THE GREENSBORO PATRIOT.

ESTABLISHED IN 1835.
NEW SERIES, NO. 947.

GREENSBORO, N. C., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1885.

JNO. B. HUSSEY, Editor & Proprietor.
TERMS: $1.50 Per Year, in Advance.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Speech of Hon. Thomas W. Palmer, of Michigan, in the Senate of the United States, Friday, February 6, 1885.]

The Senate having under consideration the joint resolution (S. R. 19) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows:

"*Resolved*, &c., That the following article be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said Legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Consitution, namely:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article"—

Mr. Palmer said:

Mr. PRESIDENT,—This resolution involves the consideration of the broadest step in the progress of the struggle for human liberty that has ever been submitted to any ruler or to any legislative body. Its taking is pregnant with wide changes in the pathway of future civilization. Its destruction will delay and cripple our advancement. The trinity of principles which Lord Chatham called the "Bible of the English constitution," namely, the Magna Charta, the Petition of Rights, and the Bill of Rights, are towering landmarks in the history of our race, but they immediately concerned but few at the time of their erection.

The Declaration of Independence by the colonists, and its successful assertion, the establishment of the right of petition, the abolition of imprisonment for debt and the property qualification for suffrage in nearly all the States, and the recognition of the right of women to earn, hold, enjoy, and devise property are proud and notable gains.

The emancipation of 4,000,000 slaves and the subsequent extension of suffrage to the male adults among them were measures enlarging the possibilities of freedom, the full benefits of which are yet to be realized; but, sir, the political emancipation of 26,000,000 of our citizens, equal to us in most essential respects and superior to us in many, seems to me to translate our nation, almost at a bound, to the broad plateau of universal equality and co operation to which all these blood stained and prayer-worn steps have surely led.

RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT.

The time which I may occupy in advocacy of this measure will not admit of even a cursory review of the history and progress of the the movement whose ultimate is before us.

Like life insurance and the man who carried the first umbrella, its inception was greeted with derision. Born of an apparently hopeless revolt against unjust discrimination, unequal statutes, and cruel constructions of courts, it has pressed on and over ridicule, malice, indifference, and conservatism until it stands in the gray dawn before the most powerful legislative body on earth and challenges final consideration.

In its progress it has benefited all and injured none. It has created a public sentiment before which Legislatures have bent and courts have bowed.

The laws which degraded our wives have been everywhere repealed or modified, and our children may now be born of free women.

Our sisters have been recognized as having brains as well as hearts, and as capable of transacting their own business affairs.

New avenues of self-support have been found and profitably entered upon, and the doors of our colleges have ceased to creak their dismay at the approach of women.

Twelve States have extended limited suffrage through their Legislatures, and three Territories admit all citizens of suitable age to the ballot box, while from no single locality in which it has been tried comes any word but that of satisfaction concerning the experiment

The spirit of inquiry attendant upon the agitation and discussion of this question has permeated every neighborhood in the land, and none can be so blind as to miss the universal development in self respect, self-reliance, general intelligence, and increased capacity among our women. They have lost none of the womanly graces, but by fitting themselves for counselor and mental companions have benefitted man, more perhaps than themselves.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

In considering the objections to this extension of the suffrage we are fortunate in finding them grouped in the adverse report of the minority of your committee, and also in confidently assuming from the acknowledged ability and evident earnestness of the distinguished Senators who prepared it that all is contained therein in the way of argument or protest which is left to the opponents of this reform after thirty seven years of discussion.

I wish every Senator would examine this report and note how many of its reasonings are sniffreputing and how few even seem to warrant further antagonism.

They cite the physical superiority of man, but offer no amendment to increase the voting power of a Sullivan or to disfranchise the halt, the lame, the blind, or the sick.

They regard the manly head of the family as its only proper representative, but would not exclude the adult bachelor sons.

They urge disability to perform military service as fitted to full citizenship, but would hardly consent to resign their own rights because they have passed the age of conscription, or question those of Quakers, who will not fight, or of professional men and civic officials who, like mothers, are regarded as of more use to the State at home.

