

“We have had somewhat too much of ‘The Gospel of Work,’ it is time to preach ‘The Gospel of Relaxation.’”—HERBERT SPENCER.

The Sunset Club

CHICAGO.

ORGANIZED, MARCH, 1889.

THE MEETINGS OF 1891-92 AND A LIST OF THE MEMBERS
TO JANUARY, 1893.

At set of sun one lone star rules the skies,
Night spreads a feast the day's long toil has won.
Eat, drink, enough—no more, and speak, ye wise,
Speak, but enough—no more, at set of sun.

—EDMUND CLARENCE STEDMAN.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

HENRY BAUSHER, JR.

DR. FRANK BILLINGS

S. S. GREGORY

C. L. HUTCHINSON

ROLLIN A. KEYES

M. M. MANGASARIAN

GEORGE D. RUMSEY

MURRY NELSON

GEORGE F. STONE

MELVILLE E. STONE

EDWARD S. WASHBURN

W. W. CATLIN

A. A. McCORMICK

JOSEPH W. ERRANT, *Secretary.*

INTRODUCTION.

It is not necessary to make any statement to members of the Sunset Club as to the contents of this book. For those who are not members and who may see this volume, it is well to say a few words.

This Year Book contains among other items of interest all the discussions of the Club for the season 1891-92. The previous Year Books have merely contained a list of subjects, speakers and members.

The organization of the Club is very simple. The declaration of principles speaks for itself. The reports of the different meetings will indicate our methods of procedure. The report of each meeting is issued about a week after the meeting has taken place and is sent out with the notice for the next meeting.

A word as to the reason for re-issuing the reports in this Year Book. It is believed that members will be glad to have the discussions of the Club in some permanent form. Interesting subjects have been discussed. What has been said and by whom it has been said is of more than passing value.

The present volume will be improved upon in the Year Books to follow. The type hereafter to be used in the General Discussion will be the same as that used for the leading speeches. This will undoubtedly prove acceptable.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES.

No Club-House	No Parliamentary Rules
No Constitution	No Personalities
No Debts	No Dues
No Contribution	No Mere Formalities
No Accounts	No Preaching
No Defalcations	No Dictation
No By-Laws	No Dues
No Stipulations	No Litigation
No Profanity	No Gamblers
No Fines	No Dead Beats
No Stealing	No Embezzlers
No "Combines"	From Foreign Retreats
No President	No Meanness
No Bores	No Vituperation—
No Steward	Simply
No "Encores"	
No Long Speeches	Tolerant Discussion
No Dress Coats	And
No Late Hours	National Recreation.
No Perfumed Notes	

OBJECT

To foster rational good fellowship and tolerant discussion among business and professional men of all classes.

REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERSHIP

Any genial and tolerant fellow may become a member on approval of the executive committee.

PROGRAMME

A dinner every other Thursday at six o'clock, followed by short talks upon a topic previously announced by the Secretary.

EXPENSES

The only expenses incident to membership in the Sunset Club are an annual assessment of three dollars for stationery, printing, etc., and one dollar and a half for each dinner partaken of.

GUESTS

Members are privileged to bring guests to the meetings, provided notice is sent to the Secretary in time to prepare for their entertainment.

CONTENTS.

SHALL THE WORLD'S FAIR BE OPEN ON SUNDAY? - - - - -	7
WOMAN SUFFRAGE, - - - - -	25
OUR FOREIGN POLICY, - - - - -	39
DELAYS OF THE LAW, - - - - -	49
THE EIGHT-HOUR DAY, - - - - -	63
THE MODERN STAGE; ITS MISSION AND INFLUENCE, - - - - -	75
DRUNKENNESS; ITS NATURE, CAUSES AND CURE, - - - - -	87
HOW WOULD YOU UPLIFT THE MASSES? - - - - -	109
WHAT SHOULD THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS TEACH? - - - - -	125
SHOULD THE ANTI-OPTION BILL BECOME A LAW? - - - - -	139
IMMIGRATION; ITS BENEFITS AND EVILS; WHAT RESTRICTIONS, IF ANY, SHOULD BE ADOPTED? - - - - -	157
WHAT IS WRONG IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL LAW IN THIS COUNTY? - - - - -	169
IS THE STUDY OF THE CLASSICS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION? - - - - -	189
SHOULD THE TORREY BANKRUPTCY BILL BECOME A LAW? - - - - -	205
SHOULD THE DRAINAGE LAW BE REPEALED? - - - - -	227
LIST OF MEMBERS, - - - - -	247

THIRTY-FIFTH MEETING.

OCTOBER 22, 1891.

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR PRESENT.

SUBJECT:

SHALL THE WORLD'S FAIR BE OPEN ON SUNDAY?

Chairman: Judge GEORGE DRIGGS.

ADDRESSES BY:

Judge SAMUEL P. McCONNELL. Rev. HERRICK JOHNSON, D.D.

GENERAL DISCUSSION BY:

Gen. I. N. Stiles,	Mr. C. S. Darrow,
Mr. Edw. F. Cragin,	Mr. George Braham,
Mr. Leon Hornstein,	Mr. L. H. Ayme,
Col. Alex. M. Woolfolk,	Mr. Walter Thomas Mills,
Rev. Dr. H. D. Kimball,	Mr. Sigmund Zeisler,
Mr. Edward O. Brown,	Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones,
Mr. Thomas J. Morgan,	Mr. C. G. Dixon,
Rev. Dr. C. A. Blanchard,	Mr. Norman S. Patton,
	Mr. George A. Schilling.

THE SUNSET CLUB, CHICAGO.

*Thirty-Fifth Meeting, held at the Grand Pacific, Thursday Eve., October 22, 1891—
Two Hundred and Twenty-four present.*

When all present had been counted, there were two hundred and twenty-four, this being the largest meeting in the history of the Sunset Club. The discussion was most animated and interesting, and the chronicler gives it to you just as it occurred. It will not be amiss to call attention to the fact that the previous work of the Sunset Club made it possible to debate a question generally so productive of ill-feeling.

MR. ALEXANDER A. McCORMICK, in retiring from the office of secretary, said:

"It is with sincere regret that I find it necessary, through the pressure of other duties, to lay down the duties of secretary. Throughout the year the readiness with which the members have responded when I have called upon them, has been a constant source of helpfulness and inspiration. In fact, I have come to believe that if the most blatant pessimist were elected secretary of this club, by the end of the year he would be converted into the most enthusiastic optimist.

"Work seems to be the one thing associated in most minds with this position, but, gentlemen, there is a very distinct gratification in knowing that one is helping to promote these discussions and in bringing together men of different faiths and opinions to discuss honestly and without passion both sides of a question. It is this feeling which is your secretary's greatest incentive to constant work.

"Your kindly sympathy and hearty co-operation which I have enjoyed through the year was also enjoyed by my predecessor, Mr. W. W. Catlin, whom it will be the effort of every secretary of this club to equal, for none can surpass him, and I can ask for no better legacy for my successor than this same sympathy and uniform courtesy.

"I hardly feel that it is necessary for me to introduce Mr. Errant to this club. The Bureau of Justice, an institution devoted to securing justice to those who are without money and without friends, was established by Mr. Errant's energy; and as its attorney he is pursuing a vocation that places him high among the well wishers of mankind."

MR. JOSEPH W. ERRANT: I am sure, gentlemen, that I appreciate the honors which have come to me; but I am also sure that I appreciate the responsibilities which now rest upon me. And this the more inasmuch as my predecessors have established for this Club and its meetings a standard which it will be difficult for me to maintain. In the course of my work during this winter I shall have to ask for your patience, oftentimes for your indulgence. I shall also not hesitate to ask for your co-operation, for remember that the success of this Club depends upon the active, living interest of the members. I trust that you are embued, as I am,

with the dignity and the importance of the mission of this Club. I feel, and I believe you feel, that whatever may be said of any other place, we want here a place where varying views can be heard, and where each shall be respectfully listened to, in order that out of all the truth shall prevail.

I now have the pleasure of introducing to you the chairman of the evening, Judge George Driggs of the Circuit Court.

JUDGE DRIGGS: Gentlemen of the Sunset Club: I give you thanks for this hearty reception, for it evidences to my mind what a good natured lot you are, and how gracefully, and even enthusiastically, you accept a situation over which you have not the slightest control. The secretary of this organization is a wonderful composition as a secretary. With his enticing manner he walks forth on the face of the earth and captures a chairman. He invites him to a seat nearest the band to have a dinner. The chairman pays for the dinner, his good little dollar and a half. The secretary then calls you to order and says in his pleasant way some truthful things, and, as secretary, some untruthful things; not individually of course. He touches the button, the chairman arises, and you do the rest.

Now the secretary who made such a graceful speech on retiring from his office called upon me the other day, and in his beguiling way got me to be here to-night. Well, of course I was complimented. It is a compliment to any man to be invited to have anything to do with the Sunset Club; but just as he was leaving he said, "By the way, the chairman is not expected to make very much of a speech; just———" "Just what?" I said. He said, "Just give them a good send-off; that sort of thing, you know." Naturally I found this rather enervating. I supposed this was going to be my opportunity. I supposed that after getting through the dinner, and before some of these other eloquent gentlemen had tired you or bored you, I should get the first crack at you, so to speak. But I had given him my word that I would be here, and of course he had the "drop" on me. You may not all understand what that means, but if I say he had the "cinch" on me you will of course all understand. Well, this is what I am doing now—this send-off business. I am glad you like it, because I intended you should; and this intention of mine will be evidenced by the marginal notes in my manuscript of this speech—and of course these few remarks will be placed in the archives of the Sunset Club. I do that to follow up a custom which was established by the speaking members last year. I hope I do not disclose any secrets in that regard, because I have reason to believe if I get it preserved in the archives it may appear with the eloquent and entertaining speeches of some other eloquent and entertaining gentlemen in some volume or other which might be called "Sunset Echoes," sold at \$1.50 per volume, with remittances made to the autocrat of this vesper meal.

This Club, gentlemen, in my judgment, needs no commendation; but I can not forego this opportunity of congratulating the members and the people of Chicago upon the unqualified success of this unique aggregation of brains. So far as I am advised it is the only corporation that dares at all times through its members to speak its thoughts with unflinching freedom, and without a symptom of fear—the only one. It is the only corporation that neither craves nor asks a favor of any power organized by the suffrages of man. When the people speak they speak the truth. We are the people.

Gentlemen, all highways on the civilized globe now lead to Jackson Park, and that majestic procession, the like of which the world has never yet seen, is organizing to move. It will be composed of men and women who will represent every

SHALL THE WORLD'S FAIR BE OPEN ON SUNDAY?

phase of thought and belief known to the human mind; and they will bring with them, by the invitation of the American people, the best and the rarest products of civilization. The opportunities and the possibilities surrounding this Exposition are well nigh beyond the power of language to describe. The question which you have selected this evening for discussion touches upon one phase of the management of this great educational display, a sensitive and a serious one. Honest men and honest women have honest views upon each side of this question. They must be heard with patience. It must be discussed with intelligence, and when settled, the conclusion, if it is to last, must rest upon the rock of reason.

MR. FRANK H. SCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I have a resolution to propose, and the reason I present it now is that it seems to me that it should most properly come at the meeting which marks the end of the term of office of one secretary and the beginning of the duties of the new secretary.

When this Club was formed I think that many of us who received the first circulars were very pessimistic as to its future. By reason of the wonderful ability and energy of our first secretary the first year of the Club was a grand success. When a change in that office came many of us looked upon it with some degree of doubt, because we had pinned our faith so entirely as to its successful career in the administration of this first secretary. We are now at the end of the second secretary's administration, and it seems to me that we ought to mark our appreciation of the very able manner in which he has contributed to our edification during the past year, and not merely by a resolution of thanks, but in some substantial manner that will testify to him in the years to come that we do appreciate the very great work he has done during his administration. I therefore move that the Executive Committee of the Club be requested to procure some substantial testimonial, and to use a large and liberal discretion in selecting it, to testify to the appreciation which this Club has of the efforts of its late secretary, Mr. McCormick.

MR. W. W. CATLIN: I am sure that every member of this Club will agree heartily with me when I say that no one could have better served the interests of this Club than has Mr. McCormick since he has been its secretary, evidenced by the splendid meeting this evening, and it affords me sincere pleasure to heartily second that motion.

The motion having been put by the chair, was unanimously carried.

MR. ALEXANDER A. MCCORMICK: I have already said that I have not had one disagreeable experience while secretary of this Club; but in the years to come, when I shall recall the memories of the past year and of this meeting, it will always be with a feeling of the greatest pleasure that they are among the brightest I have to treasure up. Gentlemen, I thank you very heartily.

The Chairman stated that it had been agreed to change the form of the subject for the evening's discussion. As announced it read: "SHALL THE WORLD'S FAIR BE CLOSED ON SUNDAYS?" As now agreed upon it read:

SHALL THE WORLD'S FAIR BE OPEN ON SUNDAY?

The Chairman, Judge Driggs, then introduced as the first speaker, Judge SAMUEL P. MCCONNELL, of the Circuit Court, who spoke as follows:

The principal difficulty which has embarrassed me in the consideration of this question, since I inadvertently consented to speak to it, has been to divest myself of the purely personal view with which I am prone to regard the controversy involved.

I very thoroughly recognize that because I do certain things on Sunday, I should not immediately conclude that everybody else ought to do the same thing. That if I want to attend the Exposition on that day, that desire in itself ought not in any manner to influence me in determining what I ought to advocate as the proper policy for the Managers of the Exposition to adopt. I hope I have succeeded in getting rid of the purely personal bias I have in the premises.

While engaged in this struggle with myself, the thought has occasionally occurred to me that perhaps the advocates of Sunday closing might also be considering the proposition, through minds largely affected by their personal practices and beliefs.

I take it for granted that we must determine this question on much broader grounds than would be proposed by a man who is always willing to do anything on Sunday not wrong on Monday or Tuesday, or that might be urged by another, who believed that on Sunday he ought to go to church in the morning, and remain grave and quiet during the afternoon and evening.

There are two classes in every American community, not by any means very distinctly defined. The one, accepting Sunday as a conventional establishment, and treating it as a holiday; the other accepting it as a part of their religion, and observing it accordingly. I said the lines dividing these two classes are not very distinctly defined; for the fact is, that many of the first class frequently attend church, and many of the other class manage to do much more than worship, in their enjoyment of the day.

I should feel as if I were going away back in the past, and at the same time be arguing a question not involved at all, if I undertook, even if I thought I could, to demonstrate that the proper Christian observance of the Sabbath did not require the abandonment on that day of the means of instruction and recreation.

I rather think that will be the task of those good people, who if they shall find the Exposition open on Sunday, and have been too busy during the week to look through it, will want to discover some reasons, which will satisfy their conscience and allow them to see the wonders of the Fair on Sunday. The principal question is, shall all the citizens of Chicago, and all the visitors within our gates during the six months of the Exposition, no matter what they believe about Sunday, be obliged to submit to what a portion of us think our religious duty on that day requires us not to do? In other words, shall that great enterprise, designed for instruction and delight, be closed every seventh day to the thousands, who might on that day, and perhaps on no other, avail themselves of all the treasures of profit and entertainment afforded by the Exposition, because a great many other people think it wrong to open the gates on Sunday?

Is it not the same old fight, which has been waged so long in the world, the fight to make one set of men think, or at least do, as another set of men, think they ought to think or do? Is there any room in the world for a question of that kind any longer? Have we not grown so much, that it seems strange to us that such a question is even debatable? Is not the controversy in the main a religious one? And might we not as well be discussing whether some of us should be made to go to some particular church, as to be discussing whether some of us should be prevented from doing on Sunday something that some others think they ought not to do on Sunday?

It is a religious question; and I think we are done for a while with coercive measures in making conversions to our religious beliefs; or even enforcing the observance of matters which are a part of our religious beliefs.

I picked up, however, a few days ago, the resolutions adopted by the Methodist Ecumenical Council, recently in session at Washington, against the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday. I take it that these resolutions fairly embody the reasons advanced by the advocates of Sunday closing. They were substantially as follows: "That it would be in open violation of Sabbath keeping; that it would deprive the employees of the transportation companies and of the Fair, of rest and worship; that the spirit is not philanthropic, but mercenary; that the exhibits of Christians from Christian lands will not be shown; and that there should be exhibited to visitors from other lands a characteristic religious

Sunday; and that Sunday opening was in violation of the laws of nearly every State in the Union, and particularly those of Illinois."

It will be easily seen that, in the main, these resolutions proceed on the theory that, as the members of this council believe in Sunday keeping, therefore, the Exposition should be closed on that day; even as against those who are entirely convinced that they have a right to attend the Exposition on that day.

It is true the resolutions go a little farther, and charge that the attempt to keep the fair open on Sunday is a mercenary scheme, and would benefit the stockholders only. That part of the resolutions, however, I do not consider as involved in the present discussion.

I think the resolutions fairly confirm what I said, that the question is a religious one with most of those who advocate Sunday closing, and, as I intimated before, I think the world too wise and too tolerant now, to make me and others refrain from doing what the Ecumenical Council of the Methodists think I ought not to do. In brief, I do not think that kind of a question debatable in 1891.

I confess, however, the force of the suggestion against Sunday opening, that it will deprive employees of the transportation companies and of the fair of the opportunities for rest and worship. I do not, however, believe that any employeè will be overworked because of Sunday opening; and I feel certain that anyone of them desiring to devote the day, or any part of it, to worship, will be accorded an opportunity to do so.

If the fair proves as much of a success as its projectors anticipate, we shall have in Chicago every Sunday of the six months, from May to November, from one hundred to three hundred thousand visitors. What will you do with them? The churches will not accommodate them. Will the day be better observed by having them thrown on their own resources in a strange city to find such entertainment as they can?

I could predict, I believe, with absolute certainty, that there would be less of the worshipful spirit in that crowd, surging through the city, than if it were allowed to find its way to the exhibition grounds. I believe, if the problem were alone confined to the question, what shall we do with our visitors on Sunday, so as in the least to disturb the ordinary occupations of that day, the answer would necessarily be, that they should be sent to the fair. There they would innocently spend the day, studying and learning the lessons afforded by the exhibits.

I am inclined to look at the whole matter from a practical point of view; and I trust the exposition managers will consider it in no other way.

The main end and aim of the projected World's Fair, considered even practically, I suppose, is to afford entertainment and instruction by its exhibits to all those who may be able to visit them.

A visitor ought to leave those exhibits with a higher respect for man, and a greater regard and desire for those peaceful triumphs which give greater happiness to mankind, and which are won by patience, thrift and industry.

I am not among those who believe that an art gallery can do so much for us as a collection of exhibits, which call us to admire and emulate the men who have been able to add to the comforts, convenience and luxuries of life.

