

TALES OF THE JURY ROOM

By Gerald Griffin

THE TWELFTH JURYMANS TALE

SIR DOWLING O'HARTIGAN

Sir Dowling did not appear to think this test essential to his purpose, and on the following morning, he set forward, accompanied by his force, to join the standard of the Ard-Righ. That monarch, and his son, to whom he had deputed the command of the royal army on this occasion, were already on the field of battle when Sir Dowling O'Hartigan arrived. Many circumstances combined to give a strong and lasting interest to this brilliant day in Ireland's clouded story. King Brian, who was seventy-six years of age when he ascended the throne, had reigned for twenty years, and raised the state of the island to a state of almost unexampled prosperity, and acquired for himself the character of a saint, a hero, and a sage. His reign bears a close resemblance to that of the French St. Louis, or the English Alfred, than that of any other Irish monarch whom we can call to mind. Devoted himself to the cultivation of letters and the practice of religion, he encouraged both, by every means which the prerogative of his station could afford. He founded many churches, and added his influence to that of the clergy, in promoting a love of piety and virtue. He conciliated the friendship of the independent princes throughout the island, by confirming their ancient privileges, and aiding them in the enforcement of their authority. The success with which his efforts to establish national peace and harmony were attended, has been celebrated in a legend which all Irish are familiar with, and which bears testimony at least to the reputation of the monarch with his subjects and their prosperity. At the close of his reign, however, he had the affliction to combat with internal treachery and foreign invasion. The annals tell us, that Malmorda, the Righ, or inferior monarch of Leinster, aided by 12,000 Danes whom he had called in to aid him in his rebellious enterprise, in arms against his sovereign. The aged monarch was prompt in taking the field against the traitor and his foreign allies, nor were his subjects slow to second him. The field, when Sir Dowling entered it, presented a striking and animated spectacle. The Irish archers and slingers with their small Scythian bows and krantabals—the gallow glach heavily armed, with the genn and battle-axe, and the shoals of kern, disengaged in their hanging cap, the ready skene as the girdle, and javelin in the hand, were arrayed between the royal tents and the rebel force. Amongst these last the island costume was shamefully mingled with the chain armor of the invaders, and the Irish poll-axe advanced in the same cause with the ponderous northern sparthe, which had so often drank the blood of their helpless and unresisting, in their towns and villages. Mindful of old Nora's warning, Sir Dowling O'Hartigan committed his men to the command of an inferior officer and, fastening the cloak around his neck, passed, unobserved, to that part of the field where Prince Murrough O'Brian was in the act of persuading his age-stricken parent, the venerable Priam of the day, to retire from a scene in which he could no longer afford assistance, and to await in his tent the issue of the combat. The monarch at length complied, and bidding an affectionate farewell to his children of two generations, who were about to risk all for his crown and people, slowly retired from the field, and at the same instant Sir Dowling had the mortification to hear the prince give utterance to an exclamation of disappointment and surprise at his non-appearance. "It is, the first time," said Prince Murrough, "that I ever knew Sir Dowling O'Hartigan untrue to his engagement." The knight had much difficulty in restraining himself from flinging away the cloak, and removing the uneasiness of his prince, but the warning of Nora, and the fear that in the eagerness to manifest his loyalty he might lose the power of manifesting it in a more effectual way, enabled him to control his inclinations. The battle commenced, and Sir Dowling, taking his position near the prince, wrought prodigies of valor in his defence. The prince and his immediate attendants beheld with astonishment Dane after Dane, and traitor after traitor fall mortally wounded to the ground, and yet none could say by whose weapon the blow was struck. More than once, the prince, as if his own strength were so gigantic that the mere intention of a blow on his part were more destructive than the practical exertions of another, saw his enemies fall prostrate at his feet when he had but lifted his sword into the air above them. At length a Nordman, of prodigious size, came bearing down upon the prince, heaving all to pieces before him, and breaking the royal ranks with the strength of a rhinoceros. At the very instant when he had arrived within a sword's length of Murrough O'Brian, and while the latter was in the act of lifting his shield in order to resist his onset, to the astonishment of all and doubtless to his own,