They are dismayed by a vison of women in attendance at caucuses at late hours of the night, but doubtless enjoy their presence at routs and entertainments until the early dawn. They deprecate the appearance of women at political meetings, but, in Michigan, women have attended such meetings for years upon the earnest solicitation of those in charge, and the influence of their presence has been for good. Eloquent women are employed by State committees of all parties to canvass in their interests and are highly valued and respected.

They object, for their own States to the addition of their former bondswomen because of their ignorance; but that risk was taken at greater hazard upon the adoption of the fifteenth amendment; and I hardly think the gentlemen would care to acknowledge their inability to provide that control for women which they appear to have obtained over the men.

They object that many women do not desire the suffrage and that some would not exercise it. It is probably true, as often claimed, that many slaves did not desire emancipation in 1863, and there are men in most communities who do not vote, but we hear of no freedman to day who asks re enslavement and no proposition is offered to disfranchise all men because some neglect their duty.

The minority profess a willingness to have this measure considered as a local issue rather than a national one, but those who recall the failures to extend the ballot to black men, in the most liberal Northern States, by a popular vote, may be excused if they question their frankness in suggesting this transfer of responsibility.

The education of the people of a whole State on this particular question is a much more laborious and expensive work than an appeal to the several Legislatures The subject would be much more likely to receive intelligent treatment at the hands of picked men of a State, where calm discussion may be had, that at the polls where prejudice and tradition oftentimes exert a more potent influence than logic and justice.

To deny this method to the women of this country is to discriminate against them invidiously.

A whole race, distinct from us, was enfranchised in this way, after repeated attempts at securing popular approval from the voters had failed, and to refuse it to those to whom we are bound by the dearest ties betrays an indifference to their requests, or an inexplicable adhesion to prejudice, which is only sought to be defended by an asserted regard for women, which to me seems most illogical.

I share no fears of the degredation of women by the ballot. I believe rather that it will elevate men. I believe the tone of our politics will be higher; that our caucuses will be jealously guarded, and our conventions more orderly and decorus. I believe the polls will be freed from the vulgarity and coarseness which now too often surround them, and that the polling booths, instead of being the least attractive parts of a ward or town, will be in the most attractive; instead of being in stables, will be in parlors. I believe the character of candidates will be more closely scrutinized and that better officers will be chosen to make and administer the laws. I believe that the casting of the ballot will be invested with a seriousness—I had almost said a sanctity—second only to a religious observance.

THE MISUSE OF THE BIBLE.

The objections enumerated above appear to be the only proferings against this measure excepting certain fragmentary quotations and deductions from the sacred Scriptures; and here, Mr. President, I desire to enter my most solemn protest.

The opinions of Paul and Peter as to what was the best policy for the struggling churches under their supervision, in deferring to the prejudices of the communities which they desired to attract and benefit, were not inspirations for the guidance of our civilization in matters of political co operation; and every apparent inhibition of the levelment of the caste of sex may be neutralized by selections of other paragraphs and by the general spirit and trend of the Holy Book.

In the history of human advancement no single influence has been so powerful as that of the Bible. It has sufficed for all the ages passed and will suffice for the ages to come. To its students has trained to virtue. To the wretched it has afforded comfort, and to the sorrowing it has brought consolation. None have learned from it bad citizenship, and its guidance has ever led to gentleness, honor, and truth. Its histories, poems, and inspired directions, altogether, inculcate the broadest equality of the human race and the greatest tenderness of mutual rights, while its pyramidion, the Golden Rule, voiced by the Saviour, contains the essence of all the law and the prophets.

Sir, my reverence for this grandest of all compilations, human or divine, compels a protest against its being cast into the street as a barricade against every moral, political, and social reform; lest, when the march of progress shall have swept on and over to its consummation, it may appear to the superficial observer that it is the Bible which has been overthrown and not its erroneous interpretation.

TRADITION AND PREJUDICE MUST BE LAID ASIDE.

Sir, if, with our present experience of the needs and dangers of co-operative government and our present observation of woman's social and economic status, we could divest ourselves of our traditions and prejudices, and the question of suffrage should come up for incorporation into a new organic law, a distinction based upon sex would not be entertained for a moment.