Will there occupy the pulpits of Chicago during these six months, men who by mere words can do so much to inspire to real action the men and women who may hear them, as shall those silent exhibits, the product of man's ingenuity, self-denial and perseverance, teach those, who view them, the nobility of labor and the possibilities of man?

The churches we have always with us; and always with enough room; but only at a rare interval shall we have brought together in one enclosure so much that shall teach us regarding the victories of peace and the brotherhood of man. Cannot as much real profit come from these, even to those who generally go to church?

I ask that the Exposition be open on Sunday for the benefit of all; but particularly for those tired men, who work eight to ten hours of every week day; and who, with the slender margin of savings that always stand between them and want, can hardly afford to sacrifice any day for recreation or instruction. Of all our citizens, they need to see this great Exposition of the results of labor. Many men, working in their narrow lines in the smoke and noise and turmoil of factories,

are seldom enabled to see the achievements of united labor. They work and sweat, and sometimes wonder for what; perhaps, feeling that merely to live after so much work is not much of an achievement. They fail to appreciate their relation and their usefulness to the rest of the world. But here on this blessed Sunday, for such it shall be, the workman shall come with his wife and children; and he shall feel great, and they proud, when they view what he, with other men, can create. Perhaps, too, he can get there, better than from sermons, which he does not go to hear, the high philosophy that will reconcile him to his hard labor and his lowly lot.

I cannot but believe that the old religious philosophy, which taught us that man was poor and weak and sinful, and with only a slender right to live, must give place to a philosophy that man, when he has a chance, is good and strong, and always by divine right entitled to live and be happy. I cannot help but think that a part of this higher philosophy will take his gaze from the skies and show him his redemption in the work which lies at his hands.

I believe too, that as the man works, and learns that all men must live by toiling and spinning, that he will feel growing more within him that high religion, which leads him to love his fellow creatures and feel deep in his heart their true kinship to him.

If this exhibition achieves its purpose, it will present on Sunday, and on every other day, a collection which will teach every visitor that no matter how humble the labor may be, its product may go somewhere to comfort or adorn the life of other human beings. I can imagine that as an American laborer gazes on the product of the toil of some human being from some distant clime, he will feel "that touch of nature, which makes the whole world kin." I can believe that a man must leave this exhibition feeling that life is more worth living than he thought. I can easily believe that true religion itself will be helped by the lessons of the exhibits; and that the men employed at the Exposition on Sunday may truly feel that they are performing a sacred and a religious duty.

Because I believe there can be nothing too good for Sunday, I want the exhibition entirely open on that day. Because our laboring men can profit most, and perhaps only on that day, I want the exhibition open on Sunday. Because we can give our visitors more innocent recreation by letting them into the fair, I want the Exposition open on Sunday.

Judge Driggs introduced as the second speaker, Rev. HERRICK JOHNSON, D.D., President of McCormick Theological Seminary, who said:

I regard the question as now twisted into its proper shape. As stated before it carried with it the unwarranted implication that some special exercise of authority was necessary in order to close the Fair. The Fair is closed until it is open. We might as well discuss the question: "Shall Marshall Field's establishment be closed on Sunday?" It is closed, has been closed, and will be closed until it is opened.

And that leads me to the first point that I would mention on the negative, that the World's Fair should not be open on Sunday because it is contrary to all national precedent. It is a break in the line of a godly succession, and the gentlemen who favor this thing should give a reason, a strong, overmastering reason, why this change should be made in the customs and usages of this country. For example, the Crystal Palace World's Fair in New York did not open its gates on Sunday. To be sure that wasn't a very big thing, but it was pretty good for New York. When we came to celebrate the rooth anniversary of our Nation's birth, we called the world together at our big show in Philadelphia. A persistent and determined effort was made to open the gates on Sunday. They were not open. I remember very well the controversy and how hot it grew as the time came for decision, but good old Philadelphia, God bless her, said the gates ought not to be opened, and Corliss with his big engine said: "Whatever you may do about it, this is certain, the big engine is going to keep Sunday." And the people with indignant and earnest protest said the gates should not be opened and they were not opened, and nobody was hurt. The workmen attended the great fair without any let or hindrance; they went there with the consent of the manufacturers, being given half holidays for that express purpose, and they entered the gates again and again. No one was

denied the privilege, and would not be here in Chicago, of having the entrance to the gates of the Exposition, and if one manufacturer granted that privilege to his workmen of a half holiday, or whole holiday, there would not be another employer in the country who would dare refuse consent to his employees for the same purpose. The precedent, therefore, is all one way. Take the Exposition at Paris, where, indeed, we had not the control; but our department was covered throughout the entire Exposition on the Sabbath, and we there again gave testimony of our regard as a great nation for the proper observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest, and as a means of worship. Now, I hold that that reasoning is good to-day—that a precedent that is to be broken must be broken for a very substantial and overmastering reason. I think that will commend itself to the judgment of every one present, and I think that thus far in the discussion we have heard nothing which indicates that there is any substantial reason, peculiar to our times to-day, that calls for different action to that taken by the government of the country in connection with preceding expositions. We must have that before we can have conviction.

My second point is that the opening of the gates on the Sabbath would be going contrary to the best memories and traditions and usages of our national life. Now, I recognize of course that Church and State are separate here; that the church can not run the government, and the government can not run the church; that we have no State religion, and no State Church. Each is free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and I do not believe there are a dozen men in the country who are so bigoted and intolerant that they are prepared to undertake to force men to worship on the Sabbath day, or to force them to the performance of any duties that might be called religious. But our laws, while they are not framed to legislate men into religion, and while he is a fool who thinks that a man is going to be made good by legal restrictions, our laws nevertheless are restrictive, and this nation is a Christian nation, and bound to guard against the destruction of those safeguards that Christianity has put about our social and our civil life. That is the province of law, to protect, not to force, religion; to protect in the exercise of religion. A great deal is said about this matter of personal liberty. Why, it is constantly interfered with in connection with legislation and with the execution of legislation. It seems to me that that ought hardly to enter into the discussion—personal liberty, personal preference, and personal rights. As a learned chief justice has said: "All sorts of restrictions are imposed upon the actions of men, notwithstanding the liberty which is guaranteed to each. It is liberty regulated by just and impartial laws." And then he goes on to say in the same case: "Laws setting aside Sunday as a day of rest are upheld, not from the right of the government to legislate for the promotion of religious observances, but from its right to protect all persons from the physical and material debasement which comes from uninterrupted labor. Such laws have been sustained by the highest courts of the State," and so on. Now, I say we are a Christian people; we are not pagans, worshipping wooden gods; we are not materialists, bowing down to impersonal forces; we are not philosophical Spencerians, adoring some transcendent unknowable; we are not Hindoos, bowing before Brahma or Buddha; but we are a Christian nation. Christianity is embodied in our usages; embodied in our appointments; embodied in our laws. We open our legislative bodies with prayer, and our national councils. We appoint Christian chaplains for our army and navy. We issue proclamations calling upon the people to pray, and give thanks to God. We put men under oath in the name of the Almighty. Now, what God is it we recognize in all this? Certainly, not the God of the pantheists; not Buddha, or Brahma; it is the God of the Christian; the God of Christian civilization; the God of the people; the God of the Sabbath; who is distinctively known as such, and therefore I say that any action of official authority which tramples on the Sabbath is going counter to our best traditions, and our best memories and usages. I think that is clear beyond all question. It would break a habit that has been universally fruitful of sobriety and decency and moral elevation, and the friends of this measure should give an overmastering reason why this habit should be broken.

My third argument is that opening the Fair on Sunday would be right in

the face of the convictions and consciences of five million church members. Here are millions of people always on the side of law and order—patrons of schools, vindicators of social purity and order, lovers of clean homes and clean lives, who really believe that the opening of the Exposition on Sunday is wrong. Now, it is not a matter of taste with them. It is not a matter of preference. It is a matter of deep-rooted conviction; of perfectly conscientious conviction. I tell you, gentlemen of the Sunset Club, that it is a tremendously serious thing to make light of that voice of conscience, which comes from millions of our fellow citizens. It is not that the church is to run the government; but here are millions who believe that the interests of society will be hazarded if that Exposition is opened on Sunday, and it is a matter of conscience with them. Now, again, unless there is some overmastering reason for ignoring that voice of conscience it ought to be heeded. It would be a violation of God's law, as they look at it.

It is said that the church herself is not united upon this matter. Where is the proof of it? Look at the hundreds of thousands of signatures to the petitions that have been sent in to the secretary of the local directory, petitioning against Sabbath opening of the World's Fair. Councils, parishes, assemblies, synods, conferences, presbyteries, Women's Christian Temperance Unions, the American Sabbath Union, Tract Societies, Bible Societies, representing millions of constituents, and all without one dissenting voice have protested against it.

This is a national issue; it is not confined to Chicago. Local opinion has nothing to do with it. No more than personal preference. From all these different quarters comes up this united protest against this thing. And who are they who have petitioned on the other side? Well, I have heard of a little gathering of theosophists who have petitioned for it. I have heard of a little company of free-thinkers, in convention assembled, who have petitioned for it. I have heard of a little man who builds his own altar, and worships the builder, Robert Ingersoll, who has protested against it. That is all, as far as I know. The workingmen—have you heard from the workingmen on this subject? Where are the petitions? They, according to the argument, are the persons most interested in this matter, and they have not exhibited the slightest concern in regard to it. It is said the churches are divided. It might as well be said that a flock of sheep is divided in color because there happens to be one sheep tainted with a little black. I tell you, gentlemen, that flock is white, notwithstanding the black one in the flock. And the church is united in her testimony notwithstanding there is some protest gotten up by some little nondescript side show on this subject.

Now, my fourth argument against Sunday opening is that it would be importing that mongrel thing called the continental Sunday, and squatting it down in the high seat of the nation, to usurp the place of our own institutions. To my mind such a thing is a national humiliation. I believe in exhibiting our own goods. The American Sabbath is one of our goods. It is peculiar to American soil; it is imbedded in our national history; it has been our glory and our joy, and legislative bodies—persons in authority, in different relations—presidents and governors, and so on, have all recognized the value of the observance of this day to the country, after the American fashion. As Chief Justice Lowry has said, it and religious institutions have been among the chief means of our progress; and now, when we are to celebrate the 400th anniversary of America's discovery, and when we are inviting the nations of the earth to come and see what God and a free people have wrought in those four hundred years, it is deliberately proposed to put our American Sabbath in the back yard—out of sight—and to set up under the ægis of the government, and in the eye of the world, this bastard European institution. For shame, citizens of America! I put it to you whether every instinct of national pride does not rise up against this shameful substitution?

On this matter just listen to the voice of Syria and China, if I may be allowed briefly to read from two petitions that have come up from the other side of the globe. Here is one from Syria, where some of the best scholars in the world are actively engaged: "Because the Columbian Exposition should be an American institution, and be true to the life and character of the American people, and an exhibition with open doors on the Sabbath would be foreign to

both, and would inflict great injury on all American institutions, especially morally and religiously." "Fourth, that thousands of Syrians will attend the Exposition, and it is but right that the lessons of sobriety, and reverence for God's laws, which have been taught by Americans in Turkey for the last seventy years, should be confirmed by this great Exposition, so peculiarly Christian and American." And that it is signed by our leading representatives in Syria. Here is one from China: "The undersigned American citizens resident in Canton, have seen the evils from having no rest-day for its toiling millions." Mark that. "The Chinese government, out of regard to the usages of Western lands, closes all of its foreign customs offices on Sunday. That the Chinese exhibitors may not get wrong impressions in regard to the observation of the rest-day in America, we join the millions of our fellow-citizens in asking that all the halls, rooms, offices of the Exposition may be closed on Sunday." What a significant thing that is! That out of a heathen land should come a voice testifying that a heathen nation, out of deference to the institutions of Western lands, has closed its public offices on Sunday, under the influence of our missionaries, and now they come over here and find that that is all a lie—a lie. Our nation, in its representative and official capacity proving to the contrary, by throwing the gates open on Sunday, to the thronging thousands who may come to it.

My fifth reason for opposing the opening of the gates on Sundays is that it will lead to a condition of things about Chicago most damaging and demoralizing. The argument on the other side by Judge McConnell has been, where will all these people go? I wonder if he has carefully considered this whole question? Does he not know that the people who will come here to spend several days and to stay over the Sabbath will be largely composed of the reputable and better classes? Men in certain walks in life do not come to spend days at an Exposition. Open the gates on Sunday and what will be the result? Excursion trains on all our railroads will be pouring into our city, from the East and the West, the North and the South, two hundred and three hundred miles away, and into this city every Saturday night and Sunday morning they will pour an additional hundred thousand to see the fair. We know what vast crowds will be here during the week and over Sunday; and they will tax our municipal resources to the utmost, especially our police force. Think of the inevitable tramps and bummers, pickpockets and gamblers, and dead beats, pouring into the city from every quarter. Think of the saloons open in full blast; think of the other dens of iniquity waiting for their victims, and tell what Chicago will do when to these are added the immense throngs who will pour into this city because the fair is open on Sunday. The Sundays of the Exposition, if that idea be carried out, will be the devil's harvest time. It will lead to a sort of pandemonium in some parts of the city.

My sixth point is that the opening of the Fair on the Sabbath will lead to future license that will rob the day of everything that thus far has made it attractive and of value in our national life. Such a conspicuous government example will be contagious. If a general government fair can be opened on Sunday to make money, why not any manufacturing establishment? If a national fair can open its gates on Sunday for the receipts, why cannot any State or county fair? Places of entertainment would all be opened, anything that dare open its doors any other day of the week would remain open over Sunday, and our good old Sabbath would be revolutionized. What is to keep the American Sabbath in that case from being the camping ground for every sort of entertainment and every sort of traffic, and the hawking of wares?

My seventh reason and last point is that it is selling the Lord's day for a few pieces of silver, and when you get to the bottom of it that is very nearly the same thing as selling the Lord himself. And I hasten to say, lest I be misunderstood, that the men who are advocating the opening of the World's Fair on Sundays do not mean to do this, but nevertheless it comes to that in the end. I say it fearless of sustainable contradiction, that we should never hear of a desire for the opening of the Fair on Sunday were it not for the money that is in it. We are told it is on behalf of the workingmen. Where are their petitions? Make the entrance to the Fair Sunday free and I venture the assertion that we should hear a great deal less of this sympathy for the workingmen. If it is the gate receipts that lead to the Sunday opening then I appeal to you if it is not true that it is selling the Lord's

day for a few pieces of silver. Think of the shame of it, gentlemen. Is it not bartering our immortal birthright for a miserable mess of pottage? Think of the four hundred years since the discovery of this continent with its splendid record of achievement owing to our Christian institutions; think of surrendering it all for a few dollars and cents: letting go this pearl of days set in the diadem of our American nationality that we may make the World's Fair pay expenses. Thirty years ago, when we were in the throes of a civil war and passing through a baptism of fire and blood, we invoked the God of our fathers to befriend us and give us the victory. Proclamation after proclamation from the now sainted Lincoln called the nation to its knees. This great Christian people had no hesitation in crying unto their God; forbid that now we should renounce our dependence upon the God of battles. In the midst of the war, in November, 1862, the president, as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, announced in a general order that the importance to man and beast of the prescribed weekly rest, and the sacred rights of Christian soldiers and sailors, becoming deference to the best sentiment of a Christian people, and a due regard for the Divine will, demands that Sunday labor in the army and navy be reduced to the measure of strict necessity. In the midst of our great throes of agony the president issued that proclamation. Shall we now, in these piping times of peace, when our lap is full of God's bounties, strike down the shield that we then lifted up, turn our backs upon the God we then invoked, and make the Lord's day in the high place of the Columbian Exposition a scene of traffic and amusement, with the whole nation as active participants?

Gentlemen of the local directory, if any of you are here, and gentlemen of the United States Commission, I do not believe it is in your hearts to do any such thing. Suppose the United States Commissioners, having just the same authority over the affairs of the Exposition that President Lincoln had over the army and navy, should issue an order that the importance for man and beast of the prescribed weekly rest, the sacred rights of Christian citizens, and becoming deference to the best sentiment of a Christian people, and due regard for the Divine will, demand that Sunday labor in the Columbian Exposition be reduced to the measure of strict necessity. Who does not know that the Exposition would not be open one hour of all the Sundays of its existence, for there would not be an hour of labor called for in connection with the Exposition.

Now, here is my argument:

First. It is counter to all national precedent.

Second. It is counter to the best memories and traditions of our national life.

Third. It is right in the face of the convictions and consciences of five millions of church members.

Fourth. It will import a mongrel thing, and put our own Sabbath in the back yard.

Fifth. It will result in utter demoralization and be the devil's harvest time.

Sixth. It will make the Sabbath in future a camping ground for entertainment and hawking of wares.

Seventh. It is selling the Lord's day for a few pieces of silver.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

GENERAL I. N. STILES: Doctor Johnson wondered if Judge McConnell had carefully considered this question. I thought he had from the way he talked; while my conclusion was that Doctor Johnson had followed the precedent so long established of reviving the old religious argument, which needs no preparation beyond that received at a theological college.

There was one question propounded by Judge McConnell that I desire to answer. Where will the vast throngs attracted by the exposition go? Where will they go? Go to the saloons, of course. Every one of them is open on Sunday, and in this Christian country, too. We are in nice shape to put on airs. New York City is in nice shape to close its Crystal Palace. But they have opened the Metropolitan Museum of Art lately, and it has been attended with great success, and it is not going to be closed, either, Doctor. And with kind feelings to all, I will say, for there are few to speak for him, that Bob Ingersoll's mouth is not going to be closed either. I am not his special defender, but if there is a man who by his life and with his voice has done anything to enlarge the sphere of human thought, for freedom of intellect and opinion, it is Bob Ingersoll.

The Doctor's argument is purely a religious argument. Now while there are many people who hold to that line of thought, there are also many people who in the sense in which the Doctor

uses the term are not religious people. This may be a Christian country, but I believe, Doctor, if the Christians are to be determined by church membership, the majority is the other way in this Christian country. There is a good deal of free thinking going on among other people than Bob Ingersoll and the theosophists, and there is a growing desire for the greatest possible freedom for each consistent with the rights of others. More men are doing their thinking for themselves.

I think the reason of this matter is on the side of those who favor the opening of the world's fair on Sundays. It may be that missionaries have encouraged the sentiment that has been referred to in Syria and China that enables them to get up petitions, but I can get a petition to have you run for alderman, Doctor, a petition too, numerous signed. What is the principle of the thing, not how many men have signed petitions. I can get petitions numerous signed by Christian people, not free thinkers nor theosophists, for the pardon of the most notorious criminals that have been convicted in this state. I can get petitions numerous signed by Christian people to excuse those rascals in Philadelphia who closed the exposition in 1876 with great unction and pious groans, and then within the year stole a million and a half from the city and state.

This straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel ought to be discouraged. We have here the old religious spirit revived. You must not think as you would about certain questions. Some questions are beyond reason. You must believe as you have been taught to believe. Above all follow religious precedent. Ah, Doctor, will it do to follow all the religious precedents that have occurred in this world? It is dangerous to arouse these religious controversies. I know of nothing more antagonistic to peace and good order.

The Doctor says that Sunday is the Lord's day? Now are you not mistaken, Doctor? Wasn't it the seventh day that was the Lord's day?

But the real question is, will the interests of humanity best be served by opening or closing the fair on Sundays? The argument that opening it will oblige the employees to work on Sunday has force with me, for it is my opinion that no man should be forced to work on Sunday. I do not say that as a Christian but as a man who loves the right of things. Such a problem can be solved without difficulty. It does not seem to me that anyone having conscientious scruples against it should be compelled to attend the fair on Sundays; but it seems to me that a proper consideration for the rights of men in this, I suppose it is the year of our Lord, Doctor, 1891, would permit others who desire to visit the exposition to do so without hindrance. The Spencerian philosophy in which I believe and at which the Doctor sneers, and which I have learned to apply to myself within the past two years, tells me that when my sight was taken it was not a lesson from that Lord of the Bible, as one of my friends suggested, but it teaches me that it is the duty of a man to bring himself into harmony with his environments, and it tells me to learn all the lessons that can be learned from my calamity, and those I propose to learn. As in thought so in action I would give to every citizen who may be here in attendance upon the exposition the greatest possible freedom, conditional that he shall spend Sunday in such a way as not to interfere with the public peace and good order, or to put it in the way that Bishop Ireland puts it, I would have an orderly, peaceable Sunday on general principles, independent of any religious conviction. As that grand old man, Bishop Ireland said: "I would have Sunday become and be recognized as a day of public calm," and so say I.

It does strike me, however, that it would be a piece of silly presumption on our part, with three thousand saloons open wide at both ends without the protest of any considerable number of us, to spend our time trying to keep poor people away from the privileges of the fair on the only day that it is practicable for them to visit it on. I do not think it will be done, for I do not believe it is right.

In closing, let me appeal once more for the greatest degree of personal freedom for every person on Sunday and every other day consistent with the public good. If a man chooses to get his amusement and recreation at one of the gardens on the North Side, let him do so; and if he chooses, as he says, to worship God on the South Side, let him do so. Let Sunday be a day alike welcome to Christian and Jew, Turk and Infidel, a day of rest and calm.

Men get their rest in different ways. I for a long time have got my rest by remaining quiet on Sunday, perhaps hearing some newspaper read, which in the opinion of very many good religious people, is all wrong.

I choose to believe that the final arbiter upon all questions relating to human affairs and human happiness, is human reason. God, if there be one, gave us our reason for that purpose, and he gave us no other.

This God of the Bible is the same that once said through Moses to the people: "Ye shall not eat of anything which dieth of itself. Ye may give it to the stranger which is within thy gates. Ye may sell it to an alien." In other words it shall not be eaten by you, the Lord's people, but you can give it to a man who comes along that you don't know; you may sell it a Canadian, but ye are a holy people. A holy people, forsooth. What do you think of that for a sentiment? I am one who believes that God never said any such thing, and that no decent God ever will.

MR. EDW. F. CRAGIN: If I have made no mistake, Judge McConnell presented four arguments. First, the right of visitors to Chicago to do as they please about this thing; second, good instruction will come to those who visit the Fair; third, what else can people do if they don't go to the Exposition? and fourth, it is a wrong to the laboring man.

As for General Stiles I will leave him to Dr. Johnson in his close, simply saying in passing that I beg of you, General, never again to present the argument that the World's Fair should be open on Sunday because the saloons are open on Sunday. Judge McConnell asks what shall they do on Sunday? Judge, don't you know that the Columbian Association has been planning for this very thing? There are to be here a hundred congresses during the fair, and the very best thinkers of all the world will be here. Every Sunday we shall have the brightest and best men here. Arrangements are being made to occupy every hall in the city. We shall have the best speakers of the world in every language. Will not that be interesting and instructive? Certainly it will.

Now just to touch one point that Dr. Johnson touched upon a little. You may not have noticed how superbly America has been leading the world in this matter. At the Paris exposition there were distributed under the auspices of American and English gentlemen, tracts and documents showing the value of Sunday observance. At Paris there was held a congress at which was discussed the very question discussed here this evening by Dr. Johnson and General Stiles, only there was no one to represent Dr. Johnson, for by the rules of that congress religion was absolutely excluded. It was shown that Germany worked fifty-five per cent of its population on Sundays, and that France and other countries worked an increasingly large proportion of their population on the Sunday. The unanimous testimony of that congress, and the unanimous resolution passed, was that efforts should be made to bring about the cessation of all Sunday work, and since that time there has been great gain in this direction throughout the continent of Europe. Now what will be said by these men who have been studying this question and taking the testimony of the working societies of this country and of Europe, if this exposition, located in Chicago, declares that it is all wrong and that Sunday is just like any other day of the week?

This is not a Chicago Fair. That was the mistake that New York made in her struggle for the location of the Exposition there. We said this is not a Chicago Fair but an exposition for the whole United States: we knew that Chicago wasn't a very pleasant subject for people from Minneapolis and St. Louis and other neighboring cities; and we kept Chicago in the background. But the New York people talked nothing but New York from the beginning to the end. The fair came to Chicago.

There have been sent out from Chicago circulars on this matter to every village and hamlet in the United States, and the replies indicate that the sentiment is very strong that the fair should not be open on Sunday.

Now as to the workingmen: not one single petition has come in from the workingmen in favor of opening on Sunday, but hundreds have come from workingmen's societies in favor of closing on Sunday.

Let us have a thought for the sake of the children. We are passing away. How is it with our children? Do you want them to have less of Sunday? Perhaps you will say that there is no use in bringing the absolute value of Sunday into the argument. Mr. Robert G. Ingersoll said recently: "Sunday is a pest; the American Sunday should be done away with. By all means open the exposition on Sunday, and help us to do away with this pest." That speech was telegraphed all over the United States and indicates what there is in this question.

The greatest argument we had to contend with in Washington was that it would be unsafe to hold the fair in Chicago, but we showed that in religious work Chicago was equal to any city in the country. We brought forward our statistics and showed that Chicago was a real good city.

MR. LEON HORNSTEIN: Religious people in our midst are responsible for a great many incongruities. We find them fiercely denouncing Bernhardt because she makes capital out of her past iniquities, and at the same time flinging to the breeze the announcement that "Ben Hogan, the reformed prize-fighter, will preach here to-night." You will hear them denouncing the abuse of power by the strong against the weak, and yet if you go to one of their camp-meetings, they will charge you a dollar for a cold potato because they know you can get nothing else to eat within a mile. From the holy precincts of Evanston they send down a Culver and a Kean. The good Inter Ocean, the only newspaper here which publicly lays claim to virtue, has a saloon in its basement. But, greatest of anomalies, these people with the best of intentions are endeavoring to destroy what little of order and decency we would have here during the continuance of the Columbian Exposition. These good people when they leave their sanctuaries to dictate morality to the rest of the world forget that it is a wicked world; it was a wicked world when there were only two people in it and it kept getting worse and worse until the good Lord got tired of it himself and drowned all of them with the exception of one family, and even the head of that family celebrated his return to dry land by going off on a drunk. Forgetting all this wickedness, these good people try to coerce others into being good by stopping up all outlets to this

wickedness and hermetically sealing it. What is the result? When a band plays patriotic airs in the park on a Sunday afternoon, we find people of all ages, sexes, conditions and colors flock there to drink in the strains. Remove the band, and what proportion of those thousands would attend the church or Sunday-school? You would find them attending cheap shows, or saloons, or dives, while the children would play around the streets, and satisfy the craving of their souls for music by following a hand organ. Remove the Sunday night theatre, and do you think the young fellow would take his best girl to church? No, he would probably extend his revels in some other place far into Monday morning.

In 1893, when the wicked of all the world will swoop down upon us, do you think they will observe the Sabbath as you want them to? Will they crowd your churches? If you have not learned differently from your lessons of the past, you should have done so. They will fill your theatres, your hotel lobbies, the saloons, the gaming houses, the brothels, anything but the churches, and Sunday nights your streets will be filled with drunkenness and ribaldry, unless extraordinary precautions are taken to prevent it; and when you take into account the possibility of our having a wicked democratic mayor at that time, who will answer for the consequences?

It seems to me that the only sound argument that has been advanced against Sunday opening is that of working men seven days in a week, and when you consider that that can easily be obviated by different shifts of employees, it does not seem to me that this question should be given much consideration.

I believe in Sunday as much as any man, but I do not believe that absolute quiet is necessary to its proper observance. I believe in Sunday for rest, for recreation, for enjoyment, for instruction, for recuperation, and not in a Sunday of enforced laziness.

COL. ALEX. M. WOOLFOLK: I believe, sir, in God, and that the Bible is the book of God's This government is based upon that belief, also. Assuming that proposition to be true, I believe further that those countries have been the most prosperous that have recognized the existence of God and lived closest to Him. In the brief time allotted to me I should like to draw a comparison between two countries which form a striking example of the truth of these facts. I refer to the ancient Israelitish nation and our own country. The ancient Jew fled into the wilderness to seek the promised land that he might be allowed to worship the God of his fathers unmolested. The Pilgrim Fathers came to this new land from the old world with exactly the same idea. Here is another analogy. When the Jew left Egypt, he carried with him to the promised land, as a distinctive feature of his religion, the Jewish Sabbath, the day of rest that peculiarly marked them from the surrounding nations. When the religious refugees came to America, they founded the American Sabbath, as an American institution, and from that day to this it has continued as an American institution.

I might call attention to a further analogy. In ancient times, no people were blessed as were God's people. The country was God's country. They were enriched by the commerce of surrounding nations. They were blessed until they forgot God; and the first step in forgetting God was to forget the Sabbath. And so America has been wonderfully blessed. There never was a nation blessed as have been these United States, and I should like, sir, if I had the time, to show that this nation has been preserved by marvelous manifestations of divine favor.

But when the Jew forgot God he was punished. He was driven into exile; and it needs no prophetic eye to see what will be the future of America if we forget God. If the Christian sentiment of America does not govern it; if instead of the church and the Sunday school the saloon and the gambling hell are to govern it, what must be the future?

So far as I am individually concerned, I would close the Fair as far as entailing labor is concerned, but I would say, open the grounds, open your art galleries. I should say there is nothing in the sight of beauty that will desecrate the Sabbath day; I should say that there is nothing in the fine paintings, there is nothing in the beautiful flowers, there is nothing in all these to desecrate the Sabbath day, for I believe the love of the beautiful is akin to the love of God.

The hour of adjournment having arrived, it was unanimously resolved that the time for discussion be extended thirty minutes.

REV. H. D. KIMBALL, D.D.: I regret that in this discussion it seems to be assumed on the one side that those who favor closing the Fair on Sunday, are seeking to force their convictions down the throats of others who do not see as they do. I have also been pained to see an apparent disposition to charge the opponents of closed gates on Sunday with immorality, and to identify them with the saloon element of Chicago.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there are men of honest convictions who are in favor of open gates on Sunday. I am sorry, if any assume that this is a priestly question, and that the ministers oppose Sunday opening because they fear their craft is in danger. I believe there is such a thing in this world as conviction. There is such a thing as loyalty to God, and I desire to emphasize the statement that above all human government there is the government of Almighty

God. We must recognize that government if we would have His blessing continue with us as a people.

Now, I am disposed to think that the argument in favor of open gates on Sunday is, after all, the argument of the almighty dollar. It is possible for an honest man to be actuated by considerations of which he is at the time unconscious. I am convinced that the basic idea of all the arguments in favor of open gates on Sunday, is the almighty dollar. Now, who of the poor men are to be benefited by Sunday opening? Will any one tell me how those men are to reach Chicago from Philadelphia, from San Francisco, from Boston, and New York, in order to enjoy the benefits of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday? It is from the cities and towns within easy reach of our city that the expected throngs are to come, and from those towns and cities will come an element which will cause our civic government a great deal of trouble, and our citizens perhaps a great deal of unrest.

MR. EDWARD O. BROWN: I have just as conscientious a conviction about the opening of the gates on Sunday as have my friends who favor their closing on that day. The gross injustice of the proposition, that the Exposition shall be closed on Sunday, is what affects my mind. I assert that it is the working classes of Chicago who will pay the immense preponderating proportion of the expense of the Fair. I assert that the contributions of the wealthy classes in this city will come back to them in the increased prices of their land, and in the increased rent which all classes will pay. I assert also that that portion of the revenue derived from extraordinary taxation will almost wholly fall upon those classes; the classes who consume most of the necessities of life, and they are mostly the working classes. I assert that the Exposition will leave here a glut in the labor market, at the same time that rents are increased. Now, what has been the answer made to the workmen when these arguments have been brought forward? It is that they will have great means of enlightenment, and moral elevation in the Columbian Exposition. And now what is this proposition? Sunday is the only day that the man with a large family can snatch from his toil to visit the Exposition. But the gates are to be closed. And why? Because certain gentlemen say that Almighty God and the Christian Church forbid recreation on the Sabbath day. That is a statement of most refreshing coolness to me. I hope I am a Christian. I believe in the Christian religion, and I say it is the Puritan Sabbath and the Puritan idea that these gentlemen want to enforce, and not the Christian Sunday or the Christian idea. I admit that that is the theory of some of the most estimable of our citizens; but I deny that the Christian Church is a unit upon this subject. I deny that that is the universal Christian doctrine. Did Martin Luther hold that view? Do the Lutheran ministers in Germany and in this country? Does the cure in France, leading his flock to innocent recreation on Sunday afternoon in the country?

MR. THOMAS J. MORGAN: We are told that to open the gates of the Fair on Sunday will break a precedent, and for that an over-mastering reason must be given. Further, that the workmen, at least so far as the ear of our clerical friends is concerned, have not made their voice heard in favor of the opening on Sunday of this Exposition. In answer to those statements, let me say that the road of progress is strewn with broken precedents and changed habits, and the reasons for these broken precedents and changed habits have been given afterwards, because the people refused to listen to them before.

The workmen have not been heard, because their opportunities for being heard are not so great as those of the church. I hold in my hand the report of the last National Convention of the Federation of Labor, held in Detroit, Mich., where a resolution was unanimously passed asking the directory of the Columbian Exposition to open its gates on Sunday, because of its intellectual and moral value. This convention represented two millions and a half of people, and had we the facilities and the machinery of the church to make ourselves heard, that could be duplicated two or three times over.

Hundreds of thousands of people will be deposited by the train on Sunday. From where—of what kind? Not the kind who travel in sleepers; but men who are isolated in little villages and towns within reaching distance of Chicago, and whose only opportunity in a lifetime this will be to see a grand object lesson on the development of our civilization. Will they come to Chicago to visit the saloons? No. At the great Fair, their minds will receive a greater and more lasting impression than ever before in their lives.

But they say this is to be denied them. Why? Because the church fears a precedent will be destroyed. Have they not adhered too strictly to precedent in the past? I ask them, what has divorced the workingman from the churches? Why do they no longer fill your pews on Sunday? They have been standing still and asking the great masses of the people to stand still also; but they have refused and they will refuse. If we had the machinery to reach the workmen of the world we should have petitions that would smother into insignificance those little affairs that come from China and Japan and Syria.

REV. DR. C. A. BLANCHARD, President Wheaton College: I wish to say that if the employers

of the United States have become so grasping, so itching of palm, and so hard of heart, that they do not propose to allow the men whom they employ to attend the Columbian Exposition on any day except the Sabbath, I think it is time that the employing classes of the United States were taught a lesson they shall never forget. But I have not so mean an opinion of the employing classes in Chicago as that.

I want to remind my friends that the Tweed Ring that stole twenty millions in New York and the Bardsley Ring that stole a million and a half in Philadelphia, were not found ordinarily in prayer meetings when they were arrested.

Now I wish to say that the Columbian Exposition ought not to be opened on Sunday because it is wrong. It is a wrong to the men who are employed there. Some of my friends on the other side have spoken as though the fourth commandment was given in order to protect the rights of the clergy. Now God says that commandment was given that "thy man servant and thy maid servant may rest as well as thou." Now the horse power of this exposition I understand is to be 24,000, and the firemen and engineers alone are to be 250. Now do the gentlemen on the other side favor working those two hundred and fifty men for six months seven days a week? My friend who has just sat down says that the railroads will bring in hundreds of thousands who can come on no other day. Does he not know that there are millions in the railroad service of the United States to-day who have no day now for wife and child? Has not a man the right to sit down one day in seven with his wife and children? Does he not know that the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday is but one more link in the chain which sooner or later will turn the workingman over bound hand and foot to those who would work him 365 days in every year?

In the second place, if the Fair could be run without sin against man for seven days a week, it cannot be run profitably. There are fifteen millions of church members in the United States, and although I do not think a boycott would be proclaimed on the Fair, if it is open seven days in the week, I believe every one of those fifteen millions would find his interest in the Exposition greatly diminished, if they understood that every employee of that World's Fair was to be deprived of all rest from his toil.

MR. C. S. DARROW: It seems to me that the clergymen who have come here so numerously to represent their side of this question, have not said all that could be said in favor of closing. I suspect that it is largely due to their modesty. Possibly with some reason combined with it. Now it seems to me that there are two very good arguments in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday. These gentlemen have refrained from making them and some one ought to make them. These gentlemen, in their arguments, composed of false premises and illogical conclusions, have assumed that this government is founded upon the law of God. This government, at least at present, is founded upon the principle of Protection. Protect infant industries. We protect pig iron and wool and hen's eggs; we protect all infants not more than two or three hundred years old. Now there are a couple of other industries in this country, which are at least as old as the pig iron industry and the egg industry, and in which a great amount of capital is invested. One of them at least this country and other countries have been supporting for nearly twenty centuries. We protect pig iron and wool and eggs; what's the matter with protecting the saloon and the church? Isn't it fair? The saloon has never had a fair chance in this world. We find it to-day practically outlawed. We find it restricted and hedged about with all manner of laws, that are a nuisance and give the saloon no chance whatever. Now while we restrict them within the small space of fifteen or twenty hours out of the twenty-four, what is the matter with giving them a Sunday for themselves? What is the matter with closing dry goods and shoe stores, the theatres, and other places of instruction or amusement, and giving the saloons one Sunday to themselves? That would be protection of a great American industry.

Then there is the church. It has suffered greatly at the hands of science and enlightenment and progress. There was a time when the decrees of the church were carried out by the State with the gun and the sword; when the faggot and the torch helped protect their infant industry; but they have lost that. There was a time when they said to the people of the country, "You must go church, or be burned at the stake." They don't ask anything so unreasonable now. They simply ask that you shall not be allowed to go anywhere else. Isn't that fair? Is there anything unreasonable about that?

