

Smiles of the Day

Good at Addition.

Sammy's mother talked to him long and earnestly about the poor marks he had been getting in his work at school. She painted in alluring colors the career of the little boy who studies his lessons and gains the love and respect of his teachers. She went even farther; she promised him that if he got good marks she would give him a whole dime, all for his own. Sammy seemed impressed.

That afternoon he returned from school fairly dancing with joy.

"Oh, mother," he shouted, "I got a hundred!"

"Sammy!" cried his delighted mother. She hugged him and kissed him and petted him and gave him the dime.

"And what did you get a hundred in?" she finally asked him.

"In two things," replied Sammy, without hesitation. "I got forty in reading and sixty in spellin'."—Everybody's Magazine.

In Fowlville.



Mr. Dorkin—Of all the fool fashions you women take up! Now what will be the good of that immense beaver hat when it goes out of style?

Mrs. Dorkin—Chump! Look what a warm nest it will make.

The Depotism of the Press.

We clip the following for the benefit of those who doubt the power of the press:

"Owing to the overcrowded condition of our columns, a number of births and deaths are unavoidably postponed this week."—Everybody's Magazine.

Squelched.

The dapper little traveling man glanced at the menu and then looked up at the pretty waitress. "Nice day, little one," he began.

"Yes, it is," she answered, "and so was yesterday, and my name is Ella, and I know I'm a little peach, and have pretty blue eyes, and I've been here quite a while and like the place, and I don't think I'm too nice a girl to be working in a hotel; if I did I'd quit my job; and my wages are satisfactory; and I don't know if there is a show or dance in town to-night, and if there is I shall not go with you, and I'm from the country, and I'm a respectable girl, and my brother is cook in this hotel, and he weighs 200 pounds and last week he wiped up this dining room floor with a fresh \$50-a-month traveling man who tried to make a date with me. Now, what'll you have?"

The dapper little traveling man said he was very hungry, and a cup of coffee and some hot cakes would do.—Pittsburg Chronicle-Telegraph.

There's a Reason.

Mr. Dubbs (with newspaper)—It tells here, my dear, how a progressive New York woman makes her social calls by telephone.

Mrs. Dubbs—Progressive. Huh! She's probably like me—not a decent thing to wear.—Boston Transcript.

A Strange Coin.

Nephew (just returned from abroad)—This franc piece, aunt, I got in Paris.

Aunt Hepsy—I wish, nephew, you'd fetched home one of them Latin quarters they talk so much about.—Boston Transcript.

A Gentle Hint.



Mrs. Henry Peck—I don't know what to buy mother for a birthday present, do you?

Mr. Henry Peck—Yes; buy her a traveling bag.

Its Language.

"Pop, did you say a bird told you about how I was naughty yesterday?"

"Yes, my son."

"Pop, did it tell you in pigeon English?"—Baltimore American.

The Aftermath.

"Christmas is a hard day for the women," said Mr. Nippy as he watched his wife basting the turkey.

"Yes," said she, "but think of the days and days afterward when we don't have to cook at all."—Newark News.

Good Place for Camels.

Governor Glasscock, of West Virginia, while traveling through Arizona, noticed the dry, dusty appearance of the country.

"Doesn't it ever rain around here?"

"Rain? The native spat. 'Rain? Why, say, pardner, there's bullfrogs in this yere town over five years old that hain't learned to swim yet.'"

—Everybody's Magazine.

Editorial Omniscience.

"Father," said the small boy of an editor, "is Jupiter inhabited?" "I don't know, my son," was the truthful answer. Presently he was interrupted again. "Father, are there any sea serpents?" "I don't know, my son." The little fellow was manifestly cast down, but presently rallied and again approached the great source of information. "Father, what does the north pole look like?" But alas! again the answer, "I don't know, my son." At last, in desperation he inquired, with withering emphasis, "Father, how did you get to be an editor?"—Concordia, Kansas.

Another Tong War.

Silas (reading morning paper)—I see, Mandy, they're having another war of the Tongs down there in China town.

Mandy—Land sakes! You'd think with all them Chinese laundries around that flatrons would be handier things tew fight with.—Judge.

A Surmise.

"What is Mrs. Gabson's favorite book?"

"I don't know," answered Miss Cayenne; "from the interest she takes in knowing the names, occupations and home surroundings of everybody she sees I should think it ought to be the city directory."—Washington Star.

Cause of Delay.

He was the bridegroom, and he was waiting at the church.

"I can't imagine why my bride is late," he said.

"Well, you will," replied the best man, "after you're married. They are hooking her dress up the back!"—Yonker's Statesman.