the head of the gigantic Nordman rolled upon the grass. The Prince started back amazed. "These must be Sir Dowling's blows," he exclaimed, "and yet I do not see the man!" "And what hand," cried Sir Dowling, flinging aside the cloak in a transport of death-defying zeal, "whose hand has a better right than Sir Dowling's to do the utmost for the son of Brian?" He had scarcely given utterance to the words, when the sparthe of a Loch Lannoch who stood at some distance, came whistling through the air, and transfixed him on the spot, the victim of his own enthusiasm. The rest is known. The aged monarch, the prince, and many of their house, and 4,000 of their followers shared the fate of Sir Dowling O'Hartigan; but their country was redeemed in their destruction, for Clontarf did more than 'scotch' the Danish hydra. It was never seen to raise one of its heads again in Ireland. At this moment, and before the Twelfth Juror had time to add a vocal contribution to the narrative which he had just afforded, an extraordinary accident threw the whole Jury Room into a commotion, which may be more easily imagined on the reader's part than described on ours. The traveller, who had been lying in the cupboard during the whole night, and listening with exemplary attention to the various narratives which had been served up for the entertainment of the company, was betrayed into an act of remarkable forgetfulness immediately on the conclusion of his foregoing tale. Whether it was that his olfactory organs had been irritated by some particles of dust which had found its entrance into the cupboard, or that the dampness of his uncomfortable retirement had given him a cold, or that, by some unaccountable fatality, the fit seized him, certain it is that at this instant he so totally forgot the precarious situation in which he stood, as to give a sudden and violent sneeze into his hiding-place. The effect produced by this unexpected sound upon the astonished jurors, they started from their seats as we are told men do in tropical climates on feeling the first shock of an earthquake. "What noise was that?" "Didn't somebody sneeze?" "Where was it?" "Who was it?" "Tis from the cupboard!" &c., &c., were exclamations which broke from the lips of the company, not *seriatim* as we have been obliged to transcribe them, but almost at the same breath. Some of the most courageous, arming themselves with pokers, tongs, and such other weapons offensive and defensive as the place afforded, advanced to the corner in which the now silent and trembling intruder lay half dead with apprehension of he knew not what, and mentally bewailing the fit of absence which had rendered all his caution and previous self-denial vain and useless. "Whose duty it was to open the cupboard, which occasioned for men in despair will catch at straws, a wild hope in the breast of the stranger that none amongst them might be found hardy enough to take the task upon him. The difficulty, however, as removed by the foreman who with an intrepidity worthy of imitation, taking the poker from the timorous hand of the juror who stood next him, advanced to near the cupboard that he was able by extending the poker at arm's length and inserting the point of it between the two doors, to throw one of them back on the hinges so as to disclose the pent-up figure of the listener inside. A single glance was sufficient to show the jurors that he was in a greater fright than they were, on which their courage rose to such a degree that all simultaneously rushed upon him and dragged him forward into the centre of the room. Language would only expose to the poverty of attempting to describe the scene that followed. Let it suffice to say that after about a quarter of an hour consumed in vociferations which led to nothing, the stranger was able to obtain something like a hearing, and was allowed to explain in a consecutive manner the circumstances which had brought him into his present very questionable position. This, however, he related with so much candour and energy of manner, that he evidently produced a favourable impression on the greater portion of his hearers. He was subjected to a vigorous cross examination, which, however, did not in the least degree shake "his own original testimony." After some further deliberation, the case was submitted to the Foreman, who decided, that presuming on the good intentions of the stranger, the jury would be willing to favour his escape on condition that he would submit to the regulation of those of which he had been so extraordinary a manner a covert auditor. The stranger readily consented, and took his seat amid general applause. THE STRANGER'S TALE THE RAVEN'S NEST The Fabii make not a more distinguished figure in the history of the ancient Romans or the Medici in that of the modern Tuscan state, than do the family of the Geraldines in the troubled tale of Ireland's miseries. Whenever the annals of the island shall be treated by a competent pen, they will not fail to be classed by all impartial judges amongst the most remarkable families in history. Their errors, and per-