It seems to me that we should divest ourselves to the utmost extent possible of these entanglements of tradition and judicially examine three questions relative to the proposed extension of suffrage: First. Is it right? Second. Is it desirable? Third. Is it expedient? If these be determined affirmatively our duty is plain.

IS IT RIGHT?

If the right of the governed and the taxed to a voice in determining by whom they shall be governed and to what extent and for what purposes they may be taxed is not a natural right, it is nevertheless a right to the declaration and establishment of which by the fathers we owe all that we possess of liberty. They declared taxation without representation to be tyranny, and grappled with the most powerful nation of their day in a seven years' struggle for the overthrow of such tyranny.

It appears incredible to me that any one can indorse the principles proclaimed by the patriots of 1776 and deny their application to women.

Samuel Adams said:

Representation and legislation, as well as taxation, are inseparable, according to the spirit of our constitution and of all others that are free.

Again, he said:

No man can be justly taxed by, or bound in conscience to obey, any law to which he has not given his consent in person or by his representative.

And again:

No man can take another's property from him without his consent. This is the law of nature; and a violation of it is the same thing whether it is done by one man, who is called a king, or by five hundred of another denomination

James Otis, in speaking of the rights of the colonists as descendants of Englishmen, said they "were not to be cheated out of them by any phantom of virtual representation or any other fiction of law or politics."

Again:

No such phrase as virtual representation is known in law or constitution. It is altogether a subtlety and illusion, wholly unfounded and absurd.

The Declaration of Independence asserts that, to secure the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuits of happiness, governments are instituted among men, "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Benjamin Franklin wrote:

That liberty of freedom consists in having an actual share in the appointment of those who frame the laws and who are the guardians of every man's life, property, and peace.

That they who have no voice nor vote in the electing of representatives do not enjoy liberty, but are absolutely enslaved to those who have votes and to their representatives.

James Madison said:

Under every view of the subject, it seems indispensable that the mass of the citizens should not be without a voice in making the laws which they are to obey, and in choosing the magistrates who are to administer them.

But it seems unnecessary to multiply these excerpts, familiar to every student of the history of those times.

These declarations were not confined to our shores. Lord Somers said:

Among all the rights and privileges appertaining unto us, that of having a share in the legislation, and being governed by such laws as we ourselves shall cause, is the most fundamental and essential as well as the most advantageous and beneficial.

The judicious Hooker wrote:

Agreeable to the same just privileges of natural equity is that maxim of the English constitution that "Law to bind must be assented to by all," and there can be no legal appearance of assent without some degree of representation.

In 1790, Condorcet, in his treatise on the admission of women to the rights of citizenship in France, says:

Now, the rights of men result solely from the fact that they are rational beings, susceptible of acquiring moral ideas and reasoning on those ideas. Women, having the same qualities, have the same equal rights. Either no one individual of the human kind has true rights or all have the same, and one who votes against the right of another, whatever be that other's religion, color, or sex, from the moment forfeits his own.

Mirabeau condenses the whole question in his definition that "a representative body should be a miniature of the whole community."

The right of women to personal representation through the ballot seems to be unassailable, wherever the right of man is conceded and exercised. I can conceive of no possible abstract justification for the exclusion of the one and the inclusion of the other.

IS IT DESIRABLE?

Is the recognition of this right desirable? The earliest mention of the Saxon peoples is found in the Germany of Tacitus, and, in his terse description of them, he states that "in all grave matters they consult their women." Can we afford to dispute this counseling in the advancement of our race?

The measure of the civilization of any nation may be no more surely ascertained by its consumption of salt than by the social, economic, and political status of its women.

It is not enough for contentment that we assert the superiority of our women in intelligence, virtue, and self sustaining qualities, but we are to consider the profit to them and to the State in their further advancement.

Our statistics are lamentably meagre in information as to the status of our women outside their mere enumeration, but we learn that in a single State 42,000 are assessed and pay one eleventh of the total burden of taxation, with no voice in its disbursement.