An Obliging Doctor.

Sick Wife—Doctor, I will double your fee if you will prescribe a trip to the seashore.

Doctor—Very well, madam, I shall do so.

Sick Wife—What were you intending to prescribe?

Doctor—A trip to the seashore.—Meggendorfer Blaetter.

A Last Resort.

"You remind me so much of my brother," she said coyly as they sat in the parlor.

"I'm awfully glad of that," he answered gallantly. "I have always admired your brother. In what way am I most like him?"

"Well, Harry seems awfully fond of me, yet he never offers to kiss me."

"After that it was unnecessary for her to rattle in any of her relatives."—St. Louis Star.

Too Easy.



"Now, Willie, what's the difference between one yard and two yards?"

"A fence! Gimme a harder one!"

Cold Comfort.

In a country store a young boy was under discussion by the cracker-barrel committee. Jones had just remarked, "That boy's a regular fool. He doesn't know nothing; he don't know enough to come in when it rains." Then he discovered the boy's father, who had overheard the remark, and, wishing to appease him, he said, "Well, Sam, 'taint your fault. You learned him all you knew."—Lippincott's.

Reasons Enough.

Father—You seem to look at things in a very different light since your marriage.

His Newly Married Daughter—Well, I ought to, after receiving fourteen lamps and nine candelabra for wedding presents.—Tit-Bits.

Out of Hearing.

Rodrick—In the stock market news I see there is money on call.

Van Albert (sadly)—On call, eh? Well, if I should call with a megaphone none of it would reach me.—Mobile Item.

Another Knock.

First Actor—I approached the clerk of the Red Dog Inn and told him actors deserved special terms.

Second Actor—Ah, indeed! And what did he say?

First Actor—He said they deserved six-month terms in the county workhouse.—Chicago Journal.

Sure of His Answer.

An individual, well known on the Berlin Bourse for his wit, one morning wagged that he would ask the same question of fifty different persons and receive the same answer from each. The wit went to first one and then another, until he had reached the number of fifty. And this is how he won the bet: "I say, have you heard that Meyer has failed?" "What Meyer?" queried the whole fifty one after another, and it was decided that the bet had been fairly won.—The Argonaut.

Plenty of Poor Stars.

"But do you think," asked the visitor in the local option town, "that prohibition really prevents?"

"Well," replied the native, "it prevents a fellow from getting the best of whisky, but it doesn't prevent whisky from getting the best of him."—Catholic Standard and Times.

A MAN WHO HAD COURAGE.

In St. Ives, in Land's End, bird killing used to flourish almost without protest. It has not wholly ceased yet, to be sure, but one little incident took place which seems to have been remembered here and there, and to have brought about a merciful truce. In "The Land's End" W. H. Hudson relates the occurrence as he heard of it. He was talking one day to a woman who deplored the way her fellow countrymen were killing birds of all kinds. "I'm sure," she said, "that if some one living here would go about among the people and talk to the men and boys, and not be afraid of anything, but try to get the police and magistrates to help him, he could get these things stopped in time, just as Mr. Ebblethwaite did about the gulls."

Who was Mr. Ebblethwaite, and what was it he did about the gulls? I had been, off and on, a long time in the place, and had talked about the birds with a score of people, without ever hearing this name mentioned. And as to the gulls, they were well enough protected by the sentiment of the fisherfolk.

But it had not been so always. On inquiry, I found twenty persons to tell me all about Mr. Ebblethwaite, who had been very well known to every-

body in the town, but as he had been dead some years, nobody had remembered to tell me about him.

It now came out that the very strict protection awarded to the gulls at St. Ives dates back only about fifteen to eighteen years. The fishermen always had a friendly feeling for the birds, as is the case of all the fishing places on the coast, but they did not protect them from persecution, although the chief persecutors were their own children.

People, natives and visitors, amused themselves by shooting the gulls along the cliffs and in the harbor. Harrying the gulls was the popular amusement of the boys; they were throwing stones at them all day long, and caught them with baited hooks, and set gins baited with fish on the sands, and no person forbade them.

Then Mr. Ebblethwaite appeared on the scene. He came from a town in the north of England, in broken health, and here he stayed a number of years, living alone in a small house down by the waterside. He was very fond of the gulls and fed them every day; but his example had no effect on others, nor had his words when he went about day after day on the beach, trying to persuade people to desist from these senseless brutalities.

