

MISCELLANY

LIFE'S AWFUL BALANCE.

For The Public.

"At last!" said the proud inventor,
 "My design has won its way;
 The factory has received it—
 They are putting it in to-day.
 That plan had the great God's blessing,
 My weary waiting is done,
 And the work for a thousand tollers
 Will be saved by the brain of one."

"Thank God!" cried a sweet-faced maiden,
 "My loved one is happy at last.
 The days of defeat and sorrow
 Lie buried away in the past.
 We mind not the years of struggle,
 Nor fret at the long delay—
 This glorious message has reached us:
 'They are putting it in to-day.'"

Scarcely a mile from this triumph
 Is the home of a factory-hand,
 Where four little fatherless children
 Are huddled—a trembling band.
 "No more work for dear mother,
 Hundreds are turned away,
 One cruel machine will do it—
 'They are putting it in to-day.'"

Oh, poets! You play with the problems of
 wrong,

Amid ceaseless want and strife;
 Pray, what do you mean, in your mellow
 song,

By "the balance wheels of life"?
 Arise! and your dreamland forsaking,
 Turn rhymes into trumpet peals:
 For the world's great heart is breaking
 Under these "balance wheels."

MARY M'NABB JOHNSTON.

COAL MINING.

The coal mines are owned by widows and orphans. They are worked by slaves.

Moreover, there are the operators. When it chanced that the widows and orphans murmur, and complain that their dividends are too small, the operators exclaim:

"What! Would you take the bread from the mouths of the poor slaves in the mines?"

And if it falls out that the slaves would have more wages, the operators protest:

"What! Would you take the bread from the mouths of the widows and orphans whose slender means are invested in these mines?"

It is their cleverness in working the widows and the orphans and the slaves that has won for these persons the name of operators.—Life.

DINKELSPIEL ON THE COAL PROBLEM.

I vent among several of my friends to see hat dey any suchchestions to offer, bud I made leedle succession.

To Chay Pierpont I set: "Guten morgen! Vot is your idea aboud a substitution for der poor peoples to burn vile coal has such a scarceness?"

Chay vas silent for a brief moment, den he set: "Vy doan'd dey turn on der steam?"

To Antrew Carnegie I proposed der same qvestion und paused for a reply.

"Vell," set Antrew, "I haf nod given der idea much thought, bud I vould suchchest a library."

"Dot is because you haf libraries to burn, bud der poor peoples vas bookless," I vispered.

"If dare vas any man, woman or child in der world dot I haf nod given a library to, name dem und I assurance you der ofersight will be apologized," set Antrew.

"Do you dink books could make der poor peoples forget der scareyosity of coal?" I conjectured.

"Sure," said Antrew; "provided dey vas light literature."

Den Antrew laughed so unanimously ad his own choke dot I vas compulsioned to rush henceforth.—Geo. V. Hobart, in Chicago Examiner.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

A portion of an address made by Newton D. Baker at the Jackson day banquet of the Cleveland Buckeye club, January 8, as reported in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The worst possible plan of government in the hands of the best men is better than the best possible plan in the hands of the worst men. Government among men is to be had neither by instinct nor by machinery. At last our government must be human, and the excellence of any government will always be in direct ratio to the honesty and intelligence of those who administer it. We cannot have good government from bad men.

No more immoral or hurtful political maxim was ever uttered than Marcy's famous cry: "To the victors belong the spoils of the vanquished," for it directed the attention of those who desired to serve the public, more to the question of their political qualification than to their efficiency, deprived the public spirited citizen of any inducement for political activity, crippled the efficiency of the public service by making not merit, but partisanship the means of entrance, divided countless miserable thousands of our people into three pitiful and unproductive classes; first, those turned out of office and trying to get back; second, those in office and in terror of being turned out; and third, those out of office and spending their time trying to get in; and perhaps worst of all, made those who were selected to be executives depend for the retention of their places rather upon their power to select and reward

those partisan leaders most efficient in vote getting than upon the uprightness or efficiency of their performance of public duty.

An essentially Democratic policy administered in part by Republicans would likely have pretty Republican consequences and an essentially Republican policy administered in part by Democrats might well fail of good results through no fault in the policy itself. But the limit of reason in the application of this rule requires change only in those places either of a confidential character, or when the duties are affected by the views the incumbent holds of the wisdom of the policy involved. Beyond this the political belief of officeholders becomes relatively unimportant and the efficiency of the service becomes the chief consideration. Fidelity to the public interest and an honest performance of duty ought in this latter class of places to protect men from being punished for their political opinions by having their careers cut short just when they have learned to do well some one thing and when it is too late for them to learn a new business or calling.

This is not a Democratic city, nor is it probably a Republican city. If you were to draw tight party lines around the partisans of each of these parties you would probably find about an equal number in each group, but not enough in either to carry an election, while off to one side would be a company of about 10,000 voters waiting to throw their decisive influence in with that party which nominated the purest and best men for office and which most closely lived up to high ideals in the conduct of public affairs. We can win elections in Cleveland just as long as we deserve to win them; just as long as we are worthy of public confidence we can have it, for what the great public wants is a competent, intelligent and trustworthy administration of its affairs.

THE RELATION OF DEMOCRACY TO A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

A portion of an address delivered at the Jackson Day banquet of the Maine Democratic club at Portland, Me., Jan. 6, 1904, by the Hon. John De Witt Warner, of New York.

What is the people's cause? Democracy opposes government restriction, for it believes in giving the people all freedom possible. But it favors extension of public service—this to give each more freedom. To illustrate: Democracy abhors a protective tariff, because it interferes

with men's business. But it favors our postal service, because that makes it easier for every man to do business.

