motive, principle or action.

The Republicans have formed a strong territorial committee, with a chairman well versed in political affairs, theoretical and practical, and we may look for some lively political work in every county in Utah.

### JURIES BEFORE THE BAR ASSOCIATION.

THE American Bar Association has been struggling with the time revered jury system. It has not apparently

accomplished much. It has not so much as fully determined its own state of mind on the question. But the resolutions presented leave no room for doubt that the Association was fairly unanimous in the feeling that the question was important and some sort of change in the present system ought to be considered at an early date. Upon this theory a majority of the committee having the subject in charge came forward and resolved that,

"The American Bar Association recommends to the Bar Associations of the States the support of such legislation or constitutional amendments as will provide for a verdict by three-fourths of the jury in civil cases."

This was evidently for a feeler, so to speak, and as such it brought the bolder spirits of the committee to the front, with a resolution which is well worthy of the august assembly to whom it was presented for discussion. "We regard the proposed change," says the minority, "as an overthrow of the entire system. Jurors were never selected as experts, or as men learned in law, but as men competent to find and agree upon the facts, and their unanimous concurrence has always been required. If the unanimity principle is to be given up and sacrificed, then the whole jury system should go with it. If a majority is to rule in fixing the verdict, let us have men of intelligence selected for the purpose, learned in the law and skilled in the investigation and sifting of evidence, and their number greatly reduced. In fact, let the whole system be abolished, if this one essential and fundamental principle is to be eliminated, and a different tribunal constituted."

While the sentiments here so forcibly expressed are presented more as a negative to the majority of the committee's positive recommendation, they embody the strong end of the argument and must be regarded in the light of a direct proposition to rid our judicial system outright of its jury principle.

The Association was evidently appalled by even the naming of so violent an innovation upon this ancient institution, and afraid to adopt the proposition, and yet being unwilling to reject it, they gravely filed it away for the docket of unfinished business at the next annual session. But the action of that august assembly having thus gone into print, their stamp of tacit favor upon it may have almost as much effect on the public mind as its formal adoption would have done. These conservative tactics will give it a show of gravity which it would not have received from hasty approval. The result will be achieved

of arresting public attention to the subject.

The fact is, that juries are proving themselves so eminently incapable of filling the purpose of their function that the people are half aware of the nuisance already, and would make no protest against radical changes in the system, but would probably resist its entire abolition. It would be interesting in the agitation of this question to see what class of men would raise the loudest objection. It is probable that the professional scamps who are thriving under jury decisions would be most conspicuous among the objectors.

The dissatisfaction with jury trials in general has manifested itself so plainly that it is only a matter of time when the country will be ready, if it is not so now, to demand a change.

The obstacles in the way of obtaining an intelligent, well informed body of men for jurors are so formidable that the panel is too often made up of incompetents. Men who do not read the public journals and are not acquainted with current events are not likely to make the best kind of jurors on either civil or criminal business. And the system which makes it possible for a just verdict of eleven sensible men to be nullified by the dogged obstinacy or cranky notion of one objector certainly needs modifying. But the abolition of the jury altogether, we do not believe, would meet with the approval of the best minds of the age, and we do not think it would prove of general public benefit.

### THE FASHIONS OF MEN.

A CORRESPONDENT to a Boston paper, signing herself "A Business Woman," has been pitching into the dress reformers of that city who are agitating the fashion of "bifurcated skirts," "knee skirts," "hip skirts," etc. But while seeming to address her lampoon to these "weak members" of her sex, she talks very directly at the officious males who encourage these dress reformers; and during a flight of overearnestness in her allusions to men in general, she loses sight of her females entirely and goes slashing right and left through the accoutrements of the men.

If utility is to be the basis of style, she wants to know why men wear their trousers dragging the ground instead of above the ankle in conformity with convenience. Why, she asks, do they have tails on their coats, where the extra cloth is of no possible usefulness, but on the other hand is a perpetual