Give the other industries the hours of the week, but protect the church and the saloon and give them Sunday.

And if there should be any one so absurd as to want to go somewhere else besides the saloon and the church, why, there is the burying ground. That is always open on Sunday. I remember when I was a boy there was no place to go but the church and the burying ground; and we always went to the burying ground.

This whole question is one of protection simply. They have lost the protection of the State. It is true that those people who want to go to church would go even if there was somewhere else to go; but that does not satisfy them. They want to fix the people who don't want to go to church so that they can't possibly go anywhere else.

MR. GEORGE BRAHAM: I am against the World's Fair being closed on Sunday because I don't believe that this is the Christain Sabbath. One gentleman says he believes in the God of the Bible. Now if that is so I don't believe in the American Sabbath, for the God of the Bible only made one Sabbath, and he never made the American Sabbath. The Indian Sabbath would be the American Sabbath. The Bible says that on the "seventh day ye shall rest," and so forth. When this question had been under discussion for some time I took a tour one Sunday through the district where the fashionable churches are, and I saw the carriages outside with their liveried drivers on the boxes. I asked one, "what are you waiting for?" He said his master was inside praying for his sins. I asked, "what church do you belong to?" "I belong to the same church," he said. "Who does your praying?" I asked. "Master does the praying for both of us," was his reply.

Now these gentlemen don't mind their servants driving them to church, but they do mind the workmen going to the World's Fair on Sunday.

It is said that we are selling the Lord's day for a few pieces of silver. Well, I would like to ask, if you take away the few pieces of silver from the preachers how much preaching will be done on Sunday. What do they work for on Sunday? Love, or glory, or honor? No; for the dollar, the almighty dollar. I have yet to see a minister who gets up and preaches for his hire Sundays who is not always promptly on hand on the monthly pay day.

If you believe in the Sabbath of the Bible then you must believe in the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day of the week. Why not make Monday into a Sabbath as well as Sunday if you are going to ignore the Sabbath of the Bible?

MR. L. H. AYME: There have been but two of the gentlemen it seems to me who have argued for the closing of the Fair on Sunday, who have attempted to be original in their arguments. One of these gentlemen, and from one connected with the World's Fair from a very early date, such a statement was astounding, said that this was not a Chicago Fair, that it was a United States Fair. Gentlemen, this is not a United States Fair, it is a World's Fair. It is not a fair for a few millions of our own people, but a fair for the millions of Hindoos, of Brahmins, of Mohammedans, for the millions of Turkey, for men of convictions all over the world who neither care for nor believe in our American Sunday.

And perhaps it is well to let ring in our ears like the sweet solemn tones of a deep voiced bell the words of Him who said: "Oh ye generation of Pharisees; fools, having eyes ye see not, and having ears ye hear not; neither do ye understand," and said that of the two great commandments the greater was, that you should love your fellow man as yourself.

Then another gentleman here states that by the grace of the manufacturer of tape or pig iron or what you will, by their courteous permission, they will grant the millions of hard working citizens of this country, forsooth, a half day when their supreme pleasure so pleases them.

MR. WALTER THOMAS MILLS: There are three points I wish to call attention to.

The first one that I am not a Puritan, although I do not think the possession of Puritan blood is anything to be ashamed of. The next point is that I do not see why there should be a quarrel between the church and somebody else on this question. I think the church in Chicago is a little inconsistent in taking so much interest in closing the World's Fair on Sunday, and manifesting so much indifference in regard to the 30,000 citizens of Chicago who are compelled to work seven days in the week all the year around or lose their livelihood.

I believe in Sunday closing and I regard this question of the opening of the World's Fair as bearing upon the other question of general Sunday closing. I want to secure a day of rest for every man, that is, a day for each man, and when he has received what belongs to him I would allow him to do what he himself elects to do with it.

MR. SIGMUND ZEISLER: Dr. Johnson said that the opening of the exposition on Sunday would mean the importation of that mongrel thing, the continental Sunday. I wonder whether Dr. Johnson ever spent Sunday on the continent of Europe?

DR. JOHNSON: Many of them.

MR. ZEISLER: I have too, Doctor, and I never saw a drunken man in the streets or places of amusement, but here we have seventeen drunken brawls on a Sunday, this holy American Sabbath.

A MEMBER: But they are not holy American brawlers.

MR. ZEISLER: If we had a little more of the continental Sunday with its innocent amusement and recreations we should be a great deal better off. We should have a Sunday for rest and enjoyment, not merely for the rich people who live in their magnificent mansions, and who have a retinue of servants to do their slightest bidding and add to their enjoyment, but for the hundreds of thousands of hard working men and women who after their week of toil feel an overpowering desire for something more than their dingy, dark rooms. If the World's Fair is not open on Sunday hundreds of thousands will be deprived of an opportunity for rational and elevating recreation.

REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES: As a man who is proud to stand in the ranks of the ministry, as a man who believes in religion, as a man who believes that he may in some sense understand the power and the beauty of the life of Jesus, and as a man who believes in the refining and elevating influences of that exhibition which is soon to be opened in this country, I say that the interests of refinement, of religion and morality demand that that exposition shall be placed at the service of the whole people as many hours of as many days in as many months as the exigencies of our civilization will make possible. I plead for the sanctifying power of science. As one who believes in religion I ask that this Columbian Exposition shall make friends with those things which have made for the bettering of human life and human society.

There is one word higher than the word Christianity and that is the word religion; and it is broader than Christianity; and there is one word that is higher than the word religion, and it is the word humanity, and that is a broader word than religion; and as a minister of religion, I plead with those who ask for a multiplication of those opportunities that will help us all.

MR. C. G. DIXON: I want to call attention to the fact already alluded to, that this fair, so far as workmen are concerned, is not the affair of any workman who lives more than two or three hundred miles from Chicago. Now it is contended that this World's Fair should be open in order that the people within one hundred and fifty miles of this city may attend on Sunday. I want to say that thirty thousand of these very people petitioned our legislature some years ago to pass a law restraining the opening of business on Sunday in the State of Illinois, and every one of them a workman whose employer in many cases compelled him to work seven days in the week. In England, where they proposed to open certain places of amusement on Sunday, Mr. Burns and 75,000 of his fellow workmen protested against this desecration of the Sabbath, not because of religious scruples, but because it meant seven days work for the employees. They put it on that ground that it meant seven days work for the six days pay.

MR. NORMAN S. PATTON: I have discovered two arguments in favor of opening on Sunday. First, that there are thousands who can not go on any other day; second, if the people don't go to the Fair on Sunday, where will they go? The first argument is purely in the imagination of those who advance it. I have seen something of this mongrel continental Sabbath in Paris. I said to a young man of my acquaintance, "Why don't you take a rest on Sunday?" He said: "Why, it is the only day I have on which to do any shopping." Shortly afterwards I went across the channel, and I went to the stores on Saturday afternoon, and they were all closed. Why is it that men and women in England earn their living in five days and a half, and in France they can't do it in six? Are the laboring men of England any worse off than those of France? I think not. Is it the laboring men who ask that the Fair shall be open on Sunday? Why, they have not national holidays enough, and so they appoint a Labor Day.

The argument that the people who come here will not be able to go anywhere but to the saloons, if the Fair is closed, is a libel on the American people.

MR. GEORGE A. SCHILLING: Professor Blanchard expressed the opinion that if the World's Fair were closed on Sunday, the employers would see that their employees found time during the week to attend the Exposition. I wonder if Professor Blanchard knows that in this city, in which we stand to-night, men are compelled by their employers to work on Sunday on pain of instant dismissal. I myself worked in the Union Stock Yards, and the rule was that during the busy season, if a man was requested to come back on Sunday, and failed, he was discharged. I say now to the Christians, that if they would use their moral forces and prestige in closing up all manufacturing establishments on Sunday, as they are now using them to close the Fair on Sunday, they would achieve a much greater amount of good.

JUDGE MCCONNELL: I scarcely know that I desire to add anything to what I have already said, and what has been said by others who advocate the same view during the course of the argument. I want to add a word upon the matter that Mr. Schilling was just touching upon. The employers may grant a day off every week to their employees to go to the Exposition, but it will invariably be done at the expense of the workmen; that is, it will cost him four or five times as much to go to the Fair as it will me. He will have to pay the cost of admission, and lose his wages besides. That will be invariably so.

The argument has followed the line that I anticipated it would, and it seems to me has followed about the line, too, that the Ecumenical Methodist Council at Philadelphia adopted. The only argument advanced is, that we have always had the Sunday as it is, and for that reason we should not depart from the precedent. I believe not merely in a Sunday of quiet and rest; I believe in a Sunday of recreation. For that reason I advocate the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday. It does not mean that we are going to work more on Sunday; it does not mean that we are to have seven days of work; it means that we are going to do something when that World's Fair is open to encourage the people to enjoy rational recreation on Sundays; that is all, gentlemen.

REV. DOCTOR JOHNSON: The frank admission of Judge McConnell I am surprised to hear; it gives away the whole case. He admits that it is the desire on the part of those who advocate the opening of the Fair, that we should have a European Sabbath in contra-distinction to the American Sabbath, which has been the glory of our institutions, and one of the first sources of our prosperity, in the opinion of all who know anything of history.

The whole question may be summed up by reference to what the laboring men are doing in connection with this matter. If, as has been intimated, the laboring man is enjoying himself so much more under the continental Sabbath, and is prospering so greatly under that Sabbath, why are the laboring men flocking to this country and placing themselves under the domination of this so-called Puritanical Sabbath? What are they here for? What are they coming for? Running away from prosperity and enjoyment and everything that the heart can desire and coming to this land of bigotry and intolerance! Why, it is absurd upon the face of it. It shows that they know where true liberty is; that laboring men are never so free, are never so prosperous, never so industrious, as they are here. The condition of the laboring men in this country is better than their condition in any other country on the globe, even England, and it is because of this American Sabbath.

References have been made to the Puritan Sabbath. We have no Puritan Sabbath, and we never had in the government of this country. We had a locality for it but it never prevailed. Somebody says that the churches have lost the protection of the State. Let him read law and he will know better. The law is full of the protection of the church by the State. The State was organized for that purpose, and sneers at the Bible and at religion are all on our side. I wish a reporter were here to report every word said here to-night, and that all the people might be informed of what has been said, and that would settle the whole question. They would say the fair is going to be closed every Sunday if that is the reason the people in Chicago want it open.

Railing at the Church, when the church has done more for the liberty of mankind than all other agencies under the wide heavens! Science, what has that done for the liberty of man? Infidelity, what has that done for the liberty of man? Let the gospel of the blessed God be disseminated; let its principles be established; let every man love his neighbor as himself; and the whole question of labor will be settled. Rail at the church; you might as well stab the mother who bore you.

The laboring men are beginning to know it. Why are there not more of them in the church, we are asked. Why are there less than there were? In the first place it is not true. There are more laboring men in the church to-day in proportion to population than there ever were. It is these importations from Europe who come here to do what they please, regardless of law or order or anything else, who are making this noise concerning the church, and it is the reason why that sort of men are not in the church.

Now I hold that if the American Sabbath is so much worse than the European Sabbath for the laboring men, then the laboring men are fools to come to this country. I hold that the argument instead of being a religious argument has been one wholly of economics; one of state and social protection; it is a governmental precedent that we follow and not a religious precedent. I know that history is full of awful religious precedent, of oppression and bigotry, of intolerance and the spirit of torture; but that is the spirit of hell rather than the spirit of heaven; and we have gotten away from that. Overthrow the blessed Gospel of the Son of God, which protects the laboring man as it does the capitalist, and would bring them together on one plane if its principles prevail.

Now I hold that all that has been said on our side, with one or two exceptions, has been along the line of protection to industry, of protection to labor, of protection to the best interests of the state and of society, of the home and not of the church. It has not been an appeal for the church, only so far as the church is organized to look after the welfare of the laboring men.

Let us look the question in the face. Let us get acquainted with the facts. Let us get out of our little circle, where we think the whole world moves. Look at history a little, look a little at law, look at the relation of liberty to law in this country, and you will find that we are sapping the very foundations of all these things, if we throw away our American Sabbath and introduce this mongrel European abortion.

Adjourned.

JOSEPH W. ERRANT,
Secretary.

THIRTY-SIXTH MEETING.

NOVEMBER 5, 1891.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-THREE PRESENT.

SUBJECT:

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Chairman: Mr. ROBERT H. McMURDY.

ADDRESSES BY:

Mr. C. S. DARROW

Mr. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS.

GENERAL DISCUSSION BY:

Mr. Walter Thomas Mills,

Mr. James Abbott,

Gen. Milo S. Hascall,

Mr. Charles Shackelford,

Judge Murray F. Tuley.

THE SUNSET CLUB,

CHICAGO.

*Thirty-Sixth Meeting, held at the Grand Pacific, Thursday Eve., November 5, 1891—
One Hundred and Forty-three Present.*

The Secretary introduced Mr. ROBERT H. McMURDY as the chairman of the evening. Mr. McMurdy in presenting the subject for discussion,

WOMAN SUFFRAGE,

stated that he had been informed by the Secretary that he was expected to make a witty speech, and that he was to keep out of the way of the speakers. He said that he would try to do what was expected. After calling attention to the interest which members might have in the recent election news from some of the States, he declared that it was eminently fitting at this time to discuss the question of suffrage. He referred to the importance of the subject of the evening and believed that he could promise that the arguments on the question, which was not a novel one, would appear dressed in an entirely new garb and that arguments which had hitherto remained hidden would make their maiden bow. He knew that the members of the Club would treat the subject fairly, "for here," said he, "reason is supreme, and the love of what is and the fear of what may be will always give way to what ought to be."

The Chairman then introduced as the first speaker Mr. C. S. DARROW, who spoke as follows:

Perhaps no new arguments have been advanced for or against "Woman Suffrage" for a hundred years.

More than a century ago the advocates of equal rights, with unanswerable logic, proved that to disfranchise one-half the race for the accident of sex was an outrage to the sense of humanity and justice too. Still, against reason and logic and in the face of fairness and equality, man has arrogated to himself the right to determine his own sphere and that of woman too.

It is for him who denies the right of equal suffrage to show why sex, and sex alone, should determine the right and duty of citizenship; to show that the right to vote should not depend upon intelligence, learning, property, strength, health, courage, morality, nativity, or any other qualification, excepting that of sex. To fix any other limitation whatsoever upon the right of franchise would give some women at least the right to vote and take from some men that ancient prerogative, which has so long been given for the sole virtue of not having been born a member of the so-called "weaker sex."

Let us determine the principle on which suffrage rests.

The ballot has not always been an institution in the world. Before men made states the strongest chiefs, with club and knife and other instruments of war, enforced their power on all the other members of the tribe. The laws enacted in this rude beginning of a state sprang from the cruel, savage brain of those whom strength and cunning gave the right to rule. No monarch of these early states was called to place and power by the other members of the tribe, but he called himself instead.

The kings and monarchs of the ancient world, like the barbarous chiefs who went before, thought that their rights descended from the gods, and allowed no worm of earth to raise a question of their right to rule. And through the long and cruel ages of the past, the favored few, with sword and rope and rack, enforced obedience from a world of cringing slaves.

The human race had lived for countless centuries on the earth before the faintest thought had ever come to ruler or to ruled of the common origin and destiny of man.

In the minds of the most favored retainers of monarchs and of kings the spirit of liberty first commenced to grow; and these lords and nobles, by the force of arms and on the field of battle, wrung from their reluctant rulers some fragment of political power in return for loyalty and support. These privileges were guaranteed in constitutions and charters, that rulers might not forget that there were limits to their power.

More and more as the spirit of liberty has penetrated the darkness of the world, have rulers of high degree and low, surrendered power and place and privilege at the demand of the common people of the earth, until to-day, in the constitutions of states and nations, full political privileges are guaranteed to those who once were chattel slaves.

The days when unorganized men, with club and knife, battled for supremacy with their fellow-men are gone, let us hope to return no more. The power of the individual in the state cannot, to-day, be expressed by the strength of his arm, but it rests in his vote instead. Every individual, who has the right of suffrage, has a weapon in his hand as potent as was the club of the savage in the ancient world. True, it may be wrongly used; it may be nullified by others; it may at times do neither him nor the community any great amount of good, but disarm him of this power and he is helpless then indeed.

The commonest observation shows the great power that comes to the individual from the ballot. In a land of politicians, like our own, rulers are influenced only by what they believe the majority will do. Our public officers are obliging. The same fellows will give us either protection or free trade, silver money or gold, prohibition, high license or free whisky. They are always obedient to petitions when these are signed by voters. But a petition signed by every woman in Chicago would have less weight with a legislative body than a resolution of a labor organization, which perhaps existed on paper alone.

The day after one of our late local conventions had adjourned it was discovered that the party had made a great mistake, one that must be remedied to avoid certain defeat. It was a mistake so grave that all marveled to think a convention of politicians could have made it. No Bohemian was on board the ticket. The mischief was afterward rectified. Some one was "pulled off" and a Bohemian placed there in his stead. It did not matter who was taken off, or who was put on, so long as the nationality was right. All the Chinamen in the United States have not as much influence as one German-American, Irish-American, Swedish-American, or even American, club.

Every human being is a portion of the state, subject to its laws and regulations, his life, interests and destiny linked with all his fellow men. And each one of these human beings, because they are human beings, should have the same privileges and rights as all the rest. It is unjust and cowardly in the rulers of any state to place a weapon or a tool in the hands of a portion of its members and deprive the rest of this defense and aid.

Unless the state is an institution that conduces to the highest good of those who make it up, unless the state is an organization that adds to the happiness of man, unless in some way it aids the weary pilgrim on the thorny path of life, and makes the burden lighter, which all of us must bear, unless this is true the state

has not the right to be, but, if from the political organizations of the world any good can come to man, then the weakest and the humblest voice should have the right to speak.

The ideal voter should be intelligent and just; should have a broad and tolerant mind; should study carefully his country's needs and forget all selfish interests in the higher and the broader good. These qualifications are not masculine alone. These, and all other qualifications, may be possessed by women and by men alike. The power to vote does not depend upon the power to fight, but the enlightened conscience of a later world chose this peaceful way to accomplish that which in early times was done by bloody strife. In theory at least the weak and helpless cripple, with the ballot in his hand, is as strong as the most brutal man, who, by reason of his sex, has inherited the right to vote.

Men, and men alone, have made the laws. They have assumed this right because they could, and have left one half the race as dependent on their will as were the early serfs upon their king's caprice. With that grace which the strong have ever shown the weak they insist that women can rely upon the generosity and justice of the stronger sex to grant them all the rights they ought to have, and more. The unequal laws that men have made for women for a thousand years show what justice means to those who have undisputed power, and the generosity of man is shown by his willingness to grant to woman all she wants, except the right to make her own demands in the way that men make theirs, at the ballot box. To further justify the arbitrary use of power by man it is said that women do not wish to vote.