No government can serve monopoly and the people; "for either it will hate the one and love the other, or it will hold to the one and despise the other." It cannot "serve God and Mammon."

To take our government out of bondage to Mammon, to make it better serve our people, such is, to-day, the people's cause—such the progress of Democracy.

What items does this involve?

First, getting it out of the service of plutocracy—making it stop taxing our people for private monopoly.

Our forefathers denounced George III. "for cutting off our trade with all parts of the world." That is just what our own government is doing. Free trade is what we want. Is it not high time to say so? If I remember correctly, the declaration of independence was the glad end of a long series of loyal protests to the British crown, in which the Tories had joined.

One of the truths we must accept as axiomatic is that "protection" is usurpation—blackmail—to which no man has any excuse for submitting, except that for the moment he cannot resist or escape; to which no one does submit except because he must.

I am not so sure, however, but that we may have among us those who wish to be classed as "tariff reformers." What does "tariff reform" mean? As I understand it, a mere tariff reformer is ready to acquiesce in a tariff "for revenue." But, in fixing a tariff for revenue, the interests affected lie, bully and bribe—just as in the case of a tariff for protection. The antics of ten monkeys to which have been thrown three oranges are dignity and generosity compared with the performance of American manufacturers when tariff schedules are fixing.

Moreover, experience has shown how little we can hope for such adjustment of any tariff as to leave it one for revenue alone. The Wilson tariff was less oppressive in its extortions than any other we have had of late years; but there never was one less defensible on logical grounds than was this when it left the House; or one more bestuck with corruption than this, when it came back from the Senate to become a law.

Senators and Congressmen were not all angels then. There are men of honor and courage among them now. But no one, on reading the roll, can claim that Congress is now better worthy of trust, or that we have a

right to expect future ones will be so.

Even if practicable, a tariff for revenue could not be defended. For it is a tax, not on ability to pay, but on necessity to use. From its very nature, to produce even a large or a stable return, it must be mainly levied, not upon luxuries, but upon the necessities of life.

It is a tax which stands by the cradle, and, as each babe enters the household, vigilantly and pitilessly increases its father's share of public burdens; but which sleeps unmoved while bond is piled upon bond in the strong box, and broad acres are added to broad acres outside. Is it fair thus to tax the necessities of the poor and leave untouched the accumulations of the rich? Is it fair thus to burden the unfortunate in proportion to his wants, and thus to let the miser go free in proportion to his stinginess? Is it fair to discourage the rearing of children, and thus to encourage the breeding of dollars?

But we have timorous friends, who shiver whenever there is danger that something will be done. And they ask: Would you have business disaster? Certainly—disaster to every man the continuance of whose prosperity depends on the continuation of his power to tax us for his benefit. When answered thus, they generally say that they agree, but—that "some tariffs are not as bad as others;" and that "we don't want to do anything that would unsettle business."

Well, which are good tariffs? Which are those the repeal of which would unsettle any business? Now I have asked that question scores of times, and I have never yet received an answer.

In the year 1901 we collected through the customs house \$233,500,000.

Of that, 27 per cent. was the duty on sugar.

Could not the business of this country stand free sugar?

Of the remainder, a little less than ten per cent. was on manufactured cottons; and about the same amount on woolen and manufactures of wool.

Could not the business interests of this country survive giving our whole people better and cheaper clothes?

Next come flax and other fibers—five and one-half per cent.; iron and steel goods, three per cent.; tea, three and one-half per cent.; chemicals, medicines, etc., two and four-tenths per cent.; pottery and china, two and three-tenths per cent.; hides and leather goods, three per cent.—in each of which free trade would help our

people. The duty on tea is already repealed.

Whom would it ruin if the sugar trust, the cotton trust, the woolen trust, the linen trust, the iron and steel trust, the leather trust and the glass trust were left without protection?

Of our total tariff receipts the only considerable items collected on luxuries are: Seven per cent. thereof on tobacco; six per cent. on manufactured silk, and four per cent. on liquors.

Liquor and tobacco duties may be needed to counterbalance internal revenue taxes. But from beginning to end of the tariff schedules, there is not an item the repeal of which would not help business rather than hurt it. A pauper dollar that don't earn its living without outdoor aid is just as much a drag on business as is a human wreck whom the poormaster has to help.

In short, my fearful friends, when you plead for tariff reform instead of free trade, in order that business may not be hurt, you are letting yourselves be used by protection monkeys as cat's paws, to pull their chestnuts out of the fire. The only good tariffs are dead tariffs.

"LOBSTERS" I HAVE MET.

A MILITARY GAZABO ON THE ROAD.
For The Public.

I arrived in Waco, Tex., one hot night last June very tired. I went to a hotel, found a chair on the sidewalk and settled down for a quiet smoke.

There were three traveling men seated in front of me, in such position as to describe a semicircle. They were talking about soldiers. One guy thought there were two or three brands of soldiers, and was giving the others the benefit of his "pipe." I resolved that no matter what was said I wouldn't butt in. For once I was going to sit by and listen to a line of fierce talk.

"There is one thing about West Pointers; when a man graduates from there he is a gentleman," said one.

"Yes, I guess that's right," drawled another.

"Now look at Sampson," said the first one; "you could tell him from an ordinary citizen anywhere."

"I never saw him," said the other.

"I never did, either," replied the first lunatic; "but I know he's a graduate of West Point, and that's enough for me!"

"Has England got any such institution as West Point?"

"I'm not sure, but I think she must