

Mr. Williams, for State, opened the debate by defining the question and outlining the entire argument of the affirmative. This side took the position that the labor unions by means of strikes, boycotts, intimidations, etc., are infringing on the liberty of the American citizen, intimidating justice, and by direct losses to manufacturers, workingmen and the public in general are tending to injure the industrial welfare of the U. S. Mr. Williams took the subject of strikes, showed that unions cause strikes, and are thus responsible for the losses to industry occasioned thereby. Strikes injure industry by destroying property, by interfering with manufacturers, transportation, supply of public necessities such as coal, etc., losses to workingmen in general, and, finally, losses of the public in contributions to strikers' funds, etc. Mr. Williams cited numerous instances and quoted statistics to prove his points. His argument was well outlined and fully substantiated.

Mr. Witmer opened for the negative. He agreed fully with the definition of the question as submitted by the affirmative, with the one exception that industrial welfare should include the welfare of salaried officials. He then outlined the argument of the negative, and quoted from various authorities to show that the labor union is all that is right and proper. He quoted from John Stuart Mill, Mark Hanna, Carroll D. Wright and Abraham Lincoln. He then showed that the labor union benefits the industry of the country by raising the standard of living. That labor unions by organizing scattered workingmen have made labor a power in this country. That by agitation they have helped to provide legislation to do away with child labor, introduced protective machinery and forced the employer to raise wages. He drew the conclusion that any organization which could thus benefit the general welfare of the workingman certainly was tending to benefit the industrial welfare of the whole country.

Mr. Hayes continued the argument for the affirmative. He took the boycott and dwelt on its injurious effects on the industry of the country, showed how it drove the independent manufacturers out of business, and intimidated capital and small investors. He