

Semi-Weekly Courier BY THE COURIER PRINTING CO. Founded August 8, 1848. Member of the Les Newspaper Syndicate. A. W. LEE, Founder. J. H. POWELL, Publisher. W. H. FOWELL, Managing Editor. Daily Courier, 1 year by mail, \$4.00. Semi-Weekly Courier, 1 year, \$2.00. OFFICE: 117-119 East Second Street. Telephone: Business office, 44; editorial offices, 173. Address, The Courier Printing Company, Ottumwa, Iowa. Entered as second class matter October 17, 1903, at the post office, Ottumwa, Iowa, under the act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Foreign representatives: Cone, Lorenson & Woodman, Advertising Bldg., Chicago; The Post, New York City; 503 Victor Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.

WHEN THE JOB SEEKS THE MAN The appointment of Charles M. Schwab to supervise and hasten the construction of ships is one of the most important steps the government or any of its bureaus has taken since the war began. The failure of the ambitious ship-building program in the past has been charged to a number of causes, tracing back to the unfortunate period during which Mr. Denman, a Pacific coast lawyer-politician, succeeded in muddling the first arrangements and stringing up a scandal of fair proportions.

Labor troubles have constituted a prominent factor in the mass of delay; there is a loud hint of profiteering and mismanagement in the history of some of the "cost plus" contracts. For a time work was retarded by changes in plans, official red tape and jealous quarrels within the emergency fleet organizations. But when Chairman Hurley had done away with most of the trouble and many of the trouble makers found that one major phase of the problem centered in the inability of some of the shipbuilders to obtain steel plates. The war industries board was accused of failing to place its orders with sufficient foresight and some of the steel manufacturers declared they had delayed production materially.

Obviously, there was room at the helm for a man who knew the steel business and ship building, a man capable of organizing, energizing and pushing a big and unwieldy enterprise to success. Such a man was at hand in Charles M. Schwab. Mr. Schwab was chosen for the enormous task because he knows its ins and outs. It is his sort of business. It is particularly his life. This is a notable indication of a new and admirable sort of thought at Washington, where Dr. Garfield was picked to administer the affairs of the coal industry despite his lack of knowledge of its intricacies, and where he made appointments of assistants, choosing men who could prove that they had no first-hand knowledge of the coal business.

It was at Washington, too, that Mr. Baker, proud of his lack of military knowledge or inclination, was made secretary of the war department, and Professor Keppel, former secretary of the Association for International Conciliation, was chosen to assist Mr. Baker. It was at Washington that George Creel, socialist-pacifist and by no means noteworthy as a newspaper man, was selected to represent the government in deciding what sort of information about the war and kindred topics should be given to the public, what should be withheld and what should be amplified. It was at Washington that an officer in Mr. Baker's general staff, when the almost universal suggestion was made that he place orders for guns while the United States was on the verge of war, replied, "We're not interested."

Beyond question the appointments of Dr. Garfield, Secretary Baker, Mr. Creel and others were made with the utmost conscientious desire to select the best possible man for each important post. There were made some time ago, and events have moved swiftly in the United States. It is the changing order to which we would direct attention and approval.

So it is reassuring to find, in the fifth reorganization of the nation's ship building activities, a man being chosen to direct the work because he can bring to his task a definite, detailed million-dollar knowledge of what that task requires. There need be no waiting for Mr. Schwab to acquire "vision" and seek "atmosphere" to equip him for his job.

IN THE ONE HOLE A Washington correspondent of the Chicago Tribune sends his paper a dispatch which takes a somewhat unfair though clever advantage of the democrats of the senate. He comments on the fact that Senator Stone's death leaves the chairmanship of the committee on foreign relations vacant and suggests that the democrats may, or might, show an admirable spirit of wartime nonpartisanship by honoring Senator Lodge, republican, with the place. The dispatch continues: Senator Lodge is the ranking republican member of this committee and the oldest member of the committee, in years of service. The republicans point to his loyal record in the war and urge that now is afforded an opportunity for the administration to demonstrate its nonpartisanship, concerning which there has been so much talk but little action. Senate precedents are invested with a great deal of dignity, solemnity and majesty, on occasions. And this particular senate chairmanship is a highly important one while America is at war, as it will be for a long time after the war ends. No doubt Senator Lodge would make an excellent chairman. Without doubt he would be filling that post now if the administration were republican. But the correspondent has selected a rather harsh test for the

nonpartisanship of the democratic senators. It would not be entirely fair to regard his suggestion too seriously. Besides, it might invite disappointment.

