

A WHIFF OF GOSSIP.

There's mischief in the garden air,
The flowers seem quite vexed;
The Bleeding Hearts are sorrowful,
The Lillies sigh, perplexed.

Soft, floating clouds up in the sky
Have made the sunlight dim;
Red Roses to the white ones nod
And both look queerly grim.

For Larkspur blossoms quaintly sit
Perched up like frisky elves,
With roguish smiles on each small face
They murmur to themselves.

And all that's said upon their stems
An idle zephyr hears,
And whiffs their heedless words about
To shock astonished ears.

It tells the Daisies, "They are prim
And sober all the while,
And tiresome in their pink and white,
Without one bit of style."

The pretty Phlox is grieved to know
It is, "too simple, quite;
The Larkspurs wonder why it strives
To crowd itself in sight."

The Holyhocks are opened wide,
Surprised to hear such jeers,
And much regret they have been called,
"Those clumsy, stupid dears."

Forget-me-nots with anguish learn
That "Larkspurs would be glad
To hear no more their doleful name,
So sorrowful and sad."

The Coxcombs get the trying news
That, "They are very plain;
That no wise flower understands
What makes them feel so vain."

Alas, that midst this lovely throng
Of neighbors, fair and sweet,
Such gossip should be carried by
A mischief-wafter fleet!

An angry wind comes sweeping on
Across the garden beds,
It shakes the Larkspurs well until
With shame they droop their heads.

The babbling zephyr flies. Once more
The kindly sunbeams dance,
Till all the flowers with a smile
Return each merry glance.

—MARY FRENCH MORTON.

THE TRUST AND THE INDIVIDUAL.

The most popular anti-trust argument, and the one that seems to influence public opinion the most, is the statement that industrial concentration is detrimental to the development of individuality. It is asserted that in great concentrated enterprises the individual has less opportunity for developing his personal characteristics or traits. It is claimed that industrial concentration will make slaves and automatons of all wage workers and operatives. It is about time that somebody handled these assertions in a plain, straightforward manner, calling a spade a spade.

This claim that individuality suffers through the concentration of industrial forces is probably the most fallacious argument yet introduced into the discussion of trusts. As well might one assert that the organization of great nations has suppressed men's individual powers. As well might it be claimed that the bushwhacking war methods of savages are more productive of great leaders among soldiers than the organ-

ized methods of great modern armies. It was the concentration of energy, enterprise, and military ability that made the great armies of the first Napoleon successful. It was this concentration that made possible the development of Napoleon's great generals. His marshals were created from the ranks. Opportunity developed all latent powers of leadership and made promotion possible. The same is true of the splendid lieutenants surrounding General Grant at the close of our civil war. Organization promotes individual ability instead of destroying it.

The concentration of our transportation companies into great trunk line systems, embracing thousands of miles of tracks, has made it possible for men of ability in the various departments to develop their strength of character and their special talents to the utmost. Almost without exception the men holding high positions in the transportation business of this country today have graduated through the lower departments up to the responsible places they now hold. The great railway enterprises have afforded correspondingly great opportunities for each individual kind of ability.

A vast manufacturing plant, such as that of either of the great harvester companies in Chicago, or such as that of any of the great steel companies, furnishes constant incentive and opportunity for development of special talents and extra abilities in different directions. The small wagon shop or blacksmith shop never could offer the same opportunities or bring out these qualities to so high a degree. The small railroad could not offer the same chance of reward as the great one can readily furnish. Why should we refuse to see that the great industrial combine will inevitably call forth the abilities of individuals more powerfully than the smaller undertaking ever could?

The great factory, employing hundreds or thousands of hands, requiring every degree of ability in production, in invention, in execution, and in salesmanship, offers an ever widening field for the development and exercise of special faculties and individual traits of character. The great jobbing house, with its hundreds or thousands of employees, gives unlimited opportunity for young men of signal ability to grow and to be singled out for promotion as their qualifications develop. Why has the ambitious retail clerk in a country town nearly always set his heart on getting a place in a large city jobbing house? Because he knows he will have a chance there to be recognized and promoted. In the small enterprise his opportunities are limited; in the large one his only limitations are those within himself. No young man with faith in his own powers was ever afraid of taking employment with too large a company.

The railway engineer or fireman prefers to work for the great trunk line,

for he knows his opportunities are multiplied there. The trained mechanic is anxious to be on the pay roll of a great industry, for he knows his place will be more secure. In hard times the small dealer, with less capital, ability, and judgment, suffers before the large and more able employer. Even the day laborer is better satisfied when his name is on the pay roll of a large and scientifically organized company, for he knows his employment is reasonably certain and his pay absolutely sure.

The industrial concentration of our producing and distributing forces, when once it becomes an accomplished economic fact, instead of dwarfing individuality, may offer increased incentives and rewards for the exercise of all the intelligence, energy, and enterprise that men individually possess.

Coin Harvey's pilgrimage and observation in Otoe county—if we may credit report of his wise sayings in a sixteen-to-one organ—have led him to conclude that the energy and brains of the fusionists in that propinquity have been largely furnished by populists. His comments upon antediluvian democrats who only chatter and jabber of getting offices and who abound as posturers in and about southeastern Nebraska are exceedingly tart and peppery. Evidently Mr. Harvey has little use for whatever of the democratic dog he can detect in the political sausage called fusion, while the flavor of the populist pup therein contained agrees with his refined taste for taking up collections for the poor.

A PRIMER OF FORESTRY.

The United States department of agriculture has in press and will soon issue Bulletin No. 24, Division of Forestry. This bulletin is the first part of a paper entitled "A Primer of Forestry," and was prepared by Mr. Gifford Pinchot, forester of the department. It deals with the units which compose the forest, with its character as an organic whole, and with its enemies. It is divided into four chapters.

The first chapter treats of the life of the tree. It describes its three parts—the roots, trunk and crown—its food, composition of wood, breathing, transpiration, growth, structure of wood, annual rings, and heartwood and sapwood.

The second chapter is devoted to a discussion of the various requirements of trees—heat, moisture, and light—their rate of growth and reproductive power, pure and mixed forest, and reproduction by sprouts.

The third chapter gives the life history of a forest showing the help and harm which the trees receive from one another. This history embraces the life of a community of trees, the life of a forest crop, the seven ages of a tree, the