Finally he succeeded in getting a number of boys summoned for cruelty before the magistrates, and although no convictions followed, nor could be obtained, since there was no law or

by-law to help him in such a case, he yet in this indirect way accomplished his object. He made himself unpopular, and was jeered and denounced as an interfering person, especially by the fishermen; but some of the fishermen now began to pluck up spirit and second his efforts, and in a little while it came to be understood that, law or no law, the gulls must not be persecuted.

That is what Mr. Ebblethwaite did. For me it was to "say something," and I have now said it. Doing and saying come to pretty much the same thing. At all events, I have on this occasion kept Ruskin's words in mind concerning the futility of prodding and scratching at that thick, insensible crust which lies above the impressive part in men unless we come through with a deep thrust somewhere.

TAME SEA GULLS.

Caught Young and Kept Around House, They Have Never Left It.

I have had a pair of tame gulls for the last five years; a writer in the Field says. I got them from Seariff Island when they were about three months old and had their wings cut.

For about two years they used to run about with the fowls and would eat anything in the way of meat, bread and cakes. I was advised to put them into the garden to eat the slugs, but I found they were fonder of strawberries and so removed them. They are not a bit afraid of dogs or cats. When

their wings were well grown I let them fly to sea (which is only about five minutes from my home).

They always came back about our meal hours. I called them Paddy and Polly. Paddy is afraid of nothing; he comes into the dining room and walks around the table, taking food from everyone, and one day he had the boldness to turn two cats from their saucer of bread and milk and finished the contents himself. Another day we were having tea outside the hall door when he flew on to the table and helped himself to bread and butter. If there is no one in the front of the house they fly around to the back and tap at one of the kitchen windows to be fed.

They go away sometimes for three or four weeks in the autumn during the mackerel fishing season, and I expect they get food enough at the fishing curing station, about a mile away. Sometimes they have brought young ones with them on their return, but the latter never get very tame and generally go away when they have acquired their full plumage.

The Philosopher of Folly.

"I see by the papers," says the philosopher of folly, "that the dentists will form a trust. I suppose it will be known as the 'Teething Ring.'"—Cleveland Leader.

Wireless telegraph apparatus is prohibited in British India except upon government license.

Don't Weep At The Ice House.

Some people swell up on "emotion" brewed from absolute untruth.

It's an old trick of the leaders of the Labor Trust to twist facts and make the "sympathetic ones" weep at the ice house." (That's part of the tale further on.)

Gompers et al. sneer at, spit upon and defy our courts, seeking sympathy by falsely telling the people the courts were trying to deprive them of free speech and free press.

Men can speak freely and print opinions freely in this country and no court will object, but they cannot be allowed to print matter as part of a criminal conspiracy to injure and ruin other citizens.

Gompers and his trust associates started out to ruin the Bucks Stove Co., drive its hundreds of workmen out of work and destroy the value of the plant without regard to the fact that hard earned money of men who worked, had been invested there.

The conspirators were told by the courts to stop these vicious "trust" methods, (efforts to break the firm that won't come under trust rule), but instead of stopping they "dare" the courts to punish them and demand new laws to protect them in such destructive and tyrannous acts as they may desire to do. . . . The reason Gompers and his band persisted in trying to ruin the Bucks Stove Works was because the stove company insisted on the right to keep some old employees at work when "de union" ordered them discharged and some of "de gang" put in.

Now let us reverse the conditions and have a look.

Suppose the company had ordered the union to dismiss certain men from their union, and, the demand being refused, should institute a boycott against that union, publish its name in an "unfair list," instruct other manufacturers all over the United States not to buy the labor of that union, have committees call at stores and threaten to boycott if the merchants sold anything made by that union. Picket the factories where members work and slug them on the way home, blow up their houses and wreck the works, and even murder a few members of the boycotted union to teach them they must obey the orders of "organized Capital!"

It would certainly be fair for the company to do these things if lawful for the Labor Trust to do them.

In such a case, under our laws, the boycotted union could apply to our courts and the courts would order the company to cease boycotting and trying to ruin these union men. Suppose thereupon the company should sneer at the court and in open defiance continue the unlawful acts in a persistent, carefully laid out plan, purposely intended to ruin the union and force its members into poverty. What a howl would go up from the union demanding that the courts protect them and punish their law-breaking oppressors. Then they would praise the courts and go on earning a living protected from ruin and happy in the knowledge that the people's courts could defend them.

How could any of us receive protection from law-breakers unless the courts have power to, and do punish such men.

The court is placed in position where it must do one thing or the other—punish men who persist in defying its peace orders or go out of service, let anarchy reign and the more powerful destroy the weaker.