From the imperfect gleaning of the Tenth Census we learn that of the total enumerated bread-winners of the United States more than one-seventh are women. They are classified in round terms as follows: Agriculture, 60,000; professional and personal services, 1,400,000; trade and transportation, 60,000; manufactures and mechanical and mining industries, 600,000. That these 2,647,157 citizens of whom we have official information labor from necessity, and are every where underpaid, is within the knowledge and observation of every Senator upon this floor.

Only the Government makes any pretense of paying women in accordance with the labor performed—without submitting them to the competition of their starving sisters, whose natural dignity and self-respect have suffered from being driven by the fierce pressure of want into the few and crowded avenues for the exchange of their labor for bread.

Is it not the highest exhibit of the moral superiority of our women that so very few consent to exchange pinching penury for gilded vice?

Will the possession of the ballot multiply and widen these avenues to self-support and independence?

The most thoughtful women who have given the subject thorough examination believe it, and I cannot but infer that many men, looking only to their own selfish interests, fear it.

History teaches that every class which has assumed political responsibility has been materially elevated and improved thereby, and I cannot believe that the rule would have an exception in the women of to day.

I do not say that to the idealized women so generally described by obstructionists—the dainty darlings whose prototypes are to be found in the heroines of Walter Scott and Fennimore Cooper—immediate awakening would come; but to the toilers, the wage workers, and the women of affairs the consequent englargement of possibilities would give new courage and stimulate to new endeavor, and the state would be the gainer thereby.

The often urged fear that the degraded and vicious would swarm to the polls, while the intelligent and virtuous would stand aloof, is fully met by the fact that the former class have never asked for the suffrage or shown interest in its seeking, while the hundreds of thousands of petitioners are from our best and noblest women, including those whose efforts for the amelioration of the wrongs and sufferings of others have won for them imperishable tablets in the temple of humanity.

Would fear be entertained that the state would suffer mortal harm if, by some strange revolution, its exclusive control should be turned over to an oligarchy composed of such women as have been and are identified with the agitation for the political emancipation of their sex?

Saloons, brothels, and gaming houses might vanish before such an administration; wars—avoidable with safety and honor—might not be undertaken and taxes might be diverted to purposes of general sanitation and higher education, but neither in these respects nor in efforts to lift the bowed and strengthen the weak would the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness be placed in peril.

Women have exercised the highest civil powers in all ages of the world—from Zenobia to Victoria—and have exhibited statecraft and military capacity of high degree without detracting from their graces as women or their virtues as mothers.

A woman, Mrs. Ross, designed the American flag.

The records of all wars show the presence of women in the ranks. More than four hundred were discovered in the Union army who had eluded the scrutiny of the mustering officers and served in disguise.

The services of Clara Barton, Dorothea Dix, Elizabeth Blackwell, and hundreds of other noble women were as valuable as any record.

That the most important campaign of that war was planned by Anna Ella Carroll is attested by the report of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives March 3, 1881, as "fully established," and was vouched for in elaborate detail by Hon. B. F. Wade, chairman of the Committee on the Conduct of the War, soon after its triumphant close permitted him to speak.

The rallying of a Michigan regiment by Ann Ethridge and leading them again into the hot fires of Chancellorsville was only a repetition of the chivalrous deeds of women recorded in every age.

The preponderance of women in our churches, our charitable organizations, our educational councils has been of such use as to suggest the benefit of their incorporation into our voting force to the least observant.

A woman who owns railroad or manufacturing or mining stock may vote unquestioned by the side of the brightest business men of our continent, but if she transfers her property into real estate she loses all voice in its control.

Their abilities, intellectual, physical and political, are as various as ours, and they err who set up any single standard, however lovely, by which to determine the rights, needs, and possibilities of the sex.

To me the recognition of their capacity for full citizenship is right and desirable, and it only remains to consider whether it is safe, whether it is expedient.

IS IT EXPEDIENT?

To this let experience answer to the extent that the experiment has been tried.