A NEEDED LAW The Courier is in hearty sympathy with the bill fathered by Senator Chamberlain which, if it becomes a law, will compel persons arrested for disloyalty to stand trial before courts martial instead of federal judges and juries.

It is eminently proper that the army deal with spies and traitors. Certainly disloyalty in civil life is entitled to no more privilege than is disloyalty on the part of a soldier. There is a business-like speed about the proceedings of military courts that robs the defendant's role of any trace of pleasure. There are few lawyers' wrangles, fewer leisurely continuances. The testimony is submitted, the verdict is announced and the prisoner is set to serve his sentence; that is all there is to it except in the infrequent cases when defendants are found not guilty.

Victor Berger and J. O. Bentall, if they had been brought before courts martial, would not now be spreading the poison doctrines of socialism and disloyalty by their speeches and their obvious contempt for the laws of the land. Berger has been indicted for seditious activity and is at liberty under bonds while the trial for his trial in a federal court approaches. He is making socialistic speeches which breed disloyalty. Bentall has been convicted under the espionage act, but while he awaits sentence by a federal judge he is continuing his speeches of the sort which brought about his arrest and conviction.

This sort of easy justice is not so much a fault of our court system as of the existing laws, which were made in and for peaceful times. The exactness of the statute Senator Chamberlain proposes would go far toward suppressing the sort of treason which is paraded now in defiance of laws and courts.

A CASE IN POINT (From Thursday's Daily.) Finally, after a serious condition has been created as the result of the difference between the fuel and railroad administrations over the price railroads should pay for their coal during the current year, the question has been settled by President Wilson and there is reason to hope for early resumption of activity in the coal mines, notably those of Iowa. A dispatch from Washington today reveals the fact that the charges which have been made against the railroad administration by coal operators are founded on fact, that this government bureau has been responsible for the refusal by the railroads to obey the rules laid down by another government bureau, the fuel administration, and that as a result there has been a grievous loss of coal production.

The vicious system by which railroads, for years, have compelled the general public to pay a large share of their coal bills, lies at the bottom of the coal problem. This was pointed out by The Courier almost a year ago when the Lever bill was adopted, with its section continuing contracts until April 1. At that time, however, it was thought the situation would be righted when the contracts expired, but when that time came the railroad administration, government bureau, actually supported the railroads in their efforts to break down the price rules made by the government's fuel administration. In other words, the railroad administration forced many mines to close, and the result in Iowa will be seen in reduced coal production possibly throughout the remainder of the year because mine workers have left this field during the period of enforced idleness since April 1. Certainly this situation affords another and a startling proof of the need for a supreme war council to decide questions and differences between government agencies. This one was put up to the president after a long delay. He made a quick and proper decision, the only regrettable feature being that his attention was not called to the matter three weeks ago. It is patent that he cannot give proper attention to all such difficulties without neglecting others of his multitudinous duties.

FORTY MILLION DOLLARS (From Friday's Daily.) In President Wilson's peremptory order, issued yesterday, commanding the railroads of the country to pay the same basic prices for their coal as the public and to refrain from interfering with the distribution of railway cars to mines, there was little to surprise anyone who had been giving close attention to the ramifications of the coal problem. There was much about the order to approve, although we have the word of John Skelton Williams, purchasing agent for Director General McAdoo's nationwide transportation system, that the cost of railroad coal this year will be \$40,000,000 more than it would have been had the president taken his—and Mr. McAdoo's—side in the argument with Dr. Garfield.

The president has endorsed a theory for which The Courier has contended since last August when the coal problem became a war problem—that railroads or other extensive coal consumers should not be permitted by law to buy their coal at prices so low as to compel the general public to pay more than the just profit on its share of the nation's coal output in order to provide the coal producers with income sufficient to make their business enterprises pay dividends. Hardly anyone except the irrepressible Clifford Thorne and those who derived financial benefit from the vicious system contended that it was right. Mr. Thorne got himself into a difficult tangle at the Illinois coal investigation when he tried to defend the plan. He was representing public utility concerns which had enjoyed favorable prices like those of the railroads and with no more justice.

That was while railroads were owned privately. Now they are controlled by the government, and the financial arrangement, in practice, is little different from what it would be if they were owned by the public. The law under which Mr. McAdoo directs all railroads guarantees a good profit to the stockholders and obligates the gov-

ernment to make good deficits from any and all causes. Mr. McAdoo and Mr. Williams argue that, because the people must finance the railroads through taxation if the incomes fail to balance expenses and pay the dividends, the railroads should have the benefit of a coal price lower than that which the federal fuel administrator determines is proper, formulating his decision on the theory that all coal produced shall be sold at the same basic price, regardless of the identity of the purchaser.