haps in many instances their crimes, were great; but their undaunted courage, their natural eloquence, their vigorous genius, and their hereditary open heartedness, are qualities which will be as certain of awakening admiration, as their misfortunes of exciting pity. The story of the earls of Kildare constitutes such a piece of history as Sallust might be proud to write, and the genius of Plutarch would have deigned, and touches of character, in which the annals of the family abound. During the reign of the Tudors, a deadly feud had raged for many years between one of the earls of Kildare, and a chieftain—a branch of the Geraldines, residing in a distant part of Munster. The Geraldine conceived his rights, as well as those of his country, invaded by the excessive rigour and even injustice with which Kildare (who was Lord Deputy) administered the government; and the earl was so highly incensed by what he called the turbulence and malice of his kinsman, that he protested his determination not to lay down his arms, until he had compelled him to make submission, "albeit he should have him as a common borderer cut off by the knee." In this resolution, he received the entire sanction of the English government, who seldom bore hard upon their deputies for an excess of zeal. Outworn by continual defeats, and feeling deeply for the sufferings which his fruitless resistance had brought on his dependents, the gallant Geraldine testified at length his willingness to make terms, and offered to come in person to the metropolis in order to make a formal submission to the viceroy. He was not so despicable an enemy that even the haughty earl was not rejoiced at his proposal. He was received in Dublin with the highest ceremonies of respect and joy. The earl gave splendid entertainments, to which many, not only of the substantial citizens of the Pale, but of the native Irish chieftains were invited; and the public places of the city for several days were thronged with a motley company of revellers, mingling with a confidence as enthusiastic as if they had not been for centuries as bitter enemies, as oppression on the one, and hate and outrage on the other side, could make them. On the second night after the arrival of the Geraldine in Dublin, a party of horse, bearing the marks of long travel in the jaded carriage both of the animals and their riders, appeared upon the borders of the Pale which they had entered by one of the northern roads. They were commanded by a young man of an appearance at once delicate and martial. The peasants and humble artificers doffed their bonnets as they passed him on the road, and the sentinels saluted, and suffered him to go un-questioned. As they approached the city, the sounds of rejoicing which were distinctly heard in the calm air, awakened their attention and curiosity of the group. "Ride on before, Thomas," said the young officer, addressing the page who bore his shield and helmet, "and ask what feasting is toward in the city." "The pages spurred on his horse, and after making inquiry at the booth of a rosy looking venter of woollen stuffs, returned to say that the Geraldine was in the city." "The Geraldine! what! hath he taken it, then?" "Nay," cried the page, "if it were so, I question whether the Pale would be so orderly. He has come to make submission to the king." "To make submission! The Geraldine make submission!" repeated the young man. "This seems a tale no less improbable than the other. Alas! such wisdom is rare in a Geraldine. The poor slave has suffered deeply to the pride of the Fitzgeralds. Poor miserable land! Give me the helmet. We must not pass the Geraldine unarmed. How long is it now since this quarrel has begun?" "Near sixteen years, my lord." "Thou sayest aright. I remember to have heard of it on my mother's knee. I well remember how Kildare returned to the castle on an autumn evening, all black with dust and sweat, and how she flew to meet him, while I marked his rusty javelin, and puzzled my brains to comprehend its use. I am not so ignorant now. Ill-fated country! How many lives, dost thou compute, have already fallen in this feud?" "It is thought, my lord, some seventy or eighty soldiers of the Pale, with about seventeen thousand of the Irish in various encounters; besides castles sacked about fifty; towns and villages demolished to the number of nineteen; and private dwellings of the common sort, to the amount of some thousand roofs. The Pale too suffered loss of property; a woollen draper's booth destroyed, besides some twenty cabins in the suburbs laid in ashes." "I pray you, Thomas, who might be your accomplice?" "My cousin Simmons, my lord, the city bailiff—your lordship may remember him?" "Ay, I thought the computation had been made within the Pale. And what was the beginning of the strife?" "The insolent Geraldine, my lord, had the audacity to turn a troop of the Lord Deputy's horse—"