During the first thirty years of the independence of New Jersey, universal suffrage was only limited by a property qualification; but we do not learn that divorces were common, that families were more divided on political than on religious differences, that children were neglected or that patriotism languished, although the first seven years of that experiment were years of decimating war, and the remaining twenty three of poverty and recuperation—conditions most conducive to discontent and eratic legislation.

The reports from Wyoming, which I have examined, are uniform in satisfaction with the system, and I do not learn therefrom that women require greater physical strength, fighting qualities, or masculinity to deposit a ballot than a letter or visiting card, while in their service as jurors they have exhibited greater courage than their brothers in finding verdicts against desperadoes in accordance with the facts.

Governors, judges, officers, and citizens unite in praises of the influence of women upon the making and execution of wholesome laws.

In Washington Territory, last fall, out of a total vote of 40,000, 12,000 ballots were cost by women, and everywhere friends were rejoiced and opponents silenced as apprehended dangers vanished upon approach.

Some of the comments of converted newspaper editors which have reached us are worthy of preservation and future reference. The elections were quiet and peaceable for the first time; the brawls of brutal men gave place to the courtesies of social intercourse; saloons were closed, and nowhere were the ladies insulted or in any way annoyed. From the Isle of Man, where universal suffrage obtains, comes similar approval.

Women vote intelligently and safely, and it does not appear that their place is solely at home any more than that the farmer should never leave his farm, the mechanic his shop, the teacher his desk, the clergyman his study, or the professional man his office for the purpose of expressing his wishes and opinions at the tribunal of the ballot box.

To-day—and to a greater extent in the near future—we are confronted with political conditions dangerous to the integrity of our nation.

In the unforeseen but consistent absorption from immigrants and former bondsmen of a vast army of untrained voters, without restrictions as to intelligence, character, or patriotism, many political economists see the material for anarchy and public demoralization.

It is claimed that the necessities of parties compel subserviency to the lawless and vicious classes in our cities, and that, without the addition of a counter balancing element, the enactment and enforcement of wholesome statutes will soon be impossible.

Fortunately that needed element is not far to seek. It stands at the door of the Congress urging annexation. In its strivings for justice it has cried aloud for petitions from the best of our land, and more than one third of the present voters of five States have indorsed its cause. Its advocates are no longer the ridiculed few but the respected many. A list of the leaders of progressive thought of this generation, who espouse and urge this reform would be too long and comprehensive for recital.

Mr. President, I do not ask the submission of this amendment, nor shall I urge its adoption because it is desired by a portion of the American women, although in intelligence, property, and numbers that portion would seem to have every requisite for the enforcement of their demands; neither are we bound to give undue regard to the timidity and hesitation of that possibly larger portion who shrink from additional responsibilities; but I ask and shall urge it because the nation has need of the co operation of women in its direction.

The war power of every government compels, upon occasion, all citizens of suitable age and physique to leave their homes, families, and avocations to be merged into armies, whether they be willing or unwilling, craven or bold, patriotic or indifferent, and no one gainsays the right, because the necessities of state require their services.

We have pessed the harsh stages incident to our permanent institution. We have conquered our independence, conquered the respect of European powers, conquered our neighbors on the Western Continent, and at vast cost of life and waste have conquered our internal differences and emerged a nation unquestioned from within or without.

Our heroic and semi-barbarous ages have closed and slumber in history, never, I trust, to be reacted.

The great questions of the future conduct of our people are to economic and social ones. No one questions the superiority of womanly instincts, and consequent thought, in the latter, and the repeated failures and absurdities exhibited by male legislators in the treatment of the former, should give pause to any assertion of superiority there.

The day has come when the counsel and service of women is required by the highest interests of the state, and who shall gainsay their conscription?

We place the ballot in the keeping of immigrats who have grown middle-aged or old in the environment of government dissimilar to the spirit and purpose of ours, and we do well; because the responsibility accompanying the trust tends to examination, comparison, and consequent political education; but we decline to avail ourselves of the aid of our daughters, wives, and mothers, who were born and already educated under our system, reading the same newspapers, books and periodicals as ourselves, proud of our common history, tenacious of our theories of human rights, and solicitous for our future progress.

