

Wanted! Ideas for Sensible Clothes for Women

New York Club-Women Offer Prizes for Designs for a Dress a Woman Can Wear All Day with Appropriateness



Miss Rose O'Neill, Who Will Be a Judge of the Sketches for the Universal Gown for Women.

A MOVEMENT to secure a model gown, suitable for all day and evening wear, and adapted to the needs of the majority of women has been started by a committee of prominent club women of New York.

The movement in this necessary and laudable direction bears the name, the Polymuriel Prize Fund. The originator of the idea has given to it the combined names of her two daughters, Polly and Muriel. The chairman of the committee of clubwomen having the matter in charge is Mrs. A. M. Palmer, president of the Rainy Day Club, the organization to whose credit may be set down the same practice which has saved the lives of many American women and assured the health and lives of their children, that of wearing sufficiently short skirts on days of storm.

The committee has set practically and efficiently about its task, for it has placed in the bank \$150 to be awarded to whoever will furnish a design for a costume fulfilling its requirements. It foreshadows the prizewinning gown in the sentence "We desire an universal gown for women, one showing the strongest combination of beauty, comfort, simplicity and durability." Mrs. A. M. Palmer, who has been termed "The Mother of the Rainy Day Skirt," outlines the committee's plan in these words:

"Business women, professional women, busy women of most sorts have long needed a frock that they could wear to an office or a business meeting and in which they could also appear suitably attired at a luncheon, a matinee or an afternoon reception.

"My own idea is that the garment should be built upon simple lines. It should preferably consist of one piece. Its silhouette should not too strongly suggest an umbrella, a knitting needle, an hour glass, a pyramid, inverted or otherwise, or other of the geometric forms into which women have from time to time tortured their bodies.

"It should be neither so scant nor so voluminous that it will be grotesque. It should be a design that could be adapted to the tall or the short, the stout or the slender woman, the old and the young. It should be suitable for light or heavy materials, according to season or weather.

It should be comfortable for drawing room wear or suitable for walking.

"It is a difficult problem we have set, yes. But it is not impossible. I have faith in the cleverness of designers. I think some American will give a design for such a costume and earn the gratitude of all women, compared with which the \$150 prize is a bagatelle."

Upon Mrs. Rose O'Neill Wilson, the gifted and beautiful artist who originated the sketches, and who has recently given the world the newest fad, which is a Mermaid, a kiewpie of the semblance of a mermaid, with which it is the fashion to bathe, has fallen the committee's choice of one who shall judge of the artistic merits of the sketches. While Miss O'Neill will pass upon the beauty of the sketches, her colleagues of the committee, Mrs. A. M. Palmer, Miss Florence Guernsey and Mrs. Mildred Johnstone Landone, the originator of the idea, will contribute their ideas and votes on the matter of utility as well as beauty.

"A garment may be beautiful as well as useful," is a ray of hope shed by the famous artist. "We must not assume that to be durable a costume must be ugly."

Another ray of hope. "A garment need not be made of expensive material to be beautiful. Some lovely stuffs now cost ten cents or less a yard.

"This movement for a universal garment is one of the worthiest outgrowths of woman's liberty of thought. It is a step toward stopping the enormous waste in dress, the waste of strength, of time, of nervous force and so of life.

"The clothes we have been wearing have imprisoned our waists and ankles. They have squandered our time and nervous force by endless intricacies of fastenings. Why does it take a man so short a time to dress and a woman so long? For instance, have you watched a man stalk angrily about the beach at the seashore waiting for his wife to disrobe herself and get into her bathing costume, or after the bath attire herself for a more conventional appearance? It is because she does not get into her garments in the same way, and when she has gotten into them has to dally with innumerable contrivances for keeping the garments on.

"Two practicable and invaluable hints

men have given us in the matter of dress. We should accept and adopt them. A man slips his shirt over his head. We should be able to get into our garments in the same way. In my studio and at home or for evening wear, I usually wear a costume that I can slip over my head. This robe is made of one long, broad piece of cloth. An opening is cut in the middle for the neck. The selvaged edges are joined at the side by a seam, leaving a long opening for the arms. This foundation garment I fasten at the neck or bosom by a cord or clasp. Presto, I have dressed in less than a minute. For beauty's sake I often wear a second and shorter tunic, of the same or a contrasting color. If I add this to my costume the process of dressing requires a full minute. I have accepted the second hint men have given us in dress, to use few and simple fastenings.