Peaceable citizens sustain the courts as their defenders, whereas thieves, forgers, burglars, crooks of all kinds and violent members of labor unions, hate them and threaten violence if their members are punished or breaking the law. They want the courts to let them go free and at the same time demand punishment for other men "outside de union" when they break the law. . . . Notice the above reference is to "violent" members of labor unions. The great majority of the "unheard" union men are peaceable, upright citizens. The noisy, violent ones get into office and the leaders of the great Labor Trust know how to mass this kind of men,

in labor conventions and thus carry out the leaders' schemes, frequently abhorrent to the rank and file: so it was at the late Toronto convention.

The paid delegates would applaud and "resolute" as Gompers wanted, but now and then some of the real workingmen insist on being heard, sometimes at the risk of their lives.

Delegate Egan is reported to have said at the Toronto convention: "If the officers of the federation would only adhere to the law we would think a lot more of them."

The Grand Council of the Provincial Workingmen's Ass'n of Canada has declared in favor of severing all connection with unions in the U. S., saying "any union having its seat of Gov't in America, and pretending to be international in its scope, must fight industrial battles according to American methods. Said methods have consequences which are abhorrent to the law-abiding people of Canada involving hunger, misery, riot, bloodshed and murder, all of which might be termed a result of the practical war now in progress in our fair province and directed by foreign emissaries of the United Miners of America."

That is an honest Canadian view of our infamous "Labor Trust."

A few days ago the daily papers printed the following:

(By the Associated Press.) Washington, D. C., Nov. 10.—Characterizing the attitude of Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell and Frank Morrison of the American Federation of Labor in the contempt proceedings in the courts of the District of Columbia, in connection with the Bucks Stove and Range Company, as "a willful, premeditated violation of the law," Simon Burns, general master workman of the general assembly, Knights of Labor, has voiced a severe condemnation of these three leaders. Mr. Burns expressed his confidence in the courts in general and in those of the District of Columbia in particular.

APPROVED BY DELEGATES. This rebuke by Burns was in his annual report to the general assembly of his organization. He received the hearty approval of the delegates who heard it read at their annual meeting in this city.

"There is no trust or combination of capital in the world," said Mr. Burns, "that violates laws oftener than do the trust labor organizations, which resort to more dishonest, unfair and dishonorable methods toward their competitors than any trust or combinations in the country."

Mr. Burns said the action of "these so-called leaders" would be harmful for years to come whenever attempts were made to obtain labor legislation. "The Labor Digest," a reputable workingman's paper, says, as part of an article entitled "The Beginning of the End of Gompersism, many organizations becoming tired of the rule-or-ruin policies which have been enforced by the president of the A. F. of L."

"That he has maintained his leadership for so long a time in the face of his stubborn clinging to policies which the more thoughtful of the workmen have seen for years must be abandoned, has been on account partly of the sentimental feeling on the part of the organizations that he ought not to be deposed, and the unwillingness of the men who were mentioned for the place to accept a nomination in opposition to him. In addition to this, there is no denying the shrewdness of the leader of the A. F. of L., and his political sagacity, which has enabled him to keep a firm grip on the machinery of the organization, and to have his faithful henchmen in the positions where they could do him the most good whenever their services might be needed.

"Further than this, he has never failed, at the last conventions, to have some sensation to spring on the convention at the psychological moment, which would place him in the light of a martyr to the cause of unionism, and excite a wave of sympathetic enthusiasm for him, which would carry the delegates off their feet, and result in his re-election.

"That his long leadership, and this apparent impossibility to fill his place has gone to his head, and made him imagine that he is much greater a man than he really is, is undoubtedly the case, and accounts for the tactics he has adopted in dealing with questions before congress, where he has unnecessarily antagonized men to whom organized labor must look for recognition of their demands, and where labor measures are often opposed on account of this very antagonism, which would otherwise receive support.

"There is no doubt but what organized labor in this country would be much stronger with a leader who was more in touch with conditions as they actually exist, and who would bring to the front the new policies which organized labor must adopt if it expects to even maintain its present standing, to say nothing of making future progress."

We quote portions of another article, a reprint, from the same labor paper:

"Organized labor, through its leaders, must recognize the mistakes of the past if they expect to perpetuate their organizations or to develop the movement which they head. No movement, no organization, no nation can develop beyond the intellects which guide these organizations, and if the leaders are dominated by a selfish motive the organization will become tinged with a spirit of selfishness, which has never appealed to mankind in any walk of life at any time since history began.