This arrangement, Mr. Williams says, would save the public \$40,000,000 in a year by reducing the expenses of railroad operation by that much. Taking Mr. Williams' figures as a basis, it is reasonable to conclude that \$40,000,000 is the amount the public has been compelled to pay each year in extra profits on its coal in order that the railroads might have their fuel at a price which precluded a profit to the operators and in some cases represented a loss on production cost. Undoubtedly this is a good time to straighten that matter out and put the transaction on a proper basis.

Forty million dollars, even in these days of billion-dollar loans and over-subscriptions, is a sum which deserves more than a careless shrug of the shoulders. Therefore it is worth while to follow the reasoning of a loss on production cost. Undoubtedly this is a good time to straighten that matter out and put the transaction on a proper basis. Had the railroads been permitted to net this saving of \$40,000,000 it is obvious that the coal producers of the country would have finished the year on April 1, 1919, with \$40,000,000 less to their credit than they may expect under the president's ruling of yesterday, providing all the coal companies should be able to elude bankruptcy that long. That would be a huge loss on the coal barons, perhaps, but if Dr. Garfield's figures are within shouting distance of accuracy the joke would rebound with a sickening thud and the public, next winter, would find itself in the midst of a coal famine which would make that of last winter seem, in comparison, like a joyful week-end at a fashionable summer resort.

For coal production would sink to the minimum if the coal operators found themselves compelled to sell their output at a loss. The government has discovered that patriotism and a flat pocketbook are but poor affinities. Men who have things the government must buy in order to win the war—labor, raw materials, manufactured articles, food, guns, ships, etc.—deliver the goods the more speedily, the more cheerfully and with far more patriotic ardor when they are assured of a profit in proportion to their industry.

Because the public and the government thought—and rightly—that the coal producers had wronged too much profit from their patrons in the winter of 1916-17, the Lever law was enacted and the president, through the federal fuel administrator, decided how much the coal mine owners might charge for their output. The maximum prices thus fixed are considerably less than the panic prices which preceded them, and the country has Dr. Garfield's word for it, backed by the word of his big force of expert accountants and statisticians, that these maximum figures include no more than a just profit on the cost of maximum coal production.

Now clip a coal \$40,000,000 off a year's income at that rate. Say to the coal operators that they must sell a share of their output to the general public at fair prices and the remainder to the railroads at much lower figures—\$40,000,000 lower. Coal production would go down and at least some of the coal operators would sink into bankruptcy. New mines would not be opened to increase an output which must be sold at a loss. Of course, the government would not permit this to continue indefinitely. Dr. Garfield would do one thing left for him to do: that is, increase the schedule of prices the general public must pay for coal, restore the old system of railroad favoritism and compel the people to hand over the \$40,000,000 they were saving on railroad coal as extra profits on the coal they burned in their furnaces in homes, factories and business buildings.

Meanwhile, however, there would be weeks of uncertainty and agitation, during which coal production would be at a minimum. The inevitable result, regardless of the ultimate standard of prices, would be a coal famine next winter, and that is just what the United States must avoid if the war is to be won.

Already three weeks have been wasted since the railroads, at Director General McAdoo's permission, permitted their coal contracts to expire and began to haggle with operators in an effort to beat down the government's price standards. The first week in April saw a loss of 1,500,000 tons of bituminous coal compared with the production for the last week of March. If this loss was repeated last week and this—and there is no reason to believe otherwise—Mr. McAdoo's permitment of 4,500,000 tons of coal, or approximately half as much as all the mines in Iowa produced last year. That production loss cannot be made up. The country needs all the coal that all its mines can produce from now until the war ends, working every day at top speed.

President Wilson's chief burdens in that further increases in freight rates may be made to supply the \$40,000,000. In that case, or in case the sum is raised by taxation, the general public—that same general public which buys coal—must in the end foot the bill. But under the plan which President Wilson approves as being the best for the country, the public has contended for months—the public and the railroads will pay for what they get and the householder need not feel that in paying his coal bill he is helping to pay dividends to the owners of railroad stock. Meanwhile—and this is most vitally important—coal production will be resumed at the maximum. Coal prices will be stabilized and the government,

through its chief executive, is on record with direct application of the principle that the railroads, no matter who controls them, are not entitled to privileges at the expense of the coal buying public.

There can be no question that Mr. McAdoo desired to cut the coal price in order to make a showing of economical handling of the nation's railroads. He was impelled by the same desire when he appealed to Governor McAdoo to refrain from taxing railroad properties heavily "because the public instead of private stockholders must pay."