"Such a garment can be made in an hour. Think of the time saved for fitting. For this garment needs not to be fitted. Women can make the costume themselves, or if they give the task over to a dressmaker who has their 'measures' in her book they need never visit her establishment.

"My own conception of a universal costume for women is a combination of Greek and Turkish apparel. The Greek costume is beautiful, because it serves the two purposes of drapery for the body. It veils and floats. It gives a woman the sense of being hidden in her robe, and this sense is peculiarly agreeable to a woman, especially if she be a plentifully rounded one. Nothing lovelier, so far as feminine beauty goes, was ever devised than the early Greek robes, for all women. For even the over plump woman looks as well in them as she does in the present revealing fashions.

"But I advise a combination of the Greek with the Turkish accessories. I do not care for the upper part of the Turkish garments. They are too heavy and burdensome about the shoulders. I eliminate their robes from all my plans for dress, but I do earnestly advocate the nether garments. The Turkish pantaloettes are beautiful and comfortable. They are much more practicable than the skirts of the day, because they are closed at the ankles. No need to fear rheumatism, ye who wear them.

"A Greek tunic reaching to the ankles at the sides, and below the knees in front, with a pair of Turkish pantaloettes, is a combination that is beautiful and practical. A tunic of satin and pantaloettes of velvet would be charming for winter. An extra tunic could be worn for warmth.

"In the summer the soft, cheap stuffs, such as cheesecloth could be utilized.

"For footwear I recommend sandals with a strong strap over the instep. I do not advise, as some extremists do, discarding hosiery. I shrink from thought of that extreme because the dust of the street is horrible and menacing. Wear the dainty stockings of the day by all means, but let them have large, loose garters woven into them as the elastic are fastened into the bloomers of bathing suits.

"For lingerie with garment I have described I should advise lighter, looser garments of the same kind. With this might be worn a brassiere, but never a corset.

"I should like to see a Summer costume devised

The Greek Costume, Miss O'Neill Says, Serves the Two Purposes of Drapery for the Body. It Veils and Floats.



Judge O'Neill Says This Costume is Beautiful but Impossible as a Polymuriel Foundation, Because It Denies the Fullest Freedom of Movement.

that can be made in simple stuffs for a dollar. Think of a costume that costs a dollar, that can be made in an hour and that one can slip into in a minute or less. I guarantee the beauty of such a costume, because not only will it veil the body, but it will float about it. When a woman enters a room there should be a vision of floating things, of draperies swirling about her as cloud float in the heavens.

"I hope that the designers of the universal costume will keep in mind the three desirable characteristics of clothing, beauty, suitability to the wearer and the occasion, and freedom of movement. It must be as far from harness, and especially from that torturing form of feminine harness, the corset, as the North Pole from the South.

"When we are



A Costume Miss O'Neill Designed for Her Sister and that Approaches Her Ideal of the Universal Gown.

as far from the burden of clothes as men are we may equal or even surpass them in great world achievements. At present we hobble through our tasks and are incalculably handicapped in their performance.

"Of the two extremes to which fashion has led us, I prefer the former to the present. The tight skirt suit, of course, was more graceful than the present full one, for it followed the outline of the figure. I protest against the present voluminous skirt. It is a slipping back into the commonplace.

"Men have been making our clothes for us. It is time that women furnished them. This is the beginning. The contest will continue until mid night on the last day of May. On June 15 the announcement of the prize winner, and the description of the prize winning garment will be made. Sketches of the much-desired garment will be sent to the Polymuriel Prize Fund Committee, No. 528 Riverside Drive.

They must be accompanied by an assumed name. In an extra envelope, sealed, will be the true name of the competitor.

All New York clubwomen are interested in the plan. Miss O'Neill's slogan has been adopted: "Beauty Suitability and Freedom."



The Tight Skirt Is More Original and Individual Than the Full Skirt. The Greek Tunic, with Turkish Pantaloettes, Is Suggested by Miss O'Neill.

THE Game Bird Society of the United States is urging the passage of this very sensible new game law:

"That all birds and animals reared or bred in captivity shall be considered domestic stock, and the owner or raiser thereof may keep, sell, ship, transport or otherwise dispose of them, and such stock shall not be affected or covered by any laws prohibiting or regulating the killing or disposition of birds and animals of the game kind grown or propagated in a wild state."