For a hundred years and more many of the best and brightest women of the world have appealed to man for equal rights, and here, within our midst, within the week our sense of justice has been shocked by the sight of women of refinement and of brains, yes, and courage too, who in vain have plead before the courts for the smallest vestige of that right which the meanest and the vilest man may sell for whisky or for cash. If all the women in the world but one should say they did not wish to vote, they still would have no right to limit or confine that woman's life. Not all the laws that man can make could place a ballot in unwilling hands. They can give the opportunity to vote and nothing more. In all the ages of the world since man has ruled his fellow man, the weak and poor of earth have struggled, not for help, but for the liberty to help themselves.

The manifest absurdity of saying that sex is any natural bar to suffrage, drives all who seek to uphold the injustice of the present into a wider discussion of woman's sphere, and the consequences that might follow to woman should she be allowed to vote.

The rulers of the world have been ever busy in defining spheres, and making laws to keep others in these artificial spheres. The world of yesterday, with caste and custom, with chain and dungeon, divided humanity into spheres and classes, and made barbarous laws to keep them there; the world of to-morrow, grown wiser and holier, will respect and reverence every atom of the great surging sea of human life, and leave each one unfettered by custom or by law, to find its individual sphere.

The careless observer, looking over the history of the world, and seeing the position woman has ever occupied, may be excused for believing that she has been assigned a certain sphere and that it is his duty to help to keep her in it; but the student of sociology sees the reason for the present and the hope for the future.

Evolution teaches us that the man of the present had his origin, countless centuries since, in the lowest form of life that blindly grew and struggled in the sea; that during vast periods of time he developed through all the grades below, until he reached his present stage.

"A state of nature is a state of war;" the stronger animals, including man, have ever grown and flourished by devouring and trampling on the weak. Through all the ages of the past, and even in the present time, the vast majority of men and beasts have ever waged a hard and cruel fight for the barest opportunity to live. By wit and strength they have fiercely sought to obtain a spot of ground on which to stand, and the scanty food that sufficed to save their lives; those least able to maintain their place have been distanced in the long and cruel race, and left by the roadside to faint or die.

In nearly every land and age the lot of woman has been cast with that of the lowly and the weak; man has always trampled on her rights, and made her little but a slave.

Yet woman did not always occupy a position inferior to the stronger sex. The time once was, long ages since, when man and woman lived on equal terms. The first age of man upon the earth we might call the "period of brute force." At that time each struggled fiercely with the rest to gain by physical means, as now in other ways, an advantage over those with whom he dwelt. The chief pursuits of that barbarous age were those of hunting and of war.

The maternal functions and instincts of woman, which were necessary to keep the race alive, rendered her unable in this brute struggle to compete with man. In the language of Olive Schreiner, "Ages ago, the age of the 'Dominion of Muscular force,' found her, and when she stooped low to nurse her young, her back was broad, and man put his burden of subjugation upon it, and bound it with the broad band of 'inevitable necessity.'"

All the oppression, injustice, and outrage woman has suffered in the past has been due to one fact, her inability to physically contend with man. This has made her life dependent on the will of the stronger sex. Her present condition, the wrongs she suffers, the legal outrages she endures, are due to her economic dependence on man.

No man or woman ever was or can be free while they must look to others for their daily bread. Chains and whips, dungeons and racks, are but the first rude instruments that man has ever used to enslave his fellow-man. The real opportunity of the tyrant can never come until the poor and weak, upon their bended knees, must look upward to their master's face and beg him for the crust that keeps the wolf outside the door. Through the countless centuries of the past, woman, weak and poor and suffering, has knelt before her brother, man, and, with shivering form and outstretched hand, has begged him for the right to live.

For a woman to have any other ambition than marriage is to be at once considered different from the rest of her sex; to be regarded with doubt; to be called "strong-minded" and "unwomanly." "She has no right to be a man," says society. "A woman's place is at her home, in the kitchen, in the sewing-room, in the laundry. A man's place is in the senate, the pulpit, at the bar, in the office, and the store." Why? I do not know that nature ever meant it thus. If nature had made any laws upon the subject, man would long since have repealed them with his statutes. But there is abundant reason for the difference that exists to-day between the spheres of man and woman. If we go out on the plains and ask the wild savage, he can tell the reason why.

The Indian warrior shoots the game, smears his face with paint, and does the fighting for the tribe; the squaw cooks the buffalo, carries the tent and pappoose on her back, and minds the house. This division of labor was made long ages since; it was not made by the squaw, but by the noble warrior, and he enforces it, if need be, by the tomahawk and knife. Civilized, or rather semi-civilized, man learned the sphere of woman, together with many other things, from the Indian on the plain; he learned it ages since, when he was a savage too. He has forgotten much as the centuries have rolled away, but the knowledge of woman's sphere, and the way to keep her in it, is green in his memory still.

I am quite sure that the division of labor, as now observed, was not made by nature. Men can cook, and do, when the employer is willing to pay the wages they demand. Men can wash and scrub and sew, and whether nature fitted them for this or not, they always receive better wages for doing woman's work than she can get herself.

But there are occupations, commonly supposed to be beyond a woman's sphere, to which man has invited her to come. He has opened the store, the factory, and the mill, and asked her to come inside the doors; aye, he has even called her down into the mines, into the bowels of the earth, to work for him. But he has invariably invited her on one condition, that she should labor cheaper than her brother. No matter how hard or disagreeable the task, man has never yet seen any reason why woman should not perform it, if she did not charge too much.

And what has followed from all this? Let us contrast the position man and woman occupies to-day.

"Man rules the world." He sits on almost every throne. His voice, and his alone, is heard in the councils of almost every political organization on the earth. He alone makes the laws and enforces them; he makes them for himself and woman too, and enforces them on both. He moves the commerce of the earth. He owns the world and all the property therein. Nearly all the business of the world is done by men, and of course all the wealth it represents is theirs. The farms, mines, factories, and in short, almost all the industrial institutions of the world are controlled and owned by men. Here and there are found a wealthy widow, whose childless husband has left her stock or lands, or a daughter, whose father had no son to confer his goods upon, with something that they call their own, although given them by some-one else. Woman has been banished from the active field of business life. If she knows aught of the industrial institutions of to-day, it is as one of the cheapest hirelings who serve for pay.

Social customs and institutions, and even the selfishness of man, could not keep all women from the field of literature and art, for genius knows no sex and when it kindles the brain of an Eliot or a Hosmer, it illumines the earth with its radiant light. But however much woman has contributed to literature and art the world can never know the fires of genius that have been quenched, the hopes and desires that have been blighted, and the bright intellects that have been circumscribed and stunted because of the false and cruel social customs that have defined woman's sphere.

Every human being needs first of all freedom, the right to be an individual, the right to live and breathe and move and act, the right to live their lives, and make the most of their sojourn on the earth.

Life is a toilsome journey that we travel step by step. Sometimes the road is smooth and straight, and we feel the morning air upon our brow and scent the perfume sweet of buds and flowers, that are thickly strewn along our path. Again the road is steep and hard, and as we slowly journey on our way the rocks and thorns make us cry out with anguish and with pain. Sometimes a sunny sky hangs over our heads and the world seems filled with gladness and with hope; again the clouds obscure the day, the lightnings flash, the thunder rolls, and we are blinded with the fury of the storm; we know not where the road will end, it may be in a garden bright as the clouds when tintured with the sunset's rosy hue; it may be a precipice from which we step into the dark and silent sea, but this we know, in spite of hopes and fears, of desires and doubts, we must ever travel on. All true men and women desire to make this journey for themselves. It matters not how steep the way, how hard the road, how furious the storm, they had rather perish in the effort to climb the mountain height than be confined to the level plain below. They had rather journey step by step, though every foot-print that they leave behind is stained with blood, than travel in a chariot though fitted up with luxury and ease.

All laws or customs or institutions that deprive any fellow-mortal of making this journey for himself, or that take away one hope or aspiration from any traveler, man or woman; that confines or fetters or hinders in the race, must go down before the march of progress and the enlightened conscience of the world.

The prizes of this life, for which we strive, fame, money, office, honor, position, or whatever else we may consider worth the seeking, these may be hollow bubbles which will break and fade, as we reach out to clasp them in our arms. It may be that like the boy who runs to dig the golden pot on which the rainbow rests, we will find, for all our pains, only the cold damp earth at last. But these same painted bubbles that we sought have cheered us on the cold and rugged path of life, have carried us through woods and tangled ways, and over dark, miasmatic swamps, where friends and comrades fainted by our side and passed forever from our sight. What if we never reach the higher ground, we had a vision while we toiled of the mountain top above the clouds, bathed in the golden sunlight of eternal peace, and we worked and toiled and lived and died buoyed by the inspiring hope that the day would come when we should realize our heart's desires.

In the era of conscience, which all of us hope is the era of the future, man will not say to woman that she must be a lawyer, a physician, a merchant, or that she must vote, he will simply say she *may*.

Man may lose some of his gallantry and chivalry, but he will replace these

with justice and common sense. He will regard woman as an individual and leave her to work out her destiny for herself. No longer will he prescribe her sphere but leave her free and untrammelled to find out for herself where she belongs.

It may be that justice will never reign on earth; it may be that the human race, unfit for a higher life, will go back from whence it sprung, but if there ever comes a time when intellect and conscience rule the world, that day will know neither rich nor poor, neither high nor low, neither man nor woman, neither bondman nor free.

The Chairman, Mr. McMurdy, announced that Judge Henry M. Shepard, who had agreed to speak on the question, had at the last moment been taken ill and was unable to be present. But, said the Chairman, "every occasion of this kind has its Cincinnatus, and fortunately for the secretary a worthy member of this club has consented to step into the breach, and in justice to him I must say that he had no expectation of doing this until he entered the room." The Chairman then introduced as the second speaker, MR. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, who said:

While I am always delighted to have an opportunity of looking into the faces of the members of this club, yet I am doing so to-night under very embarrassing circumstances. My initials I discovered many years ago spell "SAD" and I have had hard luck ever since I found it out.

If ever I come to this club and there is a question that nobody wants to tackle, or a side of it that nobody wants to be found dead on, by unanimous consent it is assigned to me. Last year I was thrown head over heels into the discussion of the reformed ballot—against the reform. The next time I strayed in I found I had to tackle Judge Thoman on the reverse of civil service reform, and to-night—here I am.

Now when you go away from here you can sort out for yourselves how much of this is owing to the position I hold in this debate and how much to what I think.

As an abstract proposition you might say that a woman has as much right to vote as a man; so she has to wear pants; still I never was delighted to see a woman wearing them. The proposition contended for by Mr. Darrow is that men and women are equal, and the inference is that they are practically the same, and therefore there should be no difference in their rights and privileges. Men and women may be equal but they are not the same by a good deal. If there is anything on this green earth that is unlike a woman it is a man; and if there is anything that is unlike a man it is a woman. The nearer a woman gets like a man the less I join in the procession; the nearer a man gets like a woman the less I weep when he is unavoidably taken away. I adore a man; and I adore a woman; but I never like them mixed in one individual.

There is nothing on earth which a man and a woman look at from the same standpoint. There is nothing which they do equally well. I have made three or four desperate efforts to see women play base ball, but have never succeeded yet. You never knew of a question of religion or politics or social life that struck a woman's mind as it struck a man's mind. If they arrive at the same conclusion they go by a different route, and generally because one loves the other—that is the only reason they ever get together on any matter of opinion.

Of course there are large numbers of exceptions to these general statements; but I am speaking of men and women as a rule. A woman, as a rule, never stands on an equality with a man and looks him square in the eye; she either looks up to him or she looks down on him. She either has the highest respect for him or he is beneath her contempt.

A woman never ranks herself any higher than a man ranks her. I have known of individual women who thought more of themselves than of anybody; and I have known that to occur with a man sometimes; but as a class woman never has a higher opinion of herself than man has of her.

Go into any community where man considers woman a brute, and she makes him come as near telling the truth as she can. Go to any community where the woman is idealized and looked up to as an angel, with one hand upon the portals of the gates above and the other gently leading up husband or father or brother

or sweetheart, and she comes pretty near filling that position too. She acts up to the standard that man fixes for her and no higher.

What does this prove? Simply this: that man and woman are placed upon this earth to live together; to work out the common destiny of the race; but not necessarily both to be put on one end of the job at once.

The women of this country are not slaves; the few that are, are held so by brutes who would not respect the right to vote, or are held so by love which they would not give up for any other thing in the wide world. It does not seem to me that these conditions can be changed by the right of suffrage except to deteriorate.

Take a woman's position in this country to-day. I believe that the number of votes practically cast by the women is infinitely larger than we would be willing to admit. In the course of my political experience I have made several talks; but the most successful one I ever made was I believe when I made an appeal direct to the hearts of women. I believe that in politics the side of a question upon which the good women of the community range themselves is almost invariably in the end the successful one. I believe that there is no moral reform upon which the good women of this country will agree but that the men will eventually give them what they want.

Take a community where the women frown upon the drinking habit, and you will find little of it, comparatively. Where woman is indifferent whisky is plentiful.

Let us look at the other side for a moment. I am prepared to say right now—a man must have some regard for his safety, I will give in that much—whenever the good women of this country, or the large majority of them, will give bond that they will vote, I will agree to woman suffrage. Give the women the ballot tomorrow and then count the votes. There would be many who would vote the first time because of its novelty who would not bother about it afterwards. Give the women the suffrage to-morrow and do you think you would add considerably to the good voters of the town? Don't you know that practically every bad woman would vote and that nine out of ten of the good women would not? We have enough bad voters now without adding to the volume. You may say, "Oh, yes, they would vote when they were educated up to it." I tell you you cannot educate a good woman to leave her baby and go to the polls. You must make woman over again. You must change her mental structure before you will make the good woman pay as much attention to the ballot as the good men do.

Would the women gain by it? If a woman wants all a man's rights, she must give up a woman's privileges. A good many forget that. They are a good deal like the Frenchman, a Communist, who was talking about the equal distribution of property. Somebody said to him: "My good friend, that would not amount to much; it would only be two or three hundred francs." "Well," he says, "that with the six hundred francs I now have would make a nice little sum."

I am afraid that those women who look to the suffrage to help their sex are like this communist; they wish to keep all they have and get what the other fellow has also.

I remember when I was a boy, riding in a street car on Pennsylvania avenue, I saw the famous old character by the name of Beau Hickman. As we passed the corner of Ninth and Pennsylvania avenue a number of ladies got aboard, coming down from Lincoln Hall, where a Female Suffrage Convention was being held. Old Hickman, who was very stately in his way, although then in the sere and yellow leaf, was getting up to give his seat to the ladies, when some one said: "Do you know who those ladies are? they are female suffragists; they want all the rights that men have." Hickman at once popped down on his seat again, saying: "Then they have just as good a right to stand as I have."

You take from woman to-day the consideration and the care, the love and the tenderness which American men have for them, and then they will have to hustle. They can't expect to go to the polls and demand things from men and then expect this great consideration besides. Whenever a woman gets in a man's way politically, she will be treated as a man is, and her fair name for virtue and chastity and everything else will be dragged in the mire, and then God help her. You never will see and cannot reasonably expect that a woman shall go on the stump, and strike clean cut blows at men, and then have the men bow politely and say "Madam, we submit."

But as I say, I desire to leave myself safe; and if, when they understand it, they desire to go in and take it as it comes, and it comes tolerably tough sometimes, if they want to stand on a dead square equality with men, asking no odds, asking no mercy and no courtesy—I am not married, and they can try it—I don't care.

Now I don't wish to be understood as in the slightest degree casting any reflections upon those good women of this country who hold strong opinions on this subject. I know some women as pure, as kindly, as womanly as God ever made a woman, who entirely disagree with me on this subject. But the market is not overstocked with them. It takes women with the keenest intellect, the clearest mind, the unerring perception of right and wrong, to mix up with men in this squabble of politics and come out all right.

I admire women so much that I believe the less they have to do with men the better for them. Anything that my friend Mr. Darrow can say in praise of the women I will swear to; anything he may say as to the brute portion of mankind I will join in with; unfortunately it is true that some men are so mean, so low, so contemptible that they will tyrannize over women; but, thank God, they are not in a majority in this country; they are not in a majority in any one precinct.

My friend Darrow says that man is willing that a woman should do a man's work, if she will do it cheaper. The only reason that a woman does not receive as much pay as a man is that she does not kick so hard about it. The moment that women will organize they will not need the ballot in order to defeat any who would oppress them. Let them quit selling dry goods behind the counters until they get more money; let them quit making dresses until they are better paid; and it would soon remedy that matter; but woman is not made that way. As soon as one woman quits work there would be 200 of her sisters after it. The reason woman works for low wages is that she will not stand by her sister and help her.

Now that is the extent of my objection to woman suffrage. In the first place it may be true but I do not believe that the amenities of political life would not injure her. Mark those words; they are mine: amenities of political life.

In the second place I do not believe, except as a fad to be used for a short time and then dropped, that any large number of American women would vote.

Thirdly, I believe that on the average two bad women would vote where one good woman would; and I think the bad elements of society are sufficiently represented in our common council as it is.

My fourth reason is that woman must not expect to keep all she now has and take what man has besides. She must stand on a dead level with man. I think mentally and physically constituted as she is she would lose in the trade.

Gentlemen, I must apologize for the fragmentary way in which I have presented my views, my excuse being that I was thrown into the breach to stem the torrent of eloquence from my friend Mr. Darrow, and I have done my best. I thank you.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

MR. WALTER THOMAS MILLS: I appreciate the great difficulty in arguing with a woman. But it is not as difficult as it is to argue with a man who is opposed to woman suffrage.

We are told that women ought not to vote because they are different from men. If they were not different from men there would be some reason in urging that they ought not to vote. If all classes of society are represented by one half and completely represented, and the other half is just like them, there would be no great injustice in withholding the right to vote; but when it is admitted that woman is very different from man we give away the whole case, for we assert that a portion of the community differing greatly from the remainder should legislate for all.

The second objection urged is that if she asks for the rights of man she must relinquish the privileges of woman; for instance, the magnificent privilege of having all the gentlemen in a Chicago street car spring up at once the moment a lady enters.

There is no such thing as giving to the women that which already belongs to them; it may be placed in their possession; it may be restored to them, but you cannot give them that which is already theirs. If women have been accorded any rights in the past it has either been because men have recognized the justice of their claim, or else it is a privilege she can well afford to surrender.

