



A FABLE WHICH IS NOT ALL A FABLE,
SHOWING HOW A LAMB, BY NOT BEING A BLACK SHEEP, DID THWART THE PACK OF WOLVES WHICH CAN BE FOUND AT NEARLY EVERY SAVINGS-BANK DOOR.

WORKING-WOMEN'S PROTECTIVE UNION.

This is an age prolific in benevolent enterprises. Never before in the history of the world has there been a time when men and women of position and wealth have evinced such a widespread interest in the welfare of their poorer fellow-creatures. How far this is owing to the influence of the Christian religion, or to the increasing wisdom and intelligence which permeate that in all nations and communities the good of one is the good of all, and *vice versa*, it is impossible to say; but certainly never before have the interdependence of rich and poor, and the duty of the former to sympathize with and alleviate the burdens of the latter, if both are to continue in conditions of peace and well-being, been so fully realized.

Among the many associations whose aim and object are to succor the poor and helpless, and whose strength does not suffice to enable them to fight their own battles with the world successfully, few, considering its limited means, have effected more good than the Working-women's Protective Union. This society was established by a number of noble-hearted and benevolent people for the relief and protection of working-women, of whatever nationality, creed, or color, from every species of oppression and wrong. Its members have not designed to offer their beneficiaries anything in the way of charity, but simply to protect them from injustice. This it endeavors to achieve by furnishing legal advice and information, by investigating every complaint of fraud, by the prompt enforcement of justice, by the collection of wages earned but withheld, and by considering every application for employment, and striving to obtain suitable work or other aid for all who are struggling to help themselves.

There is a certain resemblance between this organization and the German Legal Aid Society, which suggests that it might have been modelled upon the latter. It has been said that Germany is a country which is governed to death, but it is one in which justice may be obtained by the poor in equal measure as by the rich. It was the want of that care, doubtless, which a paternal government, with a vast and intricate machinery at its command, endeavors to exercise over its lowest subjects, that induced wealthy and thoughtful Germans to establish in New York a society for the benefit of their fellow-countrymen who come to our shores as poor emigrants. These men, who are among the most intelligent and law-abiding of our citizens, claim that however unjust the laws of the different states of Germany before it was one great empire may have been, the administration of those laws was always most exact. They say that there has been justice between man and man for centuries back through every state, and that it has therefore created in the mass of the people the consciousness that if they have a wrong to complain of, the proper authority will give them redress. There is an anecdote familiar to many, but it illustrates this principle so admirably that it will do to quote it once more:

Frederick the Great built himself the castle of Sans Souci, near Potsdam, and adjoining the grounds there was a mill property which the king wanted for the purpose of extending the park surrounding his beautiful palace, and he sought to purchase it through his agents from the miller, to whom and whose ancestors it had belonged for many years. The miller refused to sell; he said no, his parents had lived there; his grandparents had lived there; he had lived there very well himself; he was satisfied with it. The king offered him three times the value of the property; but the miller was obstinate, and would not sell. Finally the king sent for him—and Frederick the Great was known not to be very pleasant in his manner, particularly when he was angry. He was in great wrath, and he walked about with his cane, ready to make the miller feel bodily, if he should refuse to sell to him his property. He peremptorily requested the miller to be seated, saying to him: "Now I offer to you three times the value of your mill. I must have it; and if you will not sell it to me, I shall take it."

But the miller was very quiet, and looked up into his Majesty's face. "But, your Majesty, you will not do it."

"But I will," he says. "Why not?"

"Because I shall sue you before the Chancery Court," the miller said.

And that was the end of the matter. Frederick the Great, the great autocrat, the monarch who ruled Prussia with an iron hand, did not dare to do an act which would have been so outrageous that a court of justice would have condemned him.

Our German friends insist that when their countrymen come to our shores as mechanics, or farmers, or laboring-men, they bring with them this sense of the prevalence of justice. But when they have been here a short time, all, or many of them at least, very soon find that they are deceived, wronged, or cheated in some way or another, and when they attempt to obtain justice, perhaps they will not succeed in getting it. Some cunning, cynical neighbor of the poor man, who has had the same experience, will say to him: "This is the land of humbug. Do not suppose that you can get justice done here in that way. Do as the smart Yankees do, and you will prosper." In this way, they say, the poor emigrant loses the sense of justice with which he came, and becomes a correspondingly bad citizen.