In support of the intelligence of such a law the society points out that of the eggs of quail set by the birds in a wild state 81 per cent hatch. Of the eggs of the same bird hatched in captivity on private game farms 72 per cent hatch. Of the birds hatched in the wild state, 15 per cent attain maturity. Of the eggs hatched in private preserves, 64 per cent mature. These figures are taken from one hundred and seven observations made in the years 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913 and 1914. These figures can be amplified by the statement of the observers, a part of

which is as follows: "Chickens were originally a wild bird. The habitat of the chicken is very limited. It consisted of a strip of territory bordering on the Mediterranean Sea on the southern border of Europe, the western border of Asia, and a part of the northern border of Africa. The chicken was not domesticated until after the coming of Christ. Then we learn from Clixius that a certain fowl very shy of mankind was brought to Athens and after three seasons reared progeny. Since then the chicken has become the most numerous of all birds. If laws were to be enacted protecting chickens from hunters and butchers and for bidding their ownership and rearing by private industry there would not be a chicken in existence in five years.

Some contend that if private ownership, sale and killing of any game birds is permitted, it will accomplish destruction of that bird by affording game hunters an opportunity to kill the wild game and palm it off on the public as domestic stock. The Chinese ring-neck pheasant is not a native of this country. All the game laws devised would not make the

Chinese ring-neck a resident of this country. That required private enterprise. An American official resident in China became acquainted with this bird and brought some to this country.

The bird was then known to this country and on that account there were no fool game laws to prevent raising the birds. He raised many. Most of these he liberated in Washington and Oregon, and as a result those States are now well stocked. England is ahead of the United States and Canada in many respects, one of which is game legislation.

In England wild game hunting is only allowed under regulations made by Parliament, but all the game laws of England expressly provide it shall be legal for any person to raise, ship, sell and kill game for pleasure or profit. The English sporting fraternity learned of the success of the ring-neck experiment in Oregon and immediately undertook their propagation.

To-day the pheasant population of England is twice as great as the human population of that island, and the secretary of the "Field Sports and Game Guild" of England and Scotland gives in its directory

for the season of 1913-1914 the names and addresses of twenty-four game raisers who in that season set seventy-five thousand pheasant pens. Don't get the idea that this is a typographical error. The figure is 75,000.

On the other hand, as soon as the successful rearing of pheasants was assured in the United States, some of the fool game hunters, game commissioners and legislators succeeded in having several States enact laws prohibiting their domestic rearing and handling. The result is that it is taking us a painfully long period of time to put upon a solid foundation an industry that England made a success in ten years. It is due solely to private industry that we have the ring-neck in America.

The States that interfered with Chinese pheasant culture have in the main seen the light and it is now permissible to rear the birds in most States. There are still some fowl laws to be repealed, but as they are not enforced it is not a matter of immediate moment. One such law was passed by the State of New York. It permits rearing and sale of pheasants in

the State, but forbids any person bringing any pheasant into the State. They say that law was passed to increase the number of New York pheasants. Another law is that of Indiana, which permits the rearing and sale of pheasants, but forbids any railroad or express company to accept them for shipment. The asinine of such laws is self-evident.

While the ring-neck pheasant in a strange country and in all its different climates has thriven because it has been raised by private parties as a business enterprise, the prairie chicken, native grouse, quail and other native game birds have been almost exterminated by disease, natural enemies, rodents and the gradual thickening of the human population which destroys their feeding and hiding places.

Give private parties the right to rear quail as a business and the interested persons will protect, feed and care for them, and as a consequence they will multiply. They will be reared and frequently sold to clubs and individuals who will liberate them for stocking purposes. Private and State hatcheries make possible the restocking of our fishing grounds.

All the protective laws did not increase the number of fish.

A man will protect his money, and if his money is invested in quail he will protect his quail. It was Buffalo Jones who saved the buffalo in this country, because he bought a few specimens and kept them for their increase. It is not always the hunter that kills and exterminates game. Disease, starvation and lack of proper care is the biggest factor in game destruction. In a wild state it is estimated that it required all North America to support two hundred thousand Indians, and it is estimated the population of this continent was two hundred thousand when Columbus discovered it. But civilization and comfort enable more people to live in a given territory than can live in the same territory in savagery. What is true of human beings is true of game.

Also, the time is rapidly passing when farmers who own and cultivate the land will tolerate laws made solely to permit some loafer with a gun to tear down fences, destroy crops, shoot domestic animals, kill human beings and outrage generosity for the purpose of calling himself a sportsman and killing game that the farmer's land has protected and the farmer's grain has fed.