"It can be said in extenuation of certain leaders of organized labor that the precarious position which they occupy as leaders has had a tendency to cause them to lose sight of the object behind the organization. The natural instinct in man for power and position is in no small measure responsible for the mistakes of the leaders, not necessarily in labor unions alone, but in every branch of society. This desire for power and leadership and personal aggrandizement causes men who have been earnest and sincere in their efforts in the start to deteriorate into mere politicians whose every act and utterance is tinged with the desire to cater to the baser passions of the working majority in the societies or organizations and this is undoubtedly true when applied to the present leaders of the Federation. We mention the Federation of Labor particularly in this article because that organization is the only organization of labor which has yet found itself in direct opposition to the laws of the land.

There are other organizations of labor whose leaders have made mistakes, but they have always kept themselves and their organizations within the bounds of the law and respected the rights of every other man in considering the rights of themselves and their constituency; whereas, the motto of the Federation is just the reverse, and unless the leaders conform themselves and their organization in accordance with the laws of the land, the leaders and the organization itself must be disintegrated and pass into history, for in America the common sense in mankind is developed to a greater extent than in any other nation on the earth, and the people who are the court of last resort in this country, will never allow any system to develop in this country which does not meet with the approval of the majority of the citizens of the country.

"This must have forced itself upon the leaders of the Federation by this time. If it has not, the leaders must be eliminated. The organization which they head has done many meritorious things in times past and the people are always ready and willing to acknowledge the benefits which their efforts have brought to their constituency as a whole, but at the present time labor organizations in general, and the Federation of Labor in particular, stand before the bar of public opinion, having been convicted of selfishness and a disposition to rule all the people of the country in the interest of the few. The people are patient and awaiting to see if the object lesson, which they have been forced to

give to these leaders is going to be recognized and if they are going to conform themselves and their future work and actions in accordance thereto."

Let the people remember that comment, "The Federation of Labor in particular stands before the bar of public opinion having been convicted of selfishness and a disposition to rule all the people of the country in the interest of the few."

The great 90 per cent of Americans do not take kindly to the acts of tyranny by these trust leaders openly demanding that all people bow down to the rules of the Labor Trust and we are treated to the humiliating spectacle of our Congress and even the Chief Executive entertaining these convicted law-breakers and listening with consideration to their insolent demands that the very laws be changed to allow them to safely carry on their plan of gaining control over the affairs of the people.

The sturdy workers of America have come to know the truth about these "martyrs sacrificing themselves in the noble cause of labor" but it's only the hysterical ones who swell up and cry over the aforesaid "heretics," reminding one of the two romantic elderly maids who, weeping copiously, were discovered by the old janitor at Mt. Vernon.

"What is it all you ladies?" Taking the handkerchief from one swollen red eye, between sobs she said:

"Why, we have so long revered the memory of George Washington that we feel it a privilege to come here and weep at his tomb."

"Yes'm, yes'm, yo' shore has a desire to express yo' sympathy, but yo' are overflowin' at de wrong spot, yo' is weepin' at de ice house."

Don't get maudlin about law-breakers who must be punished if the very existence of our people is to be maintained.

If you have any surplus sympathy it can be extended to the honest workers who continue to earn food when threatened and are frequently hurt and sometimes killed before the courts can intervene to protect them.

Now the Labor Trust leaders demand of Congress that the courts be stripped of power to issue injunctions to prevent them from assaulting or perhaps murdering men who dare earn a living when ordered by the Labor Trust to quit work.

Don't "weep at the Ice House" and don't permit any set of law-breakers to bully our courts, if your voice and vote can prevent. Be sure and write your Representatives and Senators in Congress asking them not to vote for any measure to prevent the courts from protecting homes, property and persons from attack by paid agents of this great Labor Trust.

Let every reader write, and write now.

Don't sit silent and allow the organized and paid men of this great trust to force Congress to believe they represent the great masses of the American people. Say your say and let your representatives in Congress know that you do not want to be governed under new laws which would empower the Labor Trust leaders with legal right to tell you when to work, Where! For whom! At what price! What to buy! What not to buy! Whom to vote for! How much you shall pay per month in fees to the Labor Trust! etc., etc., etc.

This power is now being demanded by the passage of laws in Congress. Tell your Senators and Representatives plainly that you don't want them to vote for any measure that will allow any set of men either representing Capital or Labor to govern and dictate to the common people, who prefer to be free to go and come, work or not, and vote for whom they please. Every man's liberty will disappear when the leaders of the great Labor Trust or any other trust can ride rough shod over people and mass their forces to prevent our courts from affording protection.

"There's a Reason."

C. W. POST, Battle Creek, Mich.