Although we are by no means prepared to admit all that is thus advanced, there can be no doubt that in our country the poor do suffer greatly from injustice, and especially women. Where can a poor man in the city of New York, for instance, with his ordinary intelligence only, where can a poor working-woman, with her children at home, if her employer attempt to cheat her, find the shield and protection of the law, or learn the redress for that wrong, unless some one aids her? If she even know enough to make her complaint, for a few dollars she will perhaps be confronted by a lawyer retained by the employer to make the most of the case against the poor man, and the chances are that unless she employs a lawyer herself she will be defrauded,

through some technicality, of what is her just due. There is really very little justice to be obtained by this class of people unless they have some one to take up their cause. The law exists, but how are they to profit by it unless some one helps them to obtain the advice of some learned counsel? To help a case it must be investigated, and by some one who understands the law, if a legal remedy is to be applied. Again, another difficulty to be contended with—and one, perhaps, that is unavoidably connected with our form of government, and with the fact that our legislators are inexperienced men, who make incongruous laws, and thus create a doubt as to what is law—is the uncertainty of the laws in many of the fields of labor, and that, too, in a country whose people maintain that it is governed by law and not by force. It is doubtful if we have not as much complication and as great difficulty in a general way to ascertain what the law is in this country as in any other, and that in spite of the proud boast that our constitutions are all based upon the great principle underlying all civilization, and brought down to us from the English charters—the principle that every man ought to have justice done him; that he ought to be able to have the law for any injury done him in his person, in his property, or in his character; that he ought to be able to obtain justice freely and without purchasing it, and promptly and without delay, conformably to the law.

To make this "ought to be" a fact in the case of unprotected and unfortunate women whose personal appeal to the law would be impossible, is one of the most important of the tasks which the Protective Union has set itself. The success which it has met so far can not be better illustrated than by citing a few instances published in its latest annual report. Two little girls were book-folders, and had been dismissed without the \$2.65 and \$1.16 which they had earned. Their employer was much incensed that the Union should interfere in so trifling a matter, but he soon found that discretion would be better than valor in a bad cause, and the money was paid. Another case was that of a poor girl employed by a fashionable dress-maker. She was very poor, and had a feeble mother and a sick brother depending on her earnings. The five dollars a week promised her would barely buy the commonest necessities of life. For two weeks the payments to her were postponed under plausible excuses, and when want drove her to a positive demand for her money at the end of the third week, she was met by an equally positive avowal that she must complete her engagement "for the season" before she could expect any payment—that they never made payments oftener than once a month, and she had not yet worked even that. What could she do? The last crust had been eaten—they were starving while this employer owed her fifteen dollars! The mother loaned her enough to procure one day's food, and found her other employment, for which she received the money, the employer was at last brought face to face with his victim, and the latter received her money.

A third instance, which shows more clearly than any other the value of the aid rendered by the Union, is that of a poor woman named Porter, who on her own account appealed to the law, and found its representative not less of a scoundrel than the employer who endeavored to defraud her of her just due. Mrs. Porter was employed, a year ago, in New York, by a prominent Commissioner in preparing certain rolls of voters, and in rendering other clerical assistance precedent to the election; but the Commissioner did not think that a woman needed pay for her work, and avoided it. A Broadway lawyer when she sought offered to prosecute the claim free of charge, and she placed it in his hands. While the suit was in progress, Mrs. Porter arranged for removing her home to far-off Colorado. Just before leaving New York she learned that her lawyer had obtained judgment and recovered the money from the Commissioner; but she was at last obliged to leave the city without it, and to content herself with his promise to forward it in a short time. But the money was never sent. The lawyer proved as great a swindler as had the Commissioner. Having heard of the Union, and of its care for the interests of working-women, Mrs. Porter wrote there, giving her experiences, and asking for such help as could be afforded. Proceedings were promptly taken against the lawyer. For a time he evaded and made promises; but when the legal forms had been completed, and he found exposure and disbarment imminent, he sent the money.

The work that has been done by the Protective Union during the sixteen years of its existence is a noble one, and there will be no limits to its usefulness if one-half of the programme which its friends sketch for it can be carried out in the future. It is proposed that a part of its work shall be to ascertain the exact number of working-women there are in New York. These are to be classified, so that it will be possible to tell how many there are engaged in one department of labor, and how many in another, and compare them. Again, it is to be found out how much each gets in each department, and who gets the most, so that it can be seen where the difficulty lies, where there is the most labor, and where the most is needed. The names of employers also are to be recorded, so that the market may be watched, and the demand supplied. Women, it is maintained, have in these days come to be an independent part of the social organization. They are recognized now as bread-winners. They are regarded as possessing certain rights they have never had before, and are therefore entitled to certain protection and certain laws. The necessity of their laboring is understood, and they are fitting themselves to the condition. Women are doing the work of clerks, and they are found in nearly all telegraphic offices. Other avenues are being opened, and their rights as workers should

be protected, their pay regulated according to the value of the work performed, and they themselves taught to respect their position as an independent integral part of the community. Toward these ends nothing can have a greater influence than an organization such as the one under consideration. Another duty which its friends hope to see it perform is that of pointing out to the State ways of performing by legal enactments the task it now struggles with privately and at a disadvantage. There is no reason why laws should not be passed which will enable people to obtain justice more freely and more promptly, and without the burdens that now adhere to it so far as small claims are concerned.