If Mr. McAdoo can make a showing which will add to his prestige and, perhaps, to his chances of the presidency, no one has the slightest right to object, so long as nothing he does injures America's prospects of victory in the war. But more than 600,000 people have every right to raise their voices in protest if he becomes so engrossed in making a creditable record for himself that he jeopardizes the nation's safety. And the loss of 1,500,000 tons of coal production weekly for three weeks is a pretty serious job of jeopardizing.

EASTMAN'S DEFENSE Max Eastman, editor in chief of The Masses, a magazine which, with several of its contributors, has come under the ban of the sedition laws, made a peculiar plea from the witness stand when summoned to testify in his own defense at the trial of the case in New York.

He declared that, although he is editor of the magazine he does not control its utterances nor does he control the appointments of its editors. He told the court, he is required to publish what they write.

Not only is this a novel method of editing a publication, but it illustrated the extent to which pacifists, pro-German agitators and other disloyal citizens go in their efforts to escape punishment when once they are arrested after flaunting their disloyalty in the faces of millions of patriotic Americans.

Eastman has been a leader and an authority among the high priests of socialism and pacifism for months. He was active in the ill-starred Lochner peace league. He has lectured and written extensively along the lines against which the sedition laws are aimed. He and his associates are undisciplined citizens at any time and particularly now, with the nation facing the greatest crisis in its history.

And yet, courts and juries must listen patiently to such an assinine defense as Eastman offered in New York. Possibly he may "put it over," too, and that is one more reason why Senator Chamberlain's bill should pass and such offenders should be tried before courts martial.

Offenses against the nation in time of war are properly military offenses, not civil affairs. The army knows how to deal out justice in homeopathic doses, without delay, foolishness or unfairness.

The adoption of the Chamberlain bill would operate two ways. It would bring about proper punishment for enemies of the nation and would reduce very materially the number of offenders because it would inspire fear among them instead of the contempt they feel now for the complicated and leisurely court system with its many opportunities for escape from deserved punishment.

OVER THERE AND BACK Dispatches from Washington bring the welcome news that Secretary Baker has recommended to President Wilson an expansion of the United States army in accordance with a new program which he is convinced is of vital importance.

It is a vast satisfaction and greatly reassuring to learn that Mr. Baker, whose pacifist tendencies have been his most characteristic, seems to have lost many of them in his visit to the battle zone. Washington correspondents say he is emphatic in his declaration that an army of 5,000,000 men must be raised without delay, and that the preparation of a big force of fighters must be rushed without waiting for the guarantee of transports to carry them to Europe.

It is this sort of program is essential now, a man with sufficient of what Mr. Baker is so fond of calling "vision" might have been able to discover the fact months ago. It is more than regrettable that, if he could assimilate a realization of the necessities of the war only by visiting the front, he did not make the trip a couple of years ago.

If he could have done that there would have been a different sort of war department in Washington last year. There would have been less of the lethargy and red-tape delay which has cost America and her allies so dearly. There would have been a real and effective effort to carry out the program which he has announced a year ago as America's for her first year of war. And there would have been a record of accomplishment now instead of the list of collapses, disappointments and failures which have been revealed by official investigations.

If Secretary Baker is to be an active secretary of war, if he is to apply the lessons which he could not have ignored during his European visit, there would be ample justification for some American poet to write a hymn of thanksgiving. It will mean that one removed from his shoulders, and that one of the pacifist spots in what would be an aggressive, enthusiastic, war-making organization has been removed.

We may expect to hear less from Mr. Baker in the future about the war 3,000 miles away from America, and more about the war which menaces the government, institutions, traditions and future of the United States. If these hopes prove to be well founded the visit Mr. Baker made to Europe must be given a high place among the important events in the history of the world war.

the Nonpartisan league or the red socialists. This was the declaration of Judge John F. McGee of Minneapolis before the senate military committee yesterday in the hearing on Senator Chamberlain's bill to put into the hands of the army the work of trying persons accused of sedition and pro-Germanism.

Minnesota has been the center of activity for the Nonpartisan league for a year or more. The I. W. W. and the socialists have been active there for much longer. In the iron mining country and Minnesota's big woods these anarchistic forces have had their headquarters for a long time, and it was only when they began to menace the government in its prosecution of the war that Minnesota officially entered on a systematic campaign against them.