"Out of a widow's house upon his holding, where they would have taken up their quarters for a fortnight in the scarce season. The insolent Geraldine! I long to see the disloyal knave. Know you if the lady Margaret his daughter be with him in the city?" "My lord, the woollen-draper spoke not of her." "I long to know them both. Report speaks loudly of her, no less than of the Geraldine himself. But here's the city. Good morrow masters! Thank you heartily, thank you all! O'Neil is quiet in the north, my masters! Long live the king! Huzza!" The last sentences were spoken as the young warrior passed the city gate, where he was recognised and hailed by a holiday throng of the loyal citizens, with shouts of welcome that made the houses tremble around them. "Kildare for ever! Long live the king! huzza!" was echoed from the city gate to the very draw-bridge of the castle. The young nobleman, who had, amid all his gallantry and gaiety, a certain air that showed him to be above the reach of party spirit, received their congratulations with spirit and cheerfulness, but without losing moment's time either to speak or hear. The streets as he passed presented an appearance singular and altogether new to his eye. The Irish green hanging bonnet seemed as common as the cap of the Pale; kernes who spoke not a syllable of English were gazing at the splendour of the city; and citizens, standing in their boots, started up, no less amazed at the unshorn locks, wild looks, and woodland attire of their new allies. Passing on to St. Thomas's Court, where the Lord Deputy, at that time, transacted the business of the government, Sir Ulick Fitzgerald, the young knight whose course we have been following, alighted from his horse, and sent one of the officers to inform the Lord Deputy of his arrival. He was received by Kildare in the king's chamber; and gave an account of the state of affairs in the north, where he had for some months past occupied the place of Lord Deputy himself. "Thou art welcome, Ulick, from the North," said Kildare, reaching his hand to his son, who kissed it with reverence and affection. "And now, how hast thou done thy work, my lad?" "Like a true soldier of the Pale, my lord," replied Sir Ulick. "I taught the rascals what it was to have to do with a friend of England. Thou and your royal master I am sure will love me for it." "What said O'Neil at the conference?" "O my good father, bid me not repeat his insolence. He said his lands and castles were in the keeping of his ancestors, before the very name of Ireland had sounded in the ear of a Plantagenet—that we used our power cruelly—(we, my lord, cruel! we and I could aver upon my oath and honour as a knight, we have not picked above thy rebelry, except on holidays, when we wanted exercise for the hobbles. We cruel!) he complained also of trespass on the property of his dependents, (what had we touched their lives, my lord?); he said all men were naturally free; that he derived his possessions from his progenitors, not from the royal gift; and many things besides, for which I would have set his head upon his castle gate, but as your lordship was so minded, I contented myself with a consoling of his whom we caught in the can after dark." "Ulick," said the earl, "I warn thee, as the Geraldines stand not over well with Tudor, how thou sufferest such humours to appear, and before whom. It has been remarked, and by those who might not pierce thine irony, that thou art rather a favourer of these turbulent insurgents." "Thou art over mild with the rebels, my lord," said Sir Ulick, "in the service of Tudor it will soon wear off." "I tell thee," said the earl, "it is thought by many that thine heart is less with the people of the Pale than might become the descendant of those who have grown old in the royal confidence and favour, and transmitted both as a legacy to their posterity. Thou hast learned the language of these rascal Irishry." "I confess my crime, my lord," replied the knight; "I know my country's tongue." "Thou lovest their braggy poetry, and villainous antiquities; and art known to keep in thy train a scoundrel harper, who sings thee to sleep at night with tales of burnings and rapines, done by their outlaw chiefs upon the honest subjects of the crown." "I confess my fault, my lord. I love sweet music." "Thou hast even been heard at times," continued the earl, "to sing a verse of their howling ditties in the very precincts of the castle." "Nay, nay, good father," cried the knight, "if you will impute my tune-ful voice as treasonous, blame nature and not me, for I had it of her. I confess myself guilty in that point also. There is a rebel melody in my voice that I cannot well be rid of." "Ay, banter, banter, villain," said the lord deputy. "I tell thee, in a word, to treasure up what I have said, nor presume so far upon thy loyal deeds to excuse disloyal words. Princes are jealous of a smile. Thou must bear in mind that it is a conquered race thou hast to deal withal, and add a ferule to the rod of government." TO BE CONTINUED