Whatever may have been wisest as to the extension of suffrage to this tender and humane class, when wars of assertion or conquest were likely to be considered, to day and to-morrow and hereafter no valid reason seems assignable for longer neglect to avail ourselves of their assertion.

The Next Congress on the Tariff.

The coming number of the *American Machinist* will contain an interesting statement, supported by many letters from Congressmen, concerning the complexion on the tarriff queston of the next House of Representatives. *The Machinist says*:

There has been more or less apprehension among manufacturers and business men since the election last fall, about a possible majority in the next House of Representatives hostile to a protective tariff an axious to take determined action in the direction of a general and sweeping reduction. One hundred and eighty seven members of the present House were re elected, (one of whom has since died, leaving a vacancy.) and all but one or two are on record as having favored or opposed the Morrson bill. Starting with this record as a basis, we determined, if possible, to ascertain the general position of the new House on the tariff by sending lettess of inquiry to each of the 138 members elect. We sent each of them the following questions:

First—Do you favor a protective tariff?

Second.—Do you favor a general and substantial reduction of the present tariff?

Each member of the majority party was asked this additional question.

Third—Which do you most favor—the Randall or the Morrison view of the tariff?

"We have thus received replies from ninety one of the new members. They represent thirty-one different States and express a variety of interesting ideas about the proper policy to pursue in tariff legislation. Five (three of one party and two of the other) rest placidly upon their party platforms, without advancing any views of their own. We would not undertake to interpret party platforms, as political doctors disagree so widely in regard to their meanings. We beleive platforms have small influence in shaping legislation. Of the 65 new Republican Representatives replies have been received from 53. all of whom declare for a protective tariff, except two, who only mention adherence to the Chicago platform. It is safe enough, in view of the unanimity of these replies, to count the count the whole 65 in favor of protection, and we feel confident that the opponents of protection will not dispute the count."

Of the seventy three Democratic Representatives replies have been received from thirty-eight or a majority of the number. Twelve of them are for protection, or for the Randall view as opposed to the Morrison idea of the tariff. The twelve are distributed as follows: Five from New York, one from Pennsylvania, one from Virginia, one from Florida, one from Alabama, two from Louisiana and one Iowa. Thus seventy seven of the new members elect may be relied upon to favor protection in tariff legislation. To these may safely be added the member hereafter to be elected in the Nineteenth Pennsylvania District to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Wm. A. Duncan (Dem.); also the new member (Dem.) elect in the Twenty-seventh Pennsylvania, from whom Representatives from both parties are always for protection There were eighty-nine members of the present Congress re elected who voted to strike out the enacting clause of the Morrison bill. One has died since the election.

The classification is as follows: New members for protection, 79; re-elected members for protection, 88. total, 167. As the whole number of members in the House is 325 a majority of nine for protection is already assured. No doubt, the majority is really much larger.

—The benefactor to whom the Southern States will owe more than to any other claimant on their gratitude, will be the man who shall persuade them to substitute farming with all that it means for planting with all that it means.

—One of the most important buildings on the farm is a tool house, or at least a convenient place for tools.

Mrs. Jones Did It.

Mr. Baker, of Benton; when his name was reached, rose to his feet and said: "Mr. President, I cast my first vote in this Senatoral contest for Gov. James H. Berry, and have continued to do so up to the present time. I know him and I like him. He is a good man, and well qualified, and wife Martha Jane, and wife Laura Evans, Lillie John Pritchet, and one [illegible] Greg speech, but not in the freedom of the pulpit. Freedom to do right, but no freedom to do wrong! It would have been one of the grandest dramas ever enacted in the Brooklyn Theatre if last Sunday evening my friend Patrick Campbell Chief of Police, a Christian man, had marched on the stage with a platoon of police and, laying his hand on the lecturer's shoulder, and said:

"'In the name of the common law; in the name of the State of New York and the city of Brooklyn, stop! Stop here and stop now.' (Applause, which Mr. Talmage rebuked.) There will some time arise in this country a municipal authority which will arrest blasphemers. The carrion stench of infidelity will be fumigated.