Women go to work differently at a given subject, they look at things differently, more largely than any other reason I believe because they have been treated differently. They have

been placed in the position throughout human history that to obtain the thing they desire it must be done through the convictions of those whom they know, or by the courtesy of some one else, or by indirection. If it be true that a large number of women already vote indirectly, and that the most telling speech ever delivered by a great political orator was an appeal to the ladies to go home and buldoze their husbands into voting their way, then I object to the whole process. If they are permitted to do this by indirection I think it would be fairer all round to have them go directly to the ballot box, and not impose upon their weaker brethren the task of registering their desires at the polls.

Another argument is that woman should not be given the ballot because she cannot carry the bayonet. It is assumed that where a difference of opinion between great communities results in war woman cannot bear her part.

Away back at the end of the little short passage way where my life commences I can see a picture up in the Adirondack mountains in New York. It was out in the yard in front of a hunter's cabin; there was a man and wife and three or four children, and a little child two weeks old in the house. There were many tears, a sad parting, and then a man walked down the pathway and passed into the woods out of sight. I was one of those children and the man who had gone down the pathway was my father. My mother turned to explain to us that he had gone to the war. We did not then know what it meant to go to the war, but we lived long enough, some of us, to find out some of the things it involved. My father went to the war. He was in the Peninsular Campaign. He was at Gettysburg and Antietam; he came back from that war with a broken life: he has suffered all these years and is suffering still, but he left up in the Adirondack mountains in that hunter's cabin, a family in a community where so many men had gone to the war that there were not enough to hold the offices—he left that home with that little woman with that family of little children, to strive and to struggle to keep that home over their heads, and with all the campaigns, with all the forced marches, the broken health, and the suffering, then and since, I believe that not one tithe of the sorrows, not one tithe of the burdens, was borne by my father compared with what my mother bore. And yet the man who bears the lesser burden is to be given the ballot while she who bears the greater is to be denied that right, because bearing those burdens she does not bear the bayonet as well.

There is one more point made and that is that "my wife can't get time to leave the baby in order to vote." Now my wife has no baby. Brother Douglas' wife has no baby either. Where did this power of voting come from? Historically the church removed itself from the idea of a divinely appointed monarch before the state did. The church moved out into local self government, government by the ballot, while all the world was still talking of the divine right of kings. The woman finds time to vote in the church; in fact she does most of the voting. They find time to attend to that; and the experiment has been so successful that there are very few churches to-day where the woman is not fully enfranchised.

GEN. MILO S. HASCALL: The remarkably well turned periods of the advocates of woman suffrage have somewhat dazed me.

I may be very ungallant when I say that it would not be just the thing for women to vote; not that I have anything against the women, for I yield to no one in my admiration for their sex—but I do think that God has made some things to suit Himself. I do think He has arranged some things according to His own notions, and it seems to me it would be a very good idea to recognize those differences, and be satisfied with them.

Thank God here and on all occasions that there is a difference between men and women. I would not deprive woman of any of her rights, but I would protect her in her purity and her beauty, that we may have something to look forward to after the trials and tribulations of life. I do not think it is right to put this question on the basis of abstract right and justice. The question is what would be best for both? Unlike Mr. Douglas, I am a married man and know something of the desires and wishes of women, and there are very few among my acquaintance who would care to vote if they had the ballot. They regard the tie that binds them as a willing one, and they would not throw it off that they might engage in the turmoil of political life, for anything in the world. Unless it can be demonstrated that men are trying to do them injustice I do not think it is worth while to agitate the subject. It would be the lower element rather than the higher that would vote and we have enough of that in politics now.

I believe the women are abundantly able to take care of themselves and that they exert a great influence now—a greater influence than they would if they were voters.

This is not so much a question of abstract right and justice as it is of good common sense. We find things work nicely as they are; there are very few women who desire to vote; and I have not seen one of them that I would care to be on very intimate relations with. Give me a woman

who is willing to be a woman; who will give us a home where we can retire free from the squabbles and strife of political life.

JUDGE MURRAY F. TULEY: About a year ago I had the pleasure of discussing the question of ballot reform with you, and on that occasion my Brother Douglas opposed ballot reform in just as felicitous a manner and called forth just as many hearty laughs as he has to-night, in discussing woman suffrage; but in one short year ballot reform has come in the passage of the Australian law, a reform that has accomplished more for the purification of our elections than all the legislation of the past half century.

I advocated that reform chiefly for the reason that it would tend to purify elections. I now advocate woman suffrage for the same reason that it will tend to purify our elections.

Every movement in which women co-operate takes a higher moral plane than when men alone are engaged in it.

The best argument against woman suffrage that I ever heard is that women will not exercise the privilege of voting if given the ballot; and that a woman should not have to pass through the perils she would have to undergo in approaching the polls to cast her ballot. I ask you what injury, physical or moral, could come to any woman going up to the polls as you went last Tuesday?

What is the power to vote? What is suffrage? It is a device to ensure good government. The ballot is given to those who it is assumed will wield it for the public good. Can you not trust the women to do that?

I was asked some years ago whether I was in favor of women being appointed on the School Board. I said I was for the reason that they were as capable as men and had more time to give to the duties of the position; and because they were more honest than men; and also because the world moves. And the world does move.

Twenty or twenty-five years ago a woman was a veritable slave; she had no property rights; she had practically no personal rights; she had no rights that a man was bound to respect. What gigantic strides have been made since then! She enjoys the right of suffrage in all the states and territories except nineteen to a greater or less degree at this very moment. Mostly upon school questions, it is true, but in the State of Wyoming women have voted ever since it was organized as a territory. She exercises the right of suffrage in municipal elections in Kansas, she exercises the right of suffrage in municipal elections in England, in Scotland and in Wales, and yet it is said the women do not want to vote. Why women want to vote is, because they feel it is their right to vote. I heard the same arguments during slavery times that the slaves did not want freedom.

Men and women are born of the same mothers; they are born with equal rights; why is that the women have lost that right? Because the men have usurped the exclusive power or voting.

It is said that the men will protect the women. How have they protected them? Look at the penalties inflicted by your laws for offenses against women and blush for shame; look on your statute books as they stood until the last few years, and see how the rights of women as to their own property and their own earnings have been protected, and blush for shame.

The right of women to vote is the necessary consequence of the doctrine of free government. It is the necessary outcome of our republican government founded upon the doctrine of equality. It is said that there are certain inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Our declaration of independence tells us that it is a right common to all and that government is instituted for the purpose of protecting those rights, deriving all its just powers from the consent of the governed—not the consent of property owners, not the consent of a few, but from the consent of all the people who are governed.

Women want to vote because they have property interests to be protected; because they have personal rights to be protected, and because you cannot trust one class to legislate for another.

The women cry out for justice; they cry out for the recognition of their rights as members of society; and the time is coming, and many here will live to see it, when women will freely exercise the right to vote.

It is said it will demoralize the women to vote. Does it demoralize the men? Does it demoralize you? Is there any law written or unwritten that requires a woman to engage in the disreputable part of politics? I know of none. If you can protect your own morals, can you not trust the women to protect theirs?

Who makes us the guardian of the morals of our women? Why not let women work out their own salvation in that regard? The women can protect themselves, never fear.

But it is said the bad women will vote. Are the bad women the intelligent women? Was

it the bad women who flocked to register a week ago Tuesday? I think not. I can name you scores and scores of the first women of this city who went to the polls to register. Are those women less mothers than they were; are they worse housewives than they were, because they tried to exercise that right?

These are the same old arguments that have been brought time and time again against the higher education of women. Yet is there an intelligent man to-day who would throw the slightest obstacle in the way of women securing the most thorough education possible?

MR. JAMES ABBOTT: The character of this discussion is not entirely satisfactory to me in that it is a somewhat jug-handled affair, but Mr. Douglas, the chief of the obstructionists, gave us the groundwork of his argument.

One of his points was that when women will give bond that they will vote he is willing they should have the privilege. I am not so young but that I remember when four millions of the people of the United States were given their freedom. Did they give a bond before they got it? I further remember when the colored population of the South were given the right to vote. No bond was given that they would exercise it. But when it is proposed that women shall vote then we must have a bond for the faithful performance of the contract. I deny that we have the right to impose any such obligation when the women demand of us that which is their inalienable right.

The fact, if it is a fact, that they do not want to vote has nothing to do with the question. The same thing was said of the negroes of the south, that they didn't want to vote, but they were given the right to vote whether they wanted it or not. They were given it because at that time it was considered their right. If the women have the right to vote, shall we withhold that right because, forsooth, some of their sex do not want to exercise it?

Another point made is that women will deteriorate if allowed to vote. If that is so, if she is to be degraded by exercising the privilege of the ballot, if her character will be gone, then I would inquire what are we men voting for? If it is degrading for her, why not for us? If it is so degrading to cast a ballot it seems to me that the only happy, elevated, pure and angelic beings in the United States are Chinamen, Indians, criminals, lunatics, idiots and women.

There is another reason why women should exercise the privilege of the ballot, and in stating this I may say that I am not a candidate for any office, otherwise I might not be so brash in making the assertion—it is a mere matter of expediency—it has nothing to do with the right of this question—it is this: I believe if the women of America were given the ballot they would down the saloon in politics. I do not think the saloon keepers would receive the support of the women, and that then they would not do as they do now, run the machine.

MR. CHARLES SHACKLEFORD: It seems to me that we are going mad on the subject of suffrage in the United States. We are trying to divest woman of the glory, the beauty and the gentleness with which the Almighty clothed her when He created her.

It is idle to say that woman is not heard in the administration of government. One of our greatest thinkers, a great general, and one of the greatest men of our time, has said: "The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world." The voice of woman is heard through her husband, or her brother, and this attempt to drag her from the beauty and seclusion of home life into the filth of political battle is an attempt to degrade her and divest her of her natural charms, of her natural rights and influence over man.

If woman is accorded the right to vote then the one hundred thousand females in excess of males in Connecticut could elect women to fill all the offices. It would be a beautiful example of petticoat government. Just think of it, female policemen! The man is left at home to suckle the baby out of a patent suckling bottle, while the wife parades the beat to arrest burglars and other criminals upon the streets.

Now there is no natural right of suffrage. We have too many men voting now. This attempt to extend the ballot to women will not benefit us.

It is said the women would vote against the saloons. You would find as many women voting for saloons as the men; the wives of saloonkeepers; the wives of men who love liquor.

The women of the world in the aggregate are no better than the men of the world, for the women of the world make the characters of the men who rule it. The wants of the women and the voice of the women is expressed by the husband and the brother and father in the exercise of suffrage.

The voice of woman is heard. One of the most amusing things I ever read was Petroleum V. Nasby's account of how he left the Whig party. He said that his mother always did the voting, allowing the old man to go through the manual labor of casting the ballot.

This forcing the exercise of the suffrage on woman has behind it motives which have not received the consideration they should have had.

MR. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS: Mr. Abbott quoted my remark that if the women would give bond to vote I would be in favor of it; of course I didn't mean that they should go before Judge Tuley and actually sign a bond; I meant if we could be assured of it. He said in reply that the colored people of the South didn't give bond that they would vote. Well, I want to say, without introducing any politics, that I have not been hugely delighted with the result of the colored people voting in the South.

Judge Tuley called attention to the gigantic strides made by woman in the last twenty-five years. He forgot to say, however, that those gigantic strides had been made without women having the ballot. They had been made by the votes of men.

How will women deteriorate by mixing in politics? Do you deteriorate, the judge asks. What harm do you get, he asks, by going into that booth and casting your ballot? If the judge has ever seen one of the boys after he has been mixing politics and lake water all day celebrating Alderman Mulholland's election, he knows where some of the deterioration comes in. Of course if every little woman would toddle off and vote and then toddle back and rock, she would escape much of the deterioration, but voting is not all of politics, and it isn't all done in the day time.

Man is not of the fineness of structure that a woman is. Take some cheap restaurant china and it is not as good as that you find at Kinsley's, but it does not break as easily either. The more delicate the organization the easier broken. You can't spoil a man quite as easily as you can a woman. A woman always makes me think in her moral nature of what Emory A. Storrs said about eggs; there is no such thing as a middling good egg. There is no such thing as a middling good woman. There is a middling good man. Let a man and woman embark upon the immoralities of life; let them spend the same time in the accomplishment; and there will be a great difference when they come out. You may argue there is no moral difference. You may say so; but there is a moral difference in the man who has sinned and the woman who has sinned, and when you live with them you will find it out. The high strung poetic temperament in man or woman is more easily spoiled than that of the heavy weight average man. Man never reaches as high as the pure, good woman and he never gets so low as a woman can fall.

I never knew a woman to elevate a disreputable business. I have known a woman to keep a saloon. It didn't help the saloon, whatever it may have done for the woman. Let a woman run a gambling house, and there will be just as many false cards turned, and a few more.

There is not one woman in ten thousand who can do exact justice between two men. Here are Jones and Smith living side by side. There is a quarrel about clothes lines. Mrs. Jones will be in the wrong and her husband will know it but he will stand by her. But if the husbands get into a row, although her husband may be ever so much in the wrong Mrs. Jones will never see it. Her husband is always right. A woman never holds the scales of justice even between her husband and another man, and the other man is left.

MR. C. S. DARROW: This is a question that ought to be settled on general principles. We have been told this evening by the opponents of woman suffrage what is the best kind of a woman, what they think is woman's proper business, a woman's duties, and what makes a woman lovely and all that. One gallant gentleman says that he does not know any women who want to vote, although he is familiar with their sex, and would not want to know any woman who desired to vote. I don't know what kind of women the gentleman is acquainted with, but if they are women who have no ideas above such as are usually found in drawing-room or kitchen talk, then perhaps he is acquainted with just such women as he ought to be, and would not appreciate a broad-minded woman, with sense and intellect, if he happened to meet her. Very likely in that society man chooses those who with the countless wiles that men have allowed women to use, have told him he was good looking when he was not; have told him he was smart when he was foolish; have told him he was great when he was small.

There are other gentlemen who say the women should stay at home instead of voting. Is it for you or any other man to say to a woman that she shall stay at home and rock the cradle; that is her business. We may say that we do not choose to do it but who has the right to say that a woman's whole life, her whole energy and spirit, shall be circumscribed by the four walls of her home? No woman can be great, or grand, or a fit companion for even the gallant General, who had no ideas beyond the four walls of her home.

All the arguments or alleged arguments that have been advanced to-night and that are always advanced against woman occupying these positions grow from the desire of men for flattery. They come from men who like to say pleasant things, largely lies, to women, and like

to have women tell them pleasant lies in return. And both know they are lies. They do not reach the true basis of this question, and all other sociological questions, that no human being should be his brother's keeper; that in this world of doubt and trouble, of toil and strife, it is enough for any one man or any one woman to take care of themselves, and choose their own spheres without setting limits to the life of any other.

We are told that if the good women vote so will the bad ones. I hope so. Why not? All men vote. Why not all women? Sometimes bad men vote more intelligently than good ones, and very likely sometimes bad women will vote more intelligently than good ones.

I am not one of those who desire to see the women vote that they may vote in prohibition, for I don't believe in it. I don't believe in the saloon, but I believe in something better than prohibition, and that is human liberty. You can only make great men and great women by giving free scope to their individuality, and with fear and suffering let them work out their own destiny.

This is an abominable doctrine that a woman cannot be a little bad and still very good. There is not a human being, man or woman, who may not be a little bad and still very good.

And it is just possible too that the bad women ought to be protected. I submit to the gentleman, the police prosecutor of this city, that, if the bad women of this city had a hand in the making of the laws, sometimes the men who frequent those houses of ill repute might be fined as heavily as the inmates.

We are told that women crowd into the different walks of life and lower the wages of their sisters. Why? Because from the earliest ages women have been taught that their only fate was to tie themselves to some man, and if they could not do that to sell their life perhaps as the only alternative. And therefore when woman has desired to avoid either of these things she has been forced to overcrowd those occupations, to bid against her sister, and in turn to bid against her brother. Leave the world open, give her an equal opportunity with man; and do not fear that the laws of nature will not be strong enough to determine what woman's sphere properly is. The law of natural selection and of sexual selection is stronger than any human law.

It is said here that the women of Germany raise corn to support their brothers on the field of battle; perhaps if the women of Germany had the right to vote they would call their brothers back from the field of battle, and inaugurate an era of peace and good will among the nations of the earth.

The inventions of the past fifty years have made it possible for the weakest woman or child to perform labors that were once impossible to the strongest man. The work of to-day is not done by bone and muscle; it is done by machines. All over the world work in all departments of industry is done by women and children and can be done by them as well as by the men.

It is not for us to say that women must do this or that; we must recognize that they are human beings like ourselves. There was a time in the history of this world when it was generally believed that woman had no soul. Of course it was assumed that men had, as the only way to prove it. We have passed that period and let us hope the time will soon come when we shall say to women "You may find your own proper mission for yourselves. We will not fear you in the race of life. We will give you equal opportunity and in the great struggle for existence will trust that the strongest may come out ahead."

Adjourned.

JOSEPH W. ERRANT,
Secretary.

THIRTY-NINTH MEETING.

DECEMBER 17, 1891.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-ONE PRESENT.

SUBJECT:

THE EIGHT-HOUR DAY.

Chairman: Mr. FRANKLIN MACVEAGH.

ADDRESSES BY:

Mr. WILLIAM M. SALTER.

Mr. MURRY NELSON.

GENERAL DISCUSSION BY:

Mr. Franklin MacVeagh,
Prof. Charles Orchardson,
Mr. George A. Schilling,
Mr. E. O. Brown,
Mr. Frederick Greeley,
Mr. Julius Rosenthal,

Mr. Sidney C. Eastman,
Mr. George Hornstein,
Mr. C. S. Darrow.
Mr. Z. S. Holbrook,
Mr. E. P. Langworthy.
Mr. Frank H. Scott.

THE SUNSET CLUB,

CHICAGO.

*Thirty-Ninth Meeting, held at the Grand Pacific, Thursday Eve., December 17, 1891.—
One Hundred and Forty-one present.*

The Secretary introduced Mr. FRANKLIN MACVEAGH as the chairman of the evening.

THE EIGHT HOUR DAY

was announced as the subject for discussion.

In introducing the first speaker, MR. WILLIAM M. SALTER, the Chairman said:

I cannot forget that I shall not again probably have this pleasure while he is a citizen of Chicago. This is a great expanding community; all of its vacant places seem easily filled; no one seems necessary to it; we are so soon forgot in this surging throng, this highly vitalized city, when we are gone; and yet we can ill afford to lose from our midst such a rare preacher of the moralities as Mr. Salter, and I have great pleasure in associating myself with him on all occasions.