Make your heart full of joy by thinking much of our Lord and His love and goodness and mercy. Hope is the bright road to God. Fix all your hope in Him. On dark days, wait for the clouds to go by. Do not be cast down when you fall. THE RIGHT OF THE WAGE-EARNER REV. FATHER ZINGER'S ADDRESS TO TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL Berlin News Record, April 16. The following is the address delivered by Rev. A. L. Zinger, president of St. Jerome's college, to the Trades and Labor Council on Monday evening. A man would need be physically and intellectually blind not to see that there is a breach between capital and labor, between the employer and employee, and that as the chasm grows wider the greater will be the discord, which must bring on a lamentable rupture in society—conditions that are destructive to the State, to the peace of the home and the general welfare of all classes. It is pleasing to know that in recent years much has been done to bring about a clearer understanding of the rights and duties of man in the various avocations of life and that in most countries, especially in the commercial nations, the Governments have enacted laws, that offer greater justice to the workingman who constitute the bulk of a nation, and restrict the assumed rights of the minority who by their vast wealth have made them a power difficult to combat. Wealth does not necessarily become a despot but the frequent abuses of it has done great injustice. It is very commendable that the Trades and Labor Council of the Twin City invites men other than those who are members of their corporation to address them. It manifests a spirit of broadness, a desire for liberal information, an inclination to acquire unbiased knowledge, to arrive at a true conception of affairs. To study this question properly we must begin with a true basis—True conclusions can logically be drawn only from true premises. Before we can speak of the rights of the employer or employee we must first understand what constitutes a right. I take it that you are all firm believers in the existence of God, the Creator, and that it will not be necessary to enter upon a lengthy proof of that fact. God was free to create man or not create him, but once He determined to create him, He necessarily established a bond between Himself and the creature. Go as far into the depth of philosophical thought as you like you will have to come to the logical conclusions that God, as an omniscient being, must have had a purpose worthy of His divine attributes for creating man, and that reason can be no other than His extrinsic glory. He must consequently will that end to be obtained. This places man under a moral obligation. If man is morally obliged to an end then God must will the means to arrive at that end. The means constitute the moral code for the human race. In other words, the will of God constitutes the supreme law. We are justified in acting only when our act is in harmony with the Supreme will and those acts that are in accordance with the Divine will constitute our rights. The Divine will we know by examining our contingent existence, i. e., our relation to the Creator, by examining ourselves; and our relations to our fellow man. Do away with the idea of God and you destroy the idea of moral obligation. Where there is no moral obligation there will not be justice among men. There will be no respect for one another's rights, there will be no permanent solution of the great economic question of capital and labor. Without religion the State cannot settle the question—Take away moral authority then physical authority cannot cope with the evils that ensue—No God—no authority—no virtue—no peace. There is a tendency to-day to exalt the State and its powers, a tendency leading up to a standard that held sway in the great ancient pagan Roman empire in the days of her greatest ascendancy in wealth and power, in the days of her luxuriousness which brought about such rank moral degradation that resulted in her ruin. There are rights of the individual and rights of the family that are logically and morally anterior to the rights of the State. They are congenital rights—they spring from nature—they are born with us—they antedate the formation of the State which was constituted to protect the rights of the individual and the family. That is the duty of the State—to protect these fundamental rights and not to create them—whether they are the rights of the poor man or the rights of the rich man, the rights of the laborer or the rights of the employer—both have rights and both have duties. From the fact of his entry into this world man has a natural right to life and as a consequence, has a right to the means necessary for subsistence, such as proper food and clothing. The laboring man has a natural right to his muscular and brain energy and he may dispose of that right i. e., he may sell his labor. In the exchange, which constitutes a bi-lateral contract, justice requires that there be an equality, between what the laborer gives to his employer and what he receives from his employer. In transferring his labor the workingman is entitled to remuneration sufficient, not merely to sustain his life but also to repair natural loss of vitality