So far, not the least good that the Protective Union has accomplished is the sentiment it has inculcated and the relations it has established between rich and poor that have come under its influence. In the modest rooms at No. 38 Bleeker Street, where the poor worker makes known her story of wrong to sympathetic and helpful friends, are received applications for help of all kinds, the society having an agency for the supply of teachers, seamstresses, dress-makers, and every branch of female labor outside of household service. Here also come wealthy visitors, who, it is hoped, do not fail to leave behind them substantial tokens of good-will; for the Protective Union, like other institutions of its kind, depends upon material help from its friends to carry on its good work. That its work is a good one, one of the best ever set in motion, all must allow. There is about it none of the charity that enables people to throw their burdens upon others. It is based upon the simple principle that justice exists for the poor as well as the rich, and should be placed within their reach. Those that exert themselves to so place it are of the class among which the extortioner and oppressor are looked for. The very fact of the wealthy and the prosperous spending their time and their substance to assist the less fortunate to the enjoyment of a common right is itself sufficient to establish relations of sympathy and harmony that can not fail to be of great value to both. "When we stand forward in an organized community," writes the Rev. John Hall, "the richest and the best people in the community taking their place in the work; when we throw the shield of protection over the poor working people; when we tell them that their cause is our cause, that their griefs grieve us, that their wrongs wrong us, that we are willing to give our time and effort and money to redress their wrongs, and to avert these grievances that oppress them—we are doing something to make these working people feel that the men of property are not their natural enemies; that the people who have means and substance are not their foes, but their friends; that we have one common interest; and that we are to stand together, each seeking to be just and upright and fair to his fellow, in the various places and relations in which it has pleased God to put us. On the ground, therefore, not merely of simple natural justice which we demand for these working people, but upon the broader and wider ground of a wise and intelligent public policy, it is good and proper for us to extend, in effective operation, such an honest, benevolent agency as that which is before you."

OUR RACE-HORSES IN ENGLAND.

At last English turf-men are beginning to place American-bred race-horses on an equality with their own thorough-breeds. For twenty-four years, since Mr. RICHARD TEN BROECK took Leconte, Prior, and Princess across the Atlantic for the purpose of trying to clutch the highest honors of the English turf from the native racers, Englishmen have looked upon our horses as inferior to their own, and have handicapped them accordingly, liberally giving them the lightest weights. Up to the splendid triumphs of Parole, this concession to American horses was about fourteen pounds. Now, however, our horses are carefully weighed in the balance, and the full measure of weight assigned them. This places us on equal terms, with the advantage, if any, on the side of the Englishmen; for the change from the blue-grass nursery of our blooded horses, across the blue billows to the frequently fog-covered downs around Newmarket, is not calculated to improve our stock to any great extent.

Notwithstanding the risk and expense of sending thorough-breeds across the sea, several of our leading turf-men are filling up stables at Newmarket which are beginning to arouse the attention, if not the admiration, of lovers of the rare old English sport of horse-racing. One of the greatest turf authorities in London said recently: "Mr. LORILLARD's team of race-horses appears to have been the advance guard of a large army of American horses coming to fight us on our own ground for the richest prizes of the English turf. Their enterprise deserves success, and we hope they may achieve it." Another influential authority says, "These Yankee horses are likely to prove just a little puzzling and perplexing to the backers as the season grows." That there is cause for these surmises is shown in the fact that the engagements of American race-horses in England for this year already number more than two hundred and sixty.

The galaxy of horses presented on page 157 may well challenge the admiration of all lovers of fine animals. With one exception, they belong to the stable of Mr. PIERRE LORILLARD. The exception is Spendthrift, the hero of Mr. JAMES R. KEENE's stable.

The central figure, Falsetto, is a grand young giant of the turf. He is by Enquirer, the sire of eighteen of last year's winners. His dam, Farsetta, is a daughter of Australian, and there are strains of Lexington and Leamington blood in his veins. Falsetto was foaled in 1876 in Kentucky. He did not run as a two-year-old. As a three-