MR. WILLIAM M. SALTER: In the few moments I have to speak this evening, I should like to get as near the gist of the question as possible. It is a side issue, whether an eight-hour working day should be or can be got by legislation; I very much doubt whether it can be, or, even if it could be, whether this would be the most desirable method to take; and I can conceive of those who distrust legislation and the state altogether, yet favor such a reduction of the hours of labor. Another unessential point is just how far the working hours shall be reduced. Few practical persons, I suppose, think of going below eight hours, at least at present; and it may well be that an abrupt change to that figure is impossible. I have even heard that some of the leaders in the eight-hour agitation a few years ago did not expect to actually secure eight hours, but asked a good deal for the sake of getting anything at all. As this is not an agitation meeting to-night, we have no motive for saying anything we do not exactly mean. The real question, I take it, before us is, would it be well to have the hours of labor reduced below the present ten-hour level? Now I will say at once, why I favor a reduction of the hours of labor—it is that the workmen may have a chance to come nearer living the life of human beings. If we hold that the only purpose of man's being here is work, (i. e. manual work), then of course we should have no quarrel with existing conditions; we should rather welcome back the "good old times" when mill-hands worked twelve and thirteen hours a day. But if we believe that man has a spiritual nature—made up of a mind that can think, of affections that should be cultivated, and of sensibilities to what is beautiful—if, in other words, we lend any sort of credence to the old saying that man is made in the image of the Divine and hence hold that he is to realize something of the Divine in his life here on the earth, then we cannot wish that his whole time, aside from eating and sleeping, and perchance a little recreation, shall be taken up by manual labor. It may be said, of course, that the workmen do not want shorter hours for a reason like this; that they simply

want to do less work and to have more time in which to do as they please; but I think we do a grave injustice to many workmen in thinking this their entire motive—and in any case, I am not speaking for the workmen, but for myself. As an abstract proposition I say that persons, save in the rarest cases, who use their muscles for ten hours in the day cannot live the life of human beings. They may not live it, if they work for eight hours; all I say is, they have more chance of living it—they will not become quite so tired, they will be in some degree fresher and can to some better advantage read a book or look at a picture or listen to or take part in some stimulating discussion. The true life of human beings is perhaps an ideal for us all: none of us quite reach it; but some are much nearer to it than others; at least some have much more opportunity than others, and if they do not reach it is in that degree their own fault, and what I ask is that everyone should have some opportunity, and none be debarred, as, to speak roughly, almost our whole working class is now. An eight hour day or a nine hour day, is simply so much more of a chance—that is all; and if we will not give men a chance till we are sure that they will use it, we commit the same folly which Macaulay rebuked in saying that "if men are to wait for freedom until they have become good and wise in slavery, they will wait forever."

But how is it possible for the world to get on if the laborer works fewer hours—how can all its needs be met if production is to this extent limited? The answer is in inquiring whether fewer hours do necessarily mean a limitation of production. This is a question of history and fact. There are two things to be taken into account: the first is labor-saving invention or machinery. A few years ago it was stated that about 160,000 persons were employed in spinning and weaving in our cotton factories; and yet, if the old spinning-wheel and hand loom were still used, 16,000,000 of persons, it was estimated, would be required to produce the cotton goods actually manufactured. It by no means follows, then, that because the laborer works less, less will be produced; the difference may be more than made up (made up a dozen times over) by the appropriation of nature's forces and the progress of inventions. It would seem a part of the natural order of things that as machinery comes into extensive use, the necessity for labor should be diminished and the leisure of the workman be greater. A Greek poet of the time of Cicero hailed the discovery of the water mill for the grinding of corn as a means of freeing the female slaves (whose task it had been to do this by hand) and of bringing in the golden age. A modern poet, seized with the same inspiration, says in the name of steam:

"I've no muscle to weary, no breast to decay,
No bones to be laid on the shelf,
And soon I intend you may go and play,
While I manage the world myself."

Of course, what might thus be expected has not been realized; and John Stuart Mill doubted if all the mechanical inventions yet made had lightened the day's toil of any human being. Steam and machinery have benefited the workmen as consumers, but very little, if any, as producers; they have made things cheaper, and have, as Mill said, enabled a larger working population to exist; but they have not contributed to enable the workman to raise his intellectual and moral level as they might have done, and as, let us trust, they still will do. When machinery is introduced into any business, all of those employed in it ought to have some benefit therefrom; the heavy weight of the world's toil ought to be so far lightened—not that the workman should have all the benefit and the consuming public none, but that he should share with the consumer in the benefit, and not be absolutely no better off than now. The very least that machinery ought to do and could do when introduced into any hive of industry, is to shorten the working hours there; it might and really ought, in addition, to raise wages, unless the employer wishes to give all the benefit to the consumer. At present, so-called "labor-saving" machinery does not save labor at all for the workman; it simply saves the employer the necessity of hiring him. But however this may be, it is obvious that with the possibility of improved machinery fewer hours does not necessarily mean restricted production, which is all I started out to say.

The second fact is that workingmen may actually do as much in shorter hours as in longer ones. Along in the sixties and seventies, hours were reduced in the factories of Massachusetts from 13 to 11 and 10; and statistical reports say

that there was even an increase of production after the change. It is not difficult to understand this. There is a limit to the number of hours anyone can work (either with his hands or his brain) and work well; and if he overworks one day, he will not do any of his work so well the next, even during those first hours when he would ordinarily have freshness and vigor. And yet what holds of a reduction to 10 hours may not hold of a reduction to 8 or 9. It is of course a question that only experience can settle, and a very sober writer (John Rae) has been recently giving the results of his investigations as to this particular point in one of the English magazines. They are to the effect that when we go below the 10 hour limit, to reductions to $9\frac{1}{2}$, 9 and $8\frac{3}{4}$ hours, we still find by experience that the tenth hour can be dispensed with advantageously, as well as the eleventh or the twelfth. He gives instances of agricultural implement makers, whose hours were reduced from $58\frac{1}{2}$ a week to 54, and who yet earned equally good wages on old piecework prices. He tells of what happened in our own country in New York State a few years ago, when 74 strikes, chiefly in the building, iron and tobacco trades, were successful, the men asking for 8 hours and getting 9. Employers had estimated that they would have to hire 1,000 more hands and increase their pay roll to correspond, but they found on experience that shortening the hours made no difference whatever; they employed no new hands and paid nothing more in wages; the old staff merely did the same work in the shorter day. There is an equally interesting fact about the reduction of hours in one of the U. S. armories in 1868; it seems that the average earnings of 1,212 piece workers under the 10 hour system had been \$2.60 a day for a certain month, and for another, under the 8 hour system, the average was \$2.88. Judge Altgeld, in a valuable paper on this subject states that one of the large stock-yards employers in our city admitted (after the failure of the 8 hour strike a few years ago) that if the strike had been for 9 hours instead of 8, they would have accomplished as much in 9 hours as they formerly had in 10. There seems thus good reason to believe that the hours of labor might be reduced below the present point, without injuring production.

In any special case, the result can perhaps only be learned by experiment. It was a surprise to me to learn that individual firms or businesses have experimented, without waiting for all others in competition with them to act in the same way. There are such facts as these, taken from Massachusetts statistical reports: Out of 31 establishments in that state for the manufacture of arms and ammunition, 5 have adopted the short day, though the rest have not; so "eight hours" is the rule in 17 out of 255 ship building yards, in 35 out of 547 printing and bookbinding firms, in 36 out of 217 tobacco factories, in 28 out of 2,582 metal working shops, in 30 out of 2,257 boot and shoe factories, in 10 out of 3,334 building firms and so on in 32 different branches of industry. In the language of Mr. Rae, "It seems an obvious conclusion that when so many establishments have found the way to make short hours pay in the face of the overwhelming competition of their long hour neighbors, there can be no essential reason why the rest should not make short hours pay likewise."

And yet undoubtedly co-operation makes things easier. The fact that other competing firms did not yield the 8 hour day in 1886, when some Chicago establishments did, made it harder for our Chicago firms and compelled (or seemed to compel) some of them to give it up. Mr. Armour is reported to have said that he was heart and soul in favor of the reduction of hours, but that the Knights of Labor must induce his competitors at other points to adopt the system before he could maintain it. Mr. Armour builds mission chapels; he is a generous man—did it not occur to him that he might have labored with his competitors to this end?—for he would have done so with far more chance of success than the Knights could have had. Does this sound unbusinesslike? But why should a man not show a little charity inside of his business as well as outside of it? Why should a man not labor with his competitors for something which if all did in common, none would be the losers by, while the workingman would richly gain? What the world wants, to lift it to a new level, is voluntary and yet united and brotherly action—brotherhood among employers, brotherhood among workingmen, yes, a grander, all inclusive brotherhood of all.

The Chairman introduced as the second speaker, MR. MURRY NELSON, who said:

While it is true that there are two sides to every question, I feel impelled to say that I am not on this side to-night from any particular choice of my own. The fact of it is your secretary said it was a vital necessity, and while I have usually been able to flock with some degree of ability, I have found more trouble on this occasion by reason of having to appear for the time being to be opposed to my teacher and friend. I shall now simply ask you in advance after listening to the very able paper of our friend to consider things rather as they are for the time being, than as they ought to be. The Chairman knows that it is not my habit to read anything; in fact I am a poor reader, whatever I may be as a speaker, but I am sufficiently familiar with this audience to know that it is well to have a record, and simply for my own protection I wish to make this record.

As I understand this question no one sets himself up as unqualifiedly against the Eight Hour Day. The matter is one of present expediency only. As far as I know we are a unit on not working more than we are obliged to. Of course I don't mean that we are shirks, or that we do not take interest in our work, but that we don't work just for the pleasure of the work in and of itself.

Our work is as a rule, and certainly ought to be, a means and not an end. That end is the advancement of the race, the making of better men and women. So we should not work any longer time than is sufficient for the attaining of that end. But before we cut down the hours of the working day another notch let us be sure that we are taking a step towards the advancement of the race.

The question is not a new one. The working day has been cut down before. The real question is whether it is now time to cut it down again or not. I am expected to represent the conservative side.

Reducing the hours is equivalent to increasing the pay, and the demand for labor may not warrant the increase in wages or the decrease in the hours of labor.

The luxuries of one age are the necessities of the next and it is elemental to say that the supply must increase with the demand. We cannot say that the increased power of production has increased so much faster than the demand for the product, that the hours of labor can be lessened one-fifth and still enable the production to satisfy the demand.

Fixing the rate of 10 hours pay for 8 hours work is arbitrary, and will fail unless it is a fact that the old 10 hours pay for 10 hours work was not sufficient. No interference by statute or regulation can be sustained in the labor market, or any other market, against the law of supply and demand.

In all these questions we should seek for the proper mean between competition and co-operation, and anyone who forgets the value of each, and the necessity of each to the life of mankind, will go astray very widely in attempting to solve problems in political economy.

It is right for labor to band together to further its interests and protect its rights; but when men band together and say to an outside individual, "You must do this or must not do that; you must not work for such a man, or you must not work more than so many hours a day," then the world will rightly call upon such an organization to give good reasons why it interferes with the individual. When the rights of individuals are abridged at the instance of the community, or especially at the instance of portions of the community, the burden lies on the ones seeking to abridge such individual rights to prove the necessity for the change.

Under a Republican government, in a free country, in a government by the people, the largest liberty of mind and body demands that every man and woman should absolutely own and control his own time. The health and general good of the laborer requires that he should be allowed absolute freedom as to the number of his hours of work.

There can be no greater tyranny and oppression than limiting or increasing the hours of labor against the will of the laborer.

The right must be admitted of every man to dispose of his labor as he would his lands or money as he may deem best, for time is money when put into labor, and the amount of money earned is only limited by the time.

The question as to how the laborer will spend his leisure time, gained by

shorter hours, is important, and it is difficult to say whether he will spend it in outdoor exercise, visiting museums or art galleries; or whether he will spend it in idleness or dissipation.

A good workman will value both wages and time highly and will spend them accordingly. Leisure time may make a good workman better, and may make a bad workman worse.

Putting it in a nut-shell, the time of a working day ought not to be limited. That is, if a man wishes to work over time he ought to be allowed to do so. Men are not equal and what is a hard day's work for one man may be an easy day's work for another. Because one man is twice as strong as another and works with half as much effort, that is no reason for cutting off his right hand in order that his weaker brother may not be at a disadvantage.

It seems to me that this question is not so very important after all, for we have the eight-hour day widely in operation at present in many different places, and apparently satisfactory to a good many people. At any rate payment by the hour or the piece may settle any difficulty in a large number of cases.

I have spoken of the tyranny which would prevent a man from disposing of his time to another as seems fit to him, providing that the agreement between them does not infringe on the rights of others. It is contrary to all good policy, contrary to law, and will, I believe, on a fair understanding of the conditions of life, be abandoned. Mind you, I would not do away with the organization and co-operation of labor, either in the management of its time or wages, but it must leave to the individual the absolute right to do as he pleases with his own.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

The Chairman, Mr. FRANKLIN MACVEAGH: I have not thought it proper to express my views of this question, being chairman, but it may be one small contribution to the facts to say that in the wholesale merchandise business ten hours has for a long time been the regulation for manual labor. I have tried the experiment during the past two years of nine hours, and I am obliged to say that to the best of my knowledge and belief it has not cost my firm a penny. I mention this that it may possibly encourage other wholesale merchants here to try the experiment themselves. I was led to try this experiment from practical considerations. When I came here a good many years ago and started the business in which I am now the men who were employed in our house, in the manual labor, lived very near to our place of business, and they could very well get there at seven o'clock in the morning and stay until six in the evening and still not spend a great deal more time in getting to and from their homes. But with the growth of the city these men were pressed back into the outskirts of the city, and with the sort of intramural transportation that now obtains it was forced upon my mind that, if these men had children who went to bed when they ought to go, they would never see them except on Sunday, and I thought if it did not cost too much I would at any rate cut the time down one hour and give them a chance of one hour with their family; and it has been gratifying to me to know that thus far it has not cost a single penny so far as my investigation goes.

PROF. CHARLES ORCHARDSON: The chairman says that he was led to experiment for practical reasons. I beg to differ with him. It was from a natural nobility of heart. If employers were all like him society would be so civilized that six hours would be the normal day's work. But he is one of the noble exceptions.

Mr. Nelson says on the one hand, that all men are a unit in not desiring to do more manual labor than they have to, and on the other hand, that a workman should not be compelled to work any less than he wishes to. That is a contradiction in terms. He further says that eight hours labor would not satisfy the demand for production; that the demand increases in proportion to our ability to produce. I deny that. There are thousands of plants lying idle and hundreds of thousands of idle workmen willing and ready to run them. Every improvement in machinery lessens the amount of wages necessary to be paid to the wage slaves. Factories are shut down to prevent them producing what the people need, in order that the manufacturers may make a profit on what they do sell. We are sometimes told, on the other hand, that there is over-production. Over-production, when thousands are crying out for the necessities of life! It is a fact that production is limited to the amount of wages paid, and when inventive genius makes one man able to do the former work of twenty, it avails little for the masses so long as those means of production are in the hands of the few.

In regard to the eight hour question, there is such a thing as vital energy. If a man works with his hands eight hours a day he may not work to exhaustion, and if he is a temperate man

his sleep, food, rest and recreation will recuperate him so that his vital energy will be exactly where it was the morning before. Hammond, the physician, of New York, has demonstrated that a healthy workman can replace all the worn-out tissue in the twenty-four hours when he does not work to exhaustion, but if he does work to exhaustion, whether in eight hours or ten hours, then the vital energy can not be exactly placed where it was before and he will be incapable of doing as much work on the following day. When you do not work to exhaustion your body is capable of greater things even than before; but when you do it is weakened permanently.

We have heard to-night about government by the people. It is doubtful if we have that to-day. It is rather a government by plutocrats. They do not need to buy individuals; they can buy legislatures more cheaply.

Mr. Salter said that workmen should live the life of human beings. Why should not all men work? Why should there be any drones? The directors of industry are workmen, only of a much more valuable kind to the community. Why should we have an aristocracy of idleness?

The first speaker said that practical persons do not think of going below eight hours. Then those who know what machinery is capable of, and what proper organization would accomplish, are not practical men.

MR. GEO. A. SCHILLING: I am not an orthodox eight hour man. I am a short hour man. I think the time will come when humanity will regard eight hours as entirely too long to work. But I do think that in the present state of economic development the eight hour day is what we should make the contest for. And we should make it with the greatest amount of judgment necessary for its introduction with the least amount of friction and cost to our industrial organism. It is true, as Mr. Salter said, that the leaders in 1886 did not expect to get all they started out for but thought it necessary to make that fight and get all they could. As I happened to be actively engaged in that struggle for the eight hour day perhaps I can support Mr. Salter in that position. Our worthy chairman in his lecture before the Economic Conferences stated his belief that the statesmanship of the leaders in that contest was very poor; but the trouble was as it usually is in great struggles, the generals had ordered the attack, and the minor officers and the rank and file had to do the best they could. It was the defeat that justified the chairman in stating that our statesmanship was at fault; had we been successful the judgment would have been a different one. But it was from that very failure that I believe a great amount of common sense was injected into this short hour movement.

The statesmanship among workmen is not always the best. It is not reasonable to expect that it should be. The larger number of the labor leaders work eight or ten hours a day at the bench, and whatever they attempt to do for the benefit of their class must be done after their work is over. They are liable to make mistakes. There was a strike recently in our city in the furniture trade. Mr. Alex. H. Revell, the senior member of one of the largest firms involved, met me in his store a few days before the strike and showed me a circular which he had received from the Furniture Workers' Union, notifying him that they desired eight hours to be a day's work on and after a certain date, and that if their demand was not granted there would be a general strike in that industry. He called me into his private office and endeavored to show me that it was utterly impossible for the employers in this city to make so great a concession. He called my attention to Rockford, and Grand Rapids, and various points in Michigan where labor was cheaper than in Chicago and claimed that all these were competing points. Having learned by experience—that is, defeats—I was willing to work along the lines of least resistance, and I made a fervent appeal to Mr. Revell to do what he could, notwithstanding the situation he had described to me, to convince his men that he was an eight hour man. I suggested to him the idea of adopting this change one half hour at a time each six months, thus bringing in the eight hour day in two years. He sent for his men and made this proposition. They said, "We will take it to the Union." They did so; and the statesmanship or generalship of that body did not "see the cat" in that form. Some of them questioned the motives of Mr. Revell. Some said that it was the first sign of a general victory and that Mr. Revell was resorting to this means to head them off. They rejected his proposal. The result was a general defeat of the organization in that contest. I think the leaders of the workmen should recognize the fact that great results cannot be attained in too short a time.

As to state regulation of this question I am entirely in harmony with Mr. Nelson; but in that I believe I am in a minority among the leaders of the workmen. I think the general tendency of the thought of organized workmen is, that if they could secure the enactment of a law regulating the hours of labor they would take it. I do not see what right the State of Illinois has to interfere in Mr. MacVeagh's business and say, "Your workmen shall not work more than six or eight or nine hours a day," without assuming the cost or consequences. I do not see what right the State of Illinois has to say to the workmen, "You shall work fourteen hours a day." Therefore I believe that along the lines of voluntary co-operation the most good can be accomplished; and the whole history of the short hour movement proves it, and I state to you frankly that I would

sooner spend ten weeks with an influential employer of labor to convince him of the feasibility and practicability of the short hour movement than I would spend five minutes with any politician in the State of Illinois.

