

turist. One generally finds, however, on enquiry and consideration, that there is a foundation of good sense underlying the vagaries of fashion, and a substratum, or subsoil, of reason on which that foundation rests. The world-renowned satirist, the inimitable "Punch," has employed the first talent of the land, with pen and pencil, in a persistent and determined effort to abolish crinoline. But he has utterly failed. And his failure is a strong proof that there must be reason and common sense sustaining the fashion. It is an evidence that there must be a convenience and an advantage in the use of the article, which enables it "to hold its own" against the attacks of an adversary so formidable.

Even the mighty potentate who defies the power of the United States, and though nominally subject to that government, mocks at its laws, and sets them at naught with impunity, the notorious multitudinously-wived autocrat of Utah, is unable to make headway against fashion. Dr. Kendall says, "Brigham Young delivered a sermon aimed partly against the introduction of hoop-skirts in Salt Lake City, which was astonishingly bitter and vulgar. But the lambs of the flock proved refractory, and carried their point; fashion was too much for him; and, as if in spite against his interference, they have given their skirts a wider expanse than usual."

A popular and able newspaper of the day says: "It may be asked, how can a custom which is so much condemned continue? The answer is obvious. Because the condemnation is unjust. There is no doubt whatever that crinoline has most materially contributed to the health, activity, and gracefulness of the fair sex; and that many of the accidents attributed to it might equally be attributed to other causes. The only objection to crinoline is the tendency, in some states of the fashion, to ridiculously exaggerated expansion, alike inconvenient to the wearer and all around her; and, withal, exceedingly unnatural and unsightly. But a moderate