

THE FABLE WHEREIN IS RELATED  
THE FALL-DOWN OF THE MAN  
WHO THOUGHT HE HAD A MIS-  
SION.

Once upon a Time there was a Man who got a Hunch that he had a Mission. He felt Impelled to Travel in a far Land and Teach its People how to be Good. He therefore secured a Pass and went Abroad, carrying a number of Reforms in his Carpet Bag. In good time he arrived in a Land whose People were Endeavoring to start up in Business for Themselves.

"Ah!" exclaimed the Man with a Mission, "I see I am just in Time. I have here in my Grip some Good Things."

"But we want to Experiment," said the People.

"Tut, tut," said the Man with a Mission. "I come from a Land where the People know all about the Governing business. I will now proceed to Start you off Right."

"But has your own Country no Need of your Services?" asked the People.

"No, we are so Thoroughly Good that we can Spare the Time to Show you How."

"But are your cities free from Corruption?"

"Well, we have a few corrupt city Governments."

"And are not Corrupt Men holding High Place in your Government?"

"Yes, but we will get rid of Them in Good Time."

"And do you not Occasionally Burn your Fellow-Citizens at the Stake?"

"Yes, but—"

"And is it not a Fact that the Party which Backs you owes its Success to Boodle?"

"Well, I confess—"

"And are not Millions of your Fellow-Citizens groaning under grievous Burdens?"

"Of course, but we—"

"Well, sir, we are Much Obligated to you, but we prefer Risking this Thing on our Own Hook."

At this the Man with the Mission waxed Wroth and Called to his aid a vast army to assist him in Shooting his Mission into the People. But the People resisted, knowing that the Mission was Frayed around the Edges and somewhat moth-eaten.

Moral: Some Missions are sadly in need of a coat of Whitewash.—Will M. Maupin, in The Commoner.

THE PROSPERITY OF NEW ZEA-  
LAND.

The contrast in the conditions of the two Australasian colonies of Queensland and New Zealand has an interest

beyond the merely financial aspect. New Zealand is described by the acting premier as "wonderfully prosperous;" Queensland pleads for the "subordination of party and personal considerations" to preserve the state with "unbroken credit." New Zealand had its dark days when Queensland was in the zenith of prosperity, and it is not impossible that by the time that Queensland's drastic reforms have retrieved its position New Zealand may be feeling the reaction that seems inevitably to follow a "boom" in every young country. Apart, however, from these ups-and-downs in the development of these colonies, it is interesting to note the fact that during the past ten or fifteen years the "Labor party" has been most influential in politics in New Zealand and least influential in Queensland. In New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia the representatives of labor have for many years held the balance of power, and they do so to-day in the federal parliament. In New Zealand the Seddon government has kept so much in the forefront of "advanced" legislation that it has practically superseded the necessity for a labor party. In Queensland labor is neither in power nor does it hold the balance. Save for a few short weeks it has always been in a minority, and never more so than after the last general election. Yet, curiously enough, the most prosperous of the seven Australasian colonies is the one (New Zealand) where labor is master and "progressive" legislation is rampant. The circumstance has some interest just now in view of the fact that, years ago, Queensland critics were conspicuous among the many who predicted disaster for New Zealand when it entered upon its career of one-man-one-vote, woman suffrage, land value taxation, old-age pensions, compulsory arbitration in strikes and other so-called "revolutionary" legislation. Politically, financially and industrially New Zealand was never sounder than to-day, which is more than can be said of Queensland, although the conservative forces have been more powerful there, for good or ill, than in the island colony.—Editorial in The London Daily Chronicle of July 10.

"LOBSTERS" I HAVE MET.  
THE PROSPEROUS ELEVATOR BOY.

For The Public.

I had only recently moved into the flat, and did not know how the building was managed. The elevator "boy" was about 25, very polite and obliging, but looked a bit "raw." One night I

came in after 11 o'clock. He was at his post, as usual. "Great Scott!" I said, "you took me down at eight o'clock this morning; what are your hours, anyway?"

With a rather feeble smile, he replied: "From 7 in the morning till 12 at night."

That was a scorcher to me, and I remarked: "If you'd put in a few more hours you would have a steady job, wouldn't you?"

"I guess that's right, sir," he answered, meekly.

I was interested to know how a young man like this could accept such a position.

"How long have you had this job?" I asked, with as much show of interest in his welfare as I could muster up at that late hour.

"Only about three months, sir," he replied, wearily.

"What do they pay you?"

"Twenty-five dollars a month."

"And cakes?"

"Wha— I don't know what you mean."

"Do you have to pay your own board?"

"Yes, sir."

How nice, I thought.

"What did you do before you came here?"

"Worked on a farm."

"Why did you leave?"

"Cause the hours were so long, and there was nothing going on."

"Were the hours as long as they are here?"

"Well, no, not exactly; but there was nothing going on. Everything is so quiet on a farm; can't have any fun."

"Oh, I see. You thought you would come into town where you could attend the theater and ball games and horse races?"

"Ye— yes, sir," he answered, feebly, as if he appreciated the irony of my question.

"Been to the grand opera this week?"

"No, sir," with a half-suppressed laugh.

"Now, as a matter of fact," I said in a more serious tone, "you are really no better off here than you were on the farm, are you?"

After a moment's reflection he said he didn't think he was.

It was just after the November election in 1900, and I wanted to satisfy another curiosity, so I asked him for whom he had voted. He replied that he had voted for McKinley. Somehow I suspected that before I asked the question.