which loss benefits the employer. That loss of vitality is renewed in his offspring. Hence the wages must be sufficient for a man to support also a wife and several children. Just what constitutes a decent living wage cannot be determined theoretically because the amount depends upon varying circumstances and must be worked out by economists to suit the times. But the minimum wage must always be sufficient to meet the requirements I have outlined. Then too, when the workingman sells his labor he is bound in justice to give a quid pro quo—he must also keep his side of the contract. We sometimes hear the argument from the lips of the employer that the workingman is the master of his labor and when he sells it at any wage he has no further claim, e. g., if a man agrees to work at \$1 a day although he is worth \$2, the workingman by virtue of the contract has his dues. When a man is held up on the highway by a gunman he of his own free will gives up his money. Why? because he does not want to lose his life. A workman may accept \$1 a day in state of starvation from himself and family, but it remains that he has a right to more. Between two evils he must choose the less. He is a victim of hard conditions of which an employer may unjustly take advantage. Since it is the duty of the State to protect the rights of its citizens, the State must employ such legislation by which the laborer may acquire his rights. The State is composed of families and the strength of the State depends upon the integrity of the homes. It is a wise State therefore that seeks by prudent legislation to preserve or create contentment in the homes of the majority of its citizens, and the laboring classes constitute a very large portion of the nation, and their homes, the sweetness of decent living, can be enjoyed only where there is a wage sufficient for their proper maintenance, hence the State should force a minimum wage when employers of their own free choice do not respond to their duties. It is frequently asserted that laborers have no right to form Unions. We claim that there can be no valid objections if there is no conflict with the rights of others. They may associate their forces to protect their individual rights and for a similar reason employers may form associations to protect their rights. As long as each restricts himself to rights there can be no conflict. A right must be sacrificed only when there is a conflict with a higher right on the principle that the right of the community has preference to the rights of the individual. Laborers form unions in order to obtain more equitable and more humane conditions under which they dispose of their energy. There surely is nothing wrong in that. It is natural that men associate their powers to obtain a legitimate result. For that reason we have literary societies, scientific societies, art associations and even capitalistic societies. As long as these societies keep within their rights the State must protect them. The objection is made that Labor unions are useless because they do not obtain the end for which they exist. Investigation shows that since labor has organized their condition has vastly improved, such, for instance, as the sanitary conditions of factories, the length of the working day, the reduction of accidents, the imperiousness of bosses, the housing conditions, the employment of children, starvation wages, etc. Adversaries say that the cost of output increases in direct ratio with the increase of wages and consequently the laborer does not benefit by an increase in wages. We reply that that is not necessarily the case. Employers by not increasing the price may not have as much profit as they would like to have but that does not say that they have not enough—a just profit. By increasing the price of the product they, in their greed for wealth, may be charging exorbitant prices for which they have no claim founded on right. They follow up by saying that when unions make use of their combined power and go on strike, and supposing that their wages are slightly increased and that the price of the product does not increase, the laborers suffer great financial loss while on strike. Grant that they do, although it does not necessarily follow, that is their own affair. It is every man's right to sell or withhold his labor and the State cannot condemn unions on that account. It is said that others also suffer financial loss and therefore strikes should not be permitted. If that principle were true then all commercial and industrial associations would have to be condemned when the capital of some individual person is jeopardized. You might as well say that if a sugar factory has been in operation for some time then it would not be permissible for the owners of the sugar factory to change it into a saw mill if thereby the farmers in that section of the country ceased to make as much profit. A man does not forego his right if by exercising it another man will suffer some financial loss. Suppose there is only one store in a town, has then no one else a right to open another store in that town just because the first one would no longer have all the business? The worker we said, may under certain circumstances make use of the strike, that is he may refuse to sell his work and by peaceful and lawful means induce others too to withhold their work when an un-

