

for gaudy and extravagant apparel, which distinguished his Court, these Friends still adhered to their plain, simple costume, thus becoming peculiar by refusing to follow with the changing fashion of the world, maintaining that the only proper objects of dress were decency and comfort, and useless ornaments and gaudy apparel were inconsistent with the Christian religion.

Therefore, the testimony of Friends is a testimony to simplicity and moderation, a non-conformity to any peculiar form or color. In view of the fact that such supreme notice is taken of the dress of Friends, it may be interesting to remark: "This dress of unintentional, almost incidental origin, (if I have been rightly informed) is the outgrowth of one of the principles of the Founder of our beloved Society, George Fox, who deemed the tyranny of "Fashion" so powerful that all considerations of health, convenience and prosperity must bow before it." He forbade such observance to his followers.

As a result the men and women of his time arrayed themselves neatly and simply, in the improved garments of the day, and when the fashions changed they did not, which at once classified them. A greater uniformity of material and color of dress succeeded, but all voluntary. No uniformity of cut and color were enjoined upon the followers of George Fox. The coat worn by Friends before their conversion was of the same cut as afterward, and was the fashionable garment of the day. In not following these vain fashions they simply ceased to change with the changing fashions. Thus the coat so generally worn by Friends for some generations became established. Our testimonies are all in favor of simplicity and plainness, really requiring no established form of garment; one simple form is as good as another, and our principles as fully carried out in spirit, if we remain faithful to this simplicity without so much

change. The consistency of an inexpensive and simple costume, with a life of practical righteousness must be so apparent, that it would seem unnecessary to advance any other reason for adoption by those who make a profession of religion. But we must not confound this fruit of the spirit with that form of dress which custom has made peculiar to us as a people; in so doing we set up a standard—an outward one—which cannot be applicable to every mind, and might throw a serious obstacle in the way of those who have not felt it incumbent upon them to adopt a peculiar garb, and yet have been called to renounce the gayeties of fashion.

ANTI-WAR.

The success of the Geneva Arbitration, some thirty years ago, seemed to show to the statesmen of Europe that the settlement of national difficulties might be effected without the aid of war, and they helped to bring about a convention to be held at Brussels, Belgium, some ten years later, its purpose being to consider and prepare an International Code, and secure its adoption. It was thought best not to connect it with any Government action, but still to throw around it some protection of law similar to that which our Supreme Court bears in its relation to the States.

This was thought feasible, owing to the high character of the men composing it, on both sides the water, all being eminent jurists. Henry Richards made a motion in the British House of Commons, not long after, which was carried, to the effect, "That Her Majesty be pleased to instruct her Secretary of Foreign Affairs to enter into communication with foreign Powers, to the improvement of International Law, and the establishment of an International Court of Arbitration." The Queen sanctioned it, and John Bright voted for it, remaining till a late hour, before the vote was taken.