"This morning I intend to take infidelity out of the realm of jocularity and place it in the realm of tragedy. First, the success of infidelity would be the disgrace of womanhood. In all states and nations where Christianity has been dominant woman has been honored. Compare her condition here with her condition in other lands, where Christianity has made little progress. Yoked like an ox, made a beast of burden, sacrificed on the funeral pyre of her husband—cat, dog, cow, horse are better than she! If she touches a mouthful of food before her husband finishes his meal it is made a ground of divorce. Her birth is a misfortune, her life a horror, her death a deliverance. Christianity has lifted her up almost to the skies. Withdraw that and she will fall down to the level of savagery. Yet last Sabbath there were women present in the Brooklyn Theatre to listen to a wholesale assault on Christianity. I make no remark on these women. In the silence of their own souls let them make their own observations.

"Destroy Christianity and you will destroy society. Take from the world the idea of hell, and there are many men who would soon turn this world into a hell. I have seen men who have flaunted their infidelity in the eyes of the community for years, but when they came to die they shrieked till they could be heard two blocks, and neighbors shut their windows because they could not endure the horror.

"Let the colonels of infidelity marshall their hosts. March on! Wave your banners in the air! There is no God! Do as you please! The sun in darkness! The first thing they will do is to abolish churches, with their consolations for this life and their blessed home for the life to come. March on! Scatter the Sabbath Schools, where the little children gather to sing songs when they should be on the streets swearing and playing marbles. March on! They will abolish the asylums which Christian philanthropy have established March on! Tear the pictures out of the galleries of Europe. They are Bible pictures Away with the oratorios of Beethoven! Tear down the carving over the gate at Greenwood! It means the resurrection. When they find an angel in marble over a grave, strike off its wings! When they find over a child's grave the words, 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' strike them out. Let infidelity triumph and life would be without comfort and death without hope; for body and soul only extinction. Faith dead, self denial dead, honesty dead, civilization would be driven back into barbarism and the clock of the centuries put back 2,000 years.

"We were struck with horror recently at the attempt to blow up the Houses of Parliament with dynamite. Let infidelity succeed and I would dynamite a world. The earth will be a habitation of three room: when infidelity triumphs, one a head house, the second a lazaretto and the third a pandemonium!

"I am asked, 'Do you think infidelity will triumph?' 'Yes, when the smoke of your chimney blots out the sun.' Great Britain will take all Europe for Christianity, the United States all America, and both will take Asia and Africa."

New Use for the Bustle.

[Paris Letter in Pall-Mall Gazette.]

On Friday last a lady, having paid her hotel bill, sent away her boxes on a cab and sallied forth on foot. No sooner had she departed than the landlord discovered that the clock had disappeared from the mantelpiece of the room which his late lodger had been occupying, though he remembered to have seen it there subsequent to her trunks being despatched. Convinced that she must be the thief, he rushed out in hot pursuit, and overtaking her, he charged her with the robbery and gave her into custody, the lady weanwhile protesting loudly against the indignity offered her, and vowing vengeance against the traducer. She was, however, taken before the Juge d'Instruction, to whom she resumed her torrent of indignant denial with the extraordinary volubility peculiar to the daughters of Gaul. Her indignation was at its height when, lo! 12 o'clock rang out in clear tones from the region of madame's dress improver. The expression of consternation depicted upon the fair pilferer's countenance, together with the appositeness of the quaint phenomenon, was too much for the gravity of the officials, who burst into fits of uncontrollable laughter. Five minutes later a female warder returned tell-tale timepiece to its owner.

"Put Ingersoll in Jail."