reasonable employer does not give just compensation for labor or makes life intolerable in other ways, but the laborer has no right to use force to prevent other laborers from exercising their rights; that is when a laborer chooses to work you have no right based on natural law to molest him. If he is a member of the Union he may be dismissed because in all societies the minority must go with the majority. But his right to work is his individual right and no power can deprive him of it. Hence when he suffers offence in the exercise of his natural right the State must protect him. Up to this point we have been speaking mostly of the rights of the laborer and said little of the duties of the employer but that is unnecessary because rights and duties are correlative terms—where there is a right on one side there is a corresponding duty on the other. Much might be said, however, of the rights of the employer and the duties of the employee but we cannot treat that at any length to-night. How is the breach between the employer and employee to be closed? Political Economy, as such, and governmental legislation will never succeed because external force is not a healing balm; the knitting together and the healing of the rupture must proceed from within. A healthy vitality must permeate the entire body of society, there must be a consciousness of our duties and rights and a will to practice the virtues of justice and charity. The question can be settled by no other than on a Christian basis. There must be brotherly love—We must recognize that we are all brothers—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" sums up the whole question. First of all there must be an animated faith in God the Supreme Master whom we must love because of His divine attributes, His infinite perfections, and because of our consanguine relationship—the relationship between the Creator and the creature—That absolute dependency brings upon us the duty to know Him, love Him and reverence Him by our obedience to His divine will. We must love our neighbor because of God who created all for the same end—His eternal glory. We must recognize the fact that we are all travelling along the same road and have the same destination for our journey—that God wills us to reach that end, that He wills us as members of the one great human family to assist one another to surmount the difficulties of the way—that we are children of a common Father—that we have the same designated inheritance—that Christ assumed our human nature, became one of us—our General yet our brother, and left us with instructions which those enrolled under His banner must obey, instructions which if closely observed, are the soothing balm that will heal all sores and wounds opened by our transgressions from the appointed way. Man must not lose sight of the fact that money and all earthly possessions are a means to an end rather than an end and that the more we have of this world's goods the greater becomes our moral responsibility. Every man must render an account of his stewardship. The trouble is that too many men of wealth consider themselves absolute owners of their property and are under no obligation to their fellow-men—they forget that there is a God above them who is the Supreme possessor and that His inhabitable earth owes a living to every man upon it. If the rich deprive their less fortunate brothers of that right they abuse their power and must bring upon themselves the condemnation of a just God. Workingmen also at times forget their Christian obligations. Instead of entertaining a spirit of charity and good will towards those in better financial circumstances they are frequently carried away by a spirit of envy, and by an unjust propaganda they provoke discontent among the masses. We cannot all be in the same position in life and as long as free competition is not unjustly checked those of brains and ambition and prudence will always forge ahead. Not all men born into this world have the same talents. Some have one, others two, others five—This difference of natural gifts, along with personal efforts, must constitute different ranks in life. I remember a story in which it is said that Moses was seated on a rock, his head resting upon his hands and buried in deep melancholic reflection. God appeared to him and said, Moses what is the trouble—Moses plaintively said—Lord why, don't you make all men as fortunate as I am—I see so many have to work hard and I am having it easy in life. All right, Moses, your wish shall be granted. Some months later God found Moses again in the same mood. Well, Moses, something seems to worry you, said God: "Yes, O Lord, restore things to their former conditions. Last week my roof blew off and the rain is destroying everything, but all the people are now so happy that I cannot find anyone to repair the roof. Labor if done in the proper spirit bears in its train bodily health and spiritual happiness. One summer afternoon I was sitting in the writing-room of the Buckingham Hotel, New York, near the window facing Fifth Avenue. There was another man in the room. He had been telling me that he spent previous summers at various resorts but that summer he remained at the Buckingham because he found it equally cool and more comfortable than at the summer