year-old he shot out like a meteor from a group of the fastest youngsters that ever raced in this country. His first race was in Lexington, Kentucky, May 10, 1879, one mile and a quarter, for the Phoenix Hotel Stakes. Ten horses started. Falsetto was hardly thought of. He won in 2.083. His next race was for the Louisville Derby. Here he met Lord Murphy and other first-class horses that had won as two-year-olds. The distance was a mile and a half. Lord Murphy was in front at the finish, with Falsetto second. This was Falsetto's only defeat. His great performances for the Clark Stakes, two miles, in 3.40; the Travers Stakes, one mile and three-quarters, 3.04; and the Kenner Stakes, two miles, 3.35, are too well known to require repetition. In the last two races he met Spendthrift, then supposed to be invincible. The Kentuckians were nearly wild with joy over these victories. Several of them yelled and jumped like maniacs on the quarter stretch. They had sold their fastest colt (Spendthrift) the year previous, and now, with their usual luck, had developed another to vanquish it. Mr. GEORGE LORILLARD remarked to his brother PIERRE that he considered Falsetto a better colt than the Duke of Magenta. Upon this representation Mr. PIERRE LORILLARD purchased Falsetto, paying the highest price ever given for a three-year-old in America—\$18,000. Mr. M. H. SAMPSON, a gentleman who has had large experience in running American horses over English turf, said to the writer last spring that if the Duke of Magenta had kept in the proper form, he would have astonished the Englishmen more than Parole did. He also expressed his belief that a horse with the blood of Lexington in his veins would yet capture the coveted English Derby. Possibly the beautiful bay may gather his white stockings with the precious blue ribbon of the English turf.

Spendthrift is a great chestnut colt. He was foaled in 1876, and bred on the vast ALEXANDER farm, in the heart of the blue-grass region. He was sired by imported Australian, dam Aerolite, by Lexington. He was a wonderful two-year-old, winning all his races, five in number. His best two-year-old performance was a mile race for colts and fillies, in which he defeated Lord Murphy, now his stable companion, in 1.44. Last year, as a three-year-old, he started eight times, winning five races, and coming in second in the others. In one race in which he came in second he was almost pulled to a stand-still in order to allow his stable companion to win, which was allowable under the rules. He was really entitled to six victories. Falsetto was the only horse that could get in front of him. Even then it was claimed that Spendthrift was not himself in his last races. This has been partly confirmed by the fact that he was sent back to Kentucky, where his feet have recovered their original soundness, and his thews and sinews filled out to an extent that augurs well for an increase of his wonderful speed, endurance, and ability to carry the top-most weights. He is to be sent across the Atlantic in April. The other members of the galaxy are at Newmarket, in full vigor.

Sly Dance is a wonderful filly. She is a large chestnut, not very rich in color, but has all the marks of form which experienced horsemen claim indicate great speed and endurance. She is by War Dance, a son of Lexington. Last season, in her two-year-old form, she ran four races, heading the squadron of young bloods in three, and coming in second in the fourth, when she was beaten by her stable companion, Mistake, in a mile run, in the fast time of 1.43.

Mistake is a chestnut colt, unpretentious in size, but with plenty of muscle, tendon, and bone. He is of fair length, with wide hips and immense quarters. He was sired by Waverley, son of Australian. Last year he headed the list of Waverley's winners, starting six times, coming in first in three races, and second in one.

Wallenstein is a handsome chestnut colt, with high head and arched neck. He is also a son of Waverley and a Lexington matron. He started in six contests last season, as a two-year-old, winning four, and coming in second once. In his last race in Jerome Park, October 11, he vanquished a fast field of four and five year olds in a mile dash.

Geraldine is a stylish and game bay filly. She was foaled in 1877. She is by imported Saxon—Girl of the Period. Geraldine never raced in this country. She was bred by Mr. PIERRE LORILLARD at his Ranocous farm, New Jersey, and sent to England in the fall of 1878. She started five times in England last year, winning first, second, and third places. Her greatest victory was at Goodwood, July 30, when she won the Lavant Stakes, value £1030. The betting was ten to one against her.

Pappoose is a fine chestnut filly, full sister to Parole. She was foaled in 1877 by imported Leamington—Maiden, by Lexington. Like Geraldine, she made her maiden races in England last year, as a two-year-old, starting six times, and scoring one victory, the first spring two-year-old stakes at Newmarket, April 30.

With the exception of Spendthrift, the above horses will soon be heard from, as they are free to enter in the spring as well as summer races. Spendthrift is to be sent over in the early spring, but will not enter the contests until late in the season.

Following are the principal events in which Mr. LORILLARD's horses are entered: March 15, the Bathany Stakes, Lincoln; March 17, the Lincoln Handicap; March 19, Liverpool Spring Cup; April 14, Newmarket Handicap; April 13, Double Trial Plate; April 16, Newmarket International Handicap; April 21, Great Metropolitan Stakes; April 22, City and Suburban; April 20, Great Surrey Handicap; April 23, the Essex Stakes, Sandown Park; April 27, Prince of Wales Stakes; May 5, the Chester Trades Cup; May 6, the Great Cheshire Stakes; May 11, Newmarket Spring Handicap; May 28, Epsom Gold Cup; June 10, Ascot Gold Cup, and All-aged Stakes.

SAG 1992-45