Rev. T. De Witt Talmage had an immense audience last Sunday, drawn by the announcement that he would preach on Bob Ingersoll's witty but wicked lecture delivered the Sunday previous. Not a few of the congregation has attended the lecture and they drew many a comparison between the manner and matter of the two orators. "Christianity," said Mr. Talmage, "is the rising sun of our time. Yet there are men trying, by the smoke of their blasphemy, to turn the sun into darkness. But what the destruction of the sun would mean to our planet, the destruction of Christianity would be to the world of morals. Infidelity in our time is considered a great joke. If a lecturer in the Brooklyn Theatre last Sunday is correctly reported, he said, 'When we compare our God with men he is not much of a God.' He said that when Christ was here he was kind and forgiving, but now that he is a God he would send men into everlasting punishment, and that was doubtless the effect of an office! Christ, who came to bear our sorrows and our sins, maligned and made the subject of mirth! Is there such a thing as blasphemy? If so, can the law be executed? These are tremendous questions for on lawyers and judges. There is such a law and it can be executed"

Mr. Talmage then quoted from Rev. Dr. Speer, Chief Justice Kent, Judge Cooley and other authorities as to the nature of blasphemy and how it could be punished under the common law "Now I say let the law against blasphemy be erased or let it be executed. But I am asked, "Don't you believe in free speech?" Yes, I believe in all kinds of freedom. I believe in driving horses, but not in driving over others. I believe in the free [illegible] shaves, but not in assassination. [illegible] not in the freedom of the pulpit. Freedom to do right, but no freedom to do wrong! It would have been one of the grandest dramas ever enacted in the Brooklyn Theatre if last Sunday evening my friend Patrick Campbell Chief of Police, a Christian man, had marched on the stage with a platoon of police and, laying his hand on the lecturer's shoulder, and said:

"'In the name of the common law; in the name of the State of New York and the city of Brooklyn, stop! Stop here and stop now.' (Applause, which Mr. Talmage rebuked.) There will some time arise in this country a municipal authority which will arrest blasphemers. The carrion stench of infidelity will be fumigated.

"This morning I intend to take infidelity out of the realm of jocularity and place it in the realm of tragedy. First, the success of infidelity would be the disgrace of womanhood. In all states and nations where Christianity has been dominant woman has been honored. Compare her condition here with her condition in other lands, where Christianity has made little progress. Yoked like an ox, made a beast of burden, sacrificed on the funeral pyre of her husband—cat, dog, cow, horse are better than she! If she touches a mouthful of food before her husband finishes his meal it is made a ground of divorce. Her birth is a misfortune, her life a horror, her death a deliverance. Christianity has lifted her up almost to the skies. Withdraw that and she will fall down to the level of savagery. Yet last Sabbath there were women present in the Brooklyn Theatre to listen to a wholesale assault on Christianity. I make no remark on these women. In the silence of their own souls let them make their own observations.

"Destroy Christianity and you will destroy society. Take from the world the idea of hell, and there are many men who would soon turn this world into a hell. I have seen men who have flaunted their infidelity in the eyes of the community for years, but when they came to die they shrieked till they could be heard two blocks, and neighbors shut their windows because they could not endure the horror.

"Let the colonels of infidelity marshall their hosts. March on! Wave your banners in the air! There is no God! Do as you please! The sun in darkness! The first thing they will do is to abolish churches, with their consolations for this life and their blessed home for the life to come. March on! Scatter the Sabbath Schools, where the little children gather to sing songs when they should be on the streets swearing and playing marbles. March on! They will abolish the asylums which Christian philanthropy have established March on! Tear the pictures out of the galleries of Europe. They are Bible pictures Away with the oratorios of Beethoven! Tear down the carving over the gate at Greenwood! It means the resurrection. When they find an angel in marble over a grave, strike off its wings! When they find over a child's grave the words, 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' strike them out. Let infidelity triumph and life would be without comfort and death without hope; for body and soul only extinction. Faith dead, self denial dead, honesty dead, civilization would be driven back into barbarism and the clock of the centuries put back 2,000 years.

"We were struck with horror recently at the attempt to blow up the Houses of Parliament with dynamite. Let infidelity succeed and I would dynamite a world. The earth will be a habitation of three room: when infidelity triumphs, one a head house, the second a lazaretto and the third a pandemonium!

"I am asked, 'Do you think infidelity will triumph?' 'Yes, when the smoke of your chimney blots out the sun.' Great Britain will take all Europe for Christianity, the United States all America, and both will take Asia and Africa."