Reference has been made to Mr. Armour. I do not wish to be personal and will handle this matter as delicately as possible. Let us see what really occurred in 1886. Mr. Armour was the largest packer in the city of Chicago. This city was the largest packing point in the world; and I think it is fair to say that two-thirds of all the pork packed in the United States was packed in Chicago under the eight hour system. Mr. Armour controlled the largest packing interest in Kansas City and also in Omaha; and at that time it looked very much as though Phil. Armour of Chicago was saying, "Here is Phil. Armour in Kansas City and there is Phil. Armour in Omaha, working under the ten hour rule and I am expected to compete with them in the market. Now unless these workmen will see to it that Phil. Armour of Kansas City and Omaha has the eight hour 'blocks' put to him out there I don't see how I, Phil. Armour in Chicago, can stand it."

MR. E. O. BROWN: When I heard Mr. Nelson say what is undoubtedly true that we none of us desire to work more than we have to; in other words, that men seek to gratify their desires with the least possible toil and suffering, it seemed to me that every one ought to see that the question of shorter hours would settle itself if men were really free. If the working, toiling masses were really free to dispose of their labor as they saw fit—and Mr. Nelson says every man ought to have the right to dispose of his labor as he wills—then it seemed to me that no man would work longer than would be necessary to satisfy his wants as he thought they should be satisfied. Why are we here discussing this eight hour question as though it were something that should be given or withheld from the workmen? It ought to be for the people who do the manual labor to say whether they shall work ten or eight or six hours. But under our present social conditions the workmen have no such free choice; and that is the reason why employers discuss whether they will reduce the hours of labor. Why are the workmen not free to decide for themselves? Is it not because they are compelled to sell the only thing they have, their labor, in a market that is not free? It is not a free contract which tells a man "You must go to work for what you can get or starve." I do not propose in the short time at my disposal to discuss at length what stands in the way of that free contract. But I suggest that if you look into the question of privilege and monopoly; if you will examine and see whether competition is really free or not; if you will see whether the workmen have their birth-right, the free opportunity to exert their physical and mental energies upon those natural opportunities that God has given for all men; if you will look into this question you will see that the reason the workmen are not able to settle this question for themselves is because the gifts of God, the natural opportunities of the earth, which were intended for all men, have been taken for the few, the select few of an hereditary caste.

MR. FREDERICK GREELEY: I have a small bit of personal reminiscence which may be of interest to the club. I have a farm of some two and a half acres to the north of the city, and I have for neighbors two gentlemen, one a manufacturer, and the other I may describe as a philanthropist or labor leader. But we are all Farmers Mutual Benefit Alliance men. Now these Farmers Alliance men pastured their cows in one lot. The cows pastured there in peace for a long time until the philanthropist adopted the eight hour system. It worked admirably on his farm. But at the end of the eight hours the philanthropist came and led down the bars of the pasture and led his herd of cows to his barn. When this had been done two or three times the other cows belonging to the manufacturer and myself began to understand the operation and they joined the union. They insisted on an application of the eight hour plan in their case and even went so far as to employ force, breaking the fences. Our only recourse was a lockout, and we disposed of the entire herd of cows—three in all. The manufacturer and myself placed our cows on the market at a great loss. We then applied for fresh cows on the understanding that they were not to belong to this eight hour union. We have secured such cows to the exclusion of the philanthropist's cows and he practices the eight hour system on his own domain.

MR. JULIUS ROSENTHAL: None of the great public questions stand alone; they are connected with all other important public questions. This is a government of checks and balances; a system of power against power; a fight of the oppressed against the superior force. It is not true that all can do as they choose. The government has the power to form four hundred individuals into one person, a corporation, and when that new person has been formed out of the four hundred, all individuals have to fight that new person, which is much stronger than the four hundred individuals. These corporations, the creation of the state, wield an enormous power; there is no personal relation between employer and employee; they are fictitious persons; and therefore the state having called this being into existence has the right to control it. It has a right to say to the workmen: "You have families, you have brains, you have hearts, you have souls; and they must have an opportunity to develop; and it is not only the right but the duty of the state to see that your relations with this creature of the state shall be of a proper kind."

In former times we had what were called the domestic relations. It was not employer and employee, but master and servant. In the course of time that domestic relation has vanished. Under the old law the servant was provided for; he had certain domestic rights; if he was old his family was taken care of; there were certain duties on the part of the master that were enforced by law. But between this creation of the state, the corporation, and the employee, there is no domestic duty; the corporation does not know the individual; it does not care for his family; the man is simply No. 1 or No. 2, and if No. 1 does not suit, No. 2 takes his place. The state has interfered with the social relations in this matter, and has the right and it is its duty to protect the weaker of the two parties.

MR. MURRY NELSON: I should like to ask right here whether our state has failed in that regard, we having at this time an eight hour law on the statute books?

MR. ROSENTHAL: I was speaking not of this state, but of *the* State. I am defending the State in enforcing such a law.

MR. NELSON: Why is that law not enforced?

MR. ROSENTHAL: I am not referring to the State of Indiana or the State of Illinois. I am simply defending the right of the State to make such laws and enforce them.

MR. SIDNEY C. EASTMAN: Mr. Rosenthal in his remarks referred to the State as against the corporation, and Mr. Nelson advances the proposition that it is not fair for the State to say to the workman, "You shall not work more than eight hours a day."

MR. NELSON: I said not practicable.

MR. EASTMAN: In spite of the many illustrations given this evening I do not regard it as a settled matter by any means that eight hours is best for the average workman. That is, whether under present conditions he can by working eight hours earn sufficient to satisfy his wants or his aspirations.

Another point suggested is that while the instance given by our chairman is very interesting, it must be borne in mind that it refers to a nine hour day, and the question we are discussing to-night is the eight hour day. Had his experiment been as to the eight hour day it would have been a most valuable addition to this discussion. It may be that nine hours is the proper limit while eight hours is too short. I am satisfied that most of us work more than eight hours; most of us work ten hours.

Mr. Brown suggests that the laborer is not free to contract. Is anything free? We are all creatures of circumstances. I heard of a man once who complained that his hard lot prevented his ever doing the work he wanted to do. In summer he wanted to shovel snow and in winter he wanted to run a lawn mower. We can not select our own positions. We have duties and work to perform.

Millions must toil that the world may subsist; and when you propose to cut off twenty per cent of the working hours, it is proper to inquire what will be the effect upon mankind. Will there not be just so much less production? It is assumed by Mr. Salter that there will not be; but when that is proven the question is settled.

I spoke to a manufacturer to-day and asked him his experience in this matter. He said that some years ago some coercion was brought to bear and he reduced the hours of labor to eight; he tried it a while and then went back to ten hours. Some one has said that machinery does not lighten labor. My manufacturing friend explained to me how it did. It does away with much of the hard manual labor, the labor of the muscles of the arm, and places in its stead the movement of the fingers. It is more a matter of attention than of hard labor.

Then if you cut off twenty per cent of the working hours, the capital invested in machinery and plant lies absolutely idle during that time. I suggested to my friend that he could work two shifts of men. He said that would not do because one man having commenced a piece of work it was necessary that he should finish it.

The argument that eight hours is the proper day's labor because fifteen hours under the old system exhausted a man is not logical. The question is: Does ten hours exhaust a man so that he cannot recuperate in the interval between his working days? It may be that a man can work ten hours and fully recuperate.

MR. GEORGE HORNSTEIN: I take issue with the gentleman who has just sat down. He refers to the old times when fourteen or fifteen hours constituted a day's labor. I was talking with a lady the other day who explained to me something about the old method of working. She said that in those days the laborers all smoked their pipes; they would leave their work, go to where their coat was hanging, take out their pipe, tobacco, flint and steel; they would strike a spark and talk industriously until they had a light, and if the first attempt was not sufficient they would try it over again. They went on the theory that they had to work fourteen hours a day and it was a cruel master that would deny them the little pleasure of a smoke. The bricklayers in Chicago—it was bricklayers in the olden time the lady was talking about—work only eight hours

a day, but it is very safe to say that the Chicago bricklayers of to-day will lay more brick in the eight hours than their predecessors would in the fourteen. So it does not follow that the labor would necessarily be more exhausting.

The gentleman wants to know what will be the effect of reducing the hours of labor. There are illustrations all through the history of civilization. It was very questionable for a long time and is yet whether slave labor was cheaper than free labor. But because slave labor is the cheaper it by no means follows that it is the most profitable.

Mr. C. S. DARROW: It seems to me that this club is bringing about some queer results, Mr. Schilling growing conservative and Mr. Nelson and Mr. MacVeagh growing radical. It may be a good thing, but it is a little surprising.

The first paper this evening was too much of an apology for one who advocates that side of the question, and then my friend Schilling—now I supposed nothing was too radical for him, and I thought he understood economic questions too well to make some of the statements he did. He is so afraid of the state. I never before saw a good, peaceable law abiding citizen who was so much afraid of the state as Schilling. He is so afraid of the state that he would be willing to drive people into slavery.

But before referring to Mr. Schilling's remarks I want to reply to Mr. Nelson's question why they do not enforce the Illinois eight hour law. For the reason that that law was made by politicians simply to fool the people, instead of with a desire to accomplish anything. There would be no difficulty in passing an eight hour law that would be enforced all over the state of Illinois just the same as a law against larceny or murder. I do not say that I advocate it, because I do not believe so much in reforming the world by law as I once did. But it would be perfectly feasible to do it.

We have an ordinance in the City of Chicago that provides for an eight hour working day. It also provides that if the city sees fit to employ any one to work more than eight hours it shall pay one and one half times the regular rate of wages for the extra hours.

This is a question which we should try to get to the bottom of. We should endeavor to reach some philosophical conclusion. What is the reason we cannot have an eight hour day? To show that we can we have but to look at the history of the past fifty years, a period that has added to the world's power of production at least twenty fold. One man by the aid of the inventive genius of the past half century is to-day able to accomplish as much as twenty men fifty years ago. Why have not the working people of the world received a very large share of this increased power? They have not had it. Whether or not you believe in the eight hour day is a question of sentiment alone and depends solely on whether you believe in righteousness or unrighteousness. It is nothing else.

The average working day at the present time is a little over six and a half hours, and the reason that some must toil ten or more hours is that other men, who come to the Sunset club and boast of how long "we" labor, may live without any labor, or practically none. Believing in shorter hours of labor is simply believing in a fairer division of labor. It is insisting that each shall contribute to the support of all, that no men shall live on the labor of other men.

Some have talked here to-night about competition. Competition has nothing to do with this question, and it is surprising that Mr. Schilling should have referred to it as he did. You may divide this city into districts, and from Jackson to Adams street you may provide that ten hours shall be a working day; from Adams to Monroe that eight hours shall be a working day; and from Monroe to Madison that six hours shall be the working day; and every block in Chicago will be filled with the hum of industry. What does that mean? There are to-day forty millions of dollars paid in this city as ground rents. That is paid to certain individuals because they or their ancestors happened to get here first. That means that the head of every family in this city before he can contribute anything to the support of himself and family must pay two hundred dollars for the privilege of staying here. The result is this: The natural advantages of Chicago are so great that a man working in the city of Chicago can afford to pay that two hundred dollars a year, or one-third of his wages, to the landlord and still compete with the man who pays ten dollars a year in the city of Rockford. And if we had an eight hour day in Chicago and a ten hour day in Milwaukee and Rockford, the city of Chicago would continue to thrive and grow great and prosperous while the grass was growing in the streets of Rockford and Milwaukee because of it.

Mr. Z. S. HOLBROOK: We have all heard of the wonderful one-horse shay, that went just a hundred years to a day. That ran theoretically; practically it didn't run. We are all familiar with the Baconian method of investigation. It is the test the boy received when he asked the doctor to tell how he could distinguish the mushroom from a toadstool. The doctor replied, "Eat it; if it kills you it's a toadstool; if it does not, it's a mushroom." That is the difference between theory and practice. We should make our theories according to the facts.

Now I have had a good deal to do with this labor question. I have been mixed up in this

last cabinet makers' strike. It is all very well for the gentleman who represents a large railroad corporation to air his theories. But I know there is a state east of here called Michigan; I have heard of a town called Grand Rapids; I have heard they have a few factories; and we Chicago manufacturers have to compete with them. It is difficult enough to make a living in Chicago any way. In the first place we can't get justice in the courts. If a man gets hurt, though by his own stupidity, he gets heavy damages; he gets all the law allows him. We have paid damage suits; we have carried suits to the appellate courts and the supreme courts and have looked in vain for justice in the courts. Ten thousand dollars have been paid for the loss of a fifteen dollar man. Then along comes the smoke inspector and informs us that we have not placed the ten dollars in the right place in the city hall so that they won't see the smoke. Then we must have a fire escape. If we have a slight trouble with our workmen our factory will be patrolled. If a man, who is in debt, with his furniture mortgaged, and his family in want, is willing to work ten hours a day, he is hit with a club as has been done in Chicago within five weeks.

I have no sympathy with these maudlin sentiments. The workingman has too much manhood and dignity to need it. Theoretically I am an eight hour man; practically I am a ten hour man. I can't help it. We can't deal in theories. If you have any spare money to invest come around on Wabash avenue and we will sell you below par three or four millions of stock, capital that has been sunk that workmen might be paid three and four dollars a day in this glorious free country, when they could not get two anywhere else.

I am going to ask you to come back to hard practical sense. If a man wants to work ten hours a day it is his right to do so. We have to meet the competition from other points and it is constantly becoming keener; and if any system is adopted which will give these outside points a decided advantage in the cost of production it simply means that the manufacturers will have to leave Chicago and locate in such towns as Aurora, Elgin and so forth, that have grown so rapidly in the past few years.

These theories remind me a good deal of the old maid who was consoling her friend on the imperfections of her husband. She said: "You should not have got married. What did I tell you?" "Well," she replied, "he is bad, but he is better than none." Manufacturing in Chicago is pretty bad but it is better than none.

MR. E. O. BROWN: May I ask Mr. Holbrook what a fifteen dollar man is?

MR. HOLBROOK: A dead Indian.

MR. E. P. LANGWORTHY: It strikes me the statement of the last gentleman that he has three millions of stock that he would like to dispose of gives his whole case away. I submit, gentlemen, that the natural condition of things is the proper condition. If there are to-night in this city thousands hungry for bread, while these gentlemen have their millions, I submit there is something wrong somewhere.

There are two occasions in the life of everyone when we are absolutely equal—that is at birth and at death, the beginning and the end. That is the natural condition, and I believe that there is enough profit in the business of the world to make all who desire to work comfortable and happy. If some are hungry to-night who are willing to work it is because others have what does not belong to them.

In 1825 and before that the day was from sun up to sun down. Then came the ten hour reform. Hardly had that agitation commenced when there came the railroad and the electric telegraph, and the innumerable labor saving inventions of the time. As that agitation for shorter hours has gone on we have seen that with every advance in the direction of less hours of labor there has been an advance in the productive power of the world. I submit that eight hours is not the limit. The limit should be this: Let every man who desires to work have the opportunity, and let him work sufficiently long that he may earn a good living for himself and his family; then there will not be so many millionaires and there will be no tramps.

We have heard something about the eight hour law in this state. My friend Darrow has spoken about it, and I know when he speaks he speaks what he believes; for he comes from the same county I came from. There he advocated free trade in a district, north-western Ohio, where you might as well ram your head against a stone wall. So I know he believes what he says. He spoke to you in regard to the eight hour law of this state. It is a failure because it provides that it shall not apply to farmers, and they may work their men just as long as they please. It provides that it shall not prevent any man from working just as long as he has a mind to; and just as long as such a law is the only one we have on the subject it will be a nullity. When we have a law carefully framed with a penalty attached it will amount to something.

MR. FRANK H. SCOTT: I hope I shall be permitted to tell a story that has no application to the subject but has to the last speech. I was once on a board of directors of an insurance company and the question was whether we should pay a loss on a man who had recently died. It appeared that at the time he was examined for insurance he was also examined by the pension officials and to the latter he stated that he had chronic rheumatism while to the former he said that he had no such thing. Some members of the board thought it would be unjust to pay this

while others thought it would be well to pay it as the man had been an old soldier. Finally an Irishman on the Board said: "I have heard all about that sort of thing. I have heard all this talk about heroes and glory before. Now all the men that went to the war were not heroes; many of them were coffee coolers and rapsallions; I know, for I was there myself."

There seem to be two points upon which we agree. We do not want to work more than we have to. Of course there was an adage that

"Satan finds some mischief still
For idle hands to do,"

but that was at a time when men could only work with their hands. I think we all agree that the hours necessary for each man to earn a living should be made as short as possible. The only question left is whether it shall be done by law, by enactment of the legislature, or by the hand of time itself. It matters not that Mr. Rosenthal has said that the state may pass such a law. The question is: Is it best? I think not, for this reason. There is no law which affords a remedy that is not founded in the sense of justice of the community or in the interests of the community to which it is to apply. You can't create a sense of justice by enactment. There may be a Keeley cure for dipsomania, but there is no bichloride of justice that can be injected into the body politic. That can only come by time. If a law is intended as a remedy for a lack among the people of a sense of justice it will be a failure. If it is to be enforced it will be because the people believe it to be to their interest.

If the hours of labor have been reduced and labor has become lighter is it not because employers have found that it pays?

Again, it is not true that the workingmen have no weapons in their hands. They have, and by their association they have compelled concessions. And they will in the future.

But a law enforcing this eight hour system would be a hardship in many cases. I know of industries which are blessings not only to the persons engaged in them, but to those also to whom they bring the happiness and joys of life. I know of one that if blotted out would destroy to an extent the prosperity of an entire section, and I know that that industry can not be run on a basis of less than ten or twelve hours a day. If such a law were enacted it would blot out that industry; and would that not be an injustice to the men engaged in it who are very willing to go on as they are now?

I think that time is bringing about the solution of this problem. But I also think that there are obstacles in the way that ought not to be in the way. There are people who talk about the rights of the people as Proctor Knott said some men practice law, "by ear." They pick up phrases that float about them in the air. Instead of trying to bring the two classes together they stir up strife and arouse the passions of their hearers. In my opinion that is one obstacle in the way. It is true that some men live in idleness, but that class is very small. Is it not so in your own experience? You are all business men. How many of your acquaintances are drones and parasites? If, therefore, this stirring up of ill feeling were done away with, and by patient teaching, by conference, we learn where each man's own interest lies, then I believe the question would come to its proper solution.

Adjourned.

JOSEPH W. ERRANT,
Secretary.