resort. His wife and several children. Just what constitutes a decent living wage cannot be determined theoretically because the amount depends upon varying circumstances and must be worked out by economists to suit the times. But the minimum wage must always be sufficient to meet the requirements I have outlined. Then too, when the workingman sells his labor he is bound in justice to give a quid pro quo—he must also keep his side of the contract. We sometimes hear the argument from the lips of the employer that the workingman is the master of his labor and when he sells it at any wage he has no further claim, e. g., if a man agrees to work at \$1 a day although he is worth \$2, the workingman by virtue of the contract has his dues. When a man is held up on the highway by a gunman he of his own free will gives up his money. Why? because he does not want to lose his life. A workman may accept \$1 a day in state of starvation from himself and family, but it remains that he has a right to more. Between two evils he must choose the less. He is a victim of hard conditions of which an employer may unjustly take advantage. Since it is the duty of the State to protect the rights of its citizens, the State must employ such legislation by which the laborer may acquire his rights. The State is composed of families and the strength of the State depends upon the integrity of the homes. It is a wise State therefore that seeks by prudent legislation to preserve or create contentment in the homes of the majority of its citizens, and the laboring classes constitute a very large portion of the nation, and their homes, the sweetness of decent living, can be enjoyed only where there is a wage sufficient for their proper maintenance, hence the State should force a minimum wage when employers of their own free choice do not respond to their duties. It is frequently asserted that laborers have no right to form Unions. We claim that there can be no valid objections if there is no conflict with the rights of others. They may associate their forces to protect their individual rights and for a similar reason employers may form associations to protect their rights. As long as each restricts himself to rights there can be no conflict. A right must be sacrificed only when there is a conflict with a higher right on the principle that the right of the community has preference to the rights of the individual. Laborers form unions in order to obtain more equitable and more humane conditions under which they dispose of their energy. There surely is nothing wrong in that. It is natural that men associate their powers to obtain a legitimate result. For that reason we have literary societies, scientific societies, art associations and even capitalistic societies. As long as these societies keep within their rights the State must protect them. The objection is made that Labor unions are useless because they do not obtain the end for which they exist. Investigation shows that since labor has organized their condition has vastly improved, such, for instance, as the sanitary conditions of factories, the length of the working day, the reduction of accidents, the imperiousness of bosses, the housing conditions, the employment of children, starvation wages, etc. Adversaries say that the cost of output increases in direct ratio with the increase of wages and consequently the laborer does not benefit by an increase in wages. We reply that that is not necessarily the case. Employers by not increasing the price may not have as much profit as they would like to have but that does not say that they have not enough—a just profit. By increasing the price of the product they, in their greed for wealth, may be charging exorbitant prices for which they have no claim founded on right. They follow up by saying that when unions make use of their combined power and go on strike, and supposing that their wages are slightly increased and that the price of the product does not increase, the laborers suffer great financial loss while on strike. Grant that they do, although it does not necessarily follow, that is their own affair. It is every man's right to sell or withhold his labor and the State cannot condemn unions on that account. It is said that others also suffer financial loss and therefore strikes should not be permitted. If that principle were true then all commercial and industrial associations would have to be condemned when the capital of some individual person is jeopardized. You might as well say that if a sugar factory has been in operation for some time then it would not be permissible for the owners of the sugar factory to change it into a saw mill if thereby the farmers in that section of the country ceased to make as much profit. A man does not forego his right if by exercising it another man will suffer some financial loss. Suppose there is only one store in a town, has then no one else a right to open another store in that town just because the first one would no longer have all the business? The worker we said, may under certain circumstances make use of the strike, that is he may refuse to sell his work and by peaceful and lawful means induce others too to withhold their work when an un-