Judge McGee has been an active leader in this campaign. As a member of the state public safety commission he brought about the arrest and prosecution of numerous agitators and enemies of government. If there has been more publicity of Minnesota's drive against disloyalty it has been because the disloyalists were inviting punishment by their open contempt for the laws and the courts, with their deliberate methods and frequent delays, if not miscarriages of justice.

Minnesotans know whereof they speak when, like Judge McGee, they brand the Nonpartisan league and the other branches of socialism as worse and more dangerous to the nation than the I. W. W.

The I. W. W., by its extreme lawlessness, viciousness and open defiance of justice, makes itself an easy target. The Nonpartisan league veils its disloyalty behind a camouflage of socialistic doctrines which, in many instances, are more than any prospect of a jury trial in a federal court, with bondsmen, continuances, stays and technicalities.

A CENSOR MIGHT HELP There can be no question of Secretary McAdoo's patriotic aspirations and intentions, but there is broad ground for questioning the wisdom and diplomacy of the declaration which is made as a part of one of his recent speeches. It is this: "There is not enough room in this great world for the German flag and the American flag, and we are going to make the American flag fly over Berlin before we get through."

This is just the sort of talk the German junkers and imperialists need to cement in their support of the efforts and opinions of the German public. It affords them a splendid opportunity, which no doubt they have used already, to say to the German proletariat, that the United States is engaged in a war of hate, a war of extermination, agrarizm, conquest and ruin. They have an excellent opportunity to gain belief when they point out that no less an American official than the secretary of the treasury, the director general of all the railroads and the president's son-in-law has made this astounding statement.

President Wilson has gone to extreme lengths to assure the people of Germany and Austria that America's aim is not to dismember their nations, but to insure for the people themselves the sort of government which will permit them to enjoy the sort of freedom Americans enjoy. The president has served notice on the entire allies that when the time shall come for writing the peace treaty at the end of the war the United States will stand firmly against conquest and for the perpetuity of proper governments in every geographical line.

In a number of official pronouncements the president has declared that America's aim is to make the world a decent place to live in, and not to wrest territory nor indemnity from a beaten enemy.

Individually and unofficially, Mr. McAdoo has every right to entertain such opinions of the German government and of Germany as he likes, but when he speaks for the American government he should observe the facts and observe, as well, the circumstances which the executive head of the American government has laid down as the nation's aims and reasons for going to war with Germany.

At this time, with Russia wobbling and socialism in Europe constituting a serious menace to the cause for which the United States is fighting, it is remarkable that Secretary McAdoo would permit himself to voice sentiments which every American knows to be untrue and which are in variance with what every American knows is the object of the government and its war aims.

It may be that President Wilson will be compelled to turn from some of his other and numerous tasks in connection with prosecution of the war to conduct a primary class in diplomacy and propriety for the most exalted member of his own administration.

In Memoriam Samuel P. Lawson. Samuel P. Lawson was born April 17, 1855, in Hancock county, Tennessee, and departed from this life Monday, April 8, 1918, after a lingering illness. He was united in marriage to Susan E. Burns, December 16, 1880. To this union were born nine children: Fred and Emil, preceding him in death; Mrs. C. E. DeBord, Mrs. W. M. Hicks, Miss Emma, John L. Verner, C. Harry A. and Jay F., all of Ottumwa. Also two sisters and three brothers survive him, Mrs. John Ratcliffe of Muscatine, Mrs. J. W. Martin of Fairview, Joseph of Rustin, La. Andrew of Libo, Mo., and George of Muscatine, Ia. Funeral services were held from

### King Charles' Letter To Prince Sixtus Stirs Warring Nations

THE young man pictured here is Prince Sixtus, the French son-in-law of Emperor Charles of Austria who received the famous "peace letter" from his royal relative and sent it to the French authorities, with the result that Austria and Germany are in a ferment of excitement which has turned Count Cserlein out of Emperor Charles' cabinet and promises to have more far-reaching influence.



The letter written by the Austrian emperor and dated March 21, 1917, began a Prince Sixtus secretly and unofficially to inform President Poincaré that he was ready to support by every possible means the just claims of France relative to Alsace-Lorraine. French opinion, while in perfect accord as to the diplomatic triumph which Clemenceau has achieved, is divided as to the reason for the astounding blunder the Austrians have made in stirring up such a hornet's nest. One school inclines to the belief that Emperor Charles in his letter of March of last year was really acting under the direction of Germany, and that the plan was to tempt France into separate negotiations for peace for the sole and express purpose of supporting Germany's traditional effort to sow discord among the allies opposed to her.

Another section of opinion while not overlooking the Austrian love of cloak-and-key prefers to explain what has occurred as merely another typical manifestation of the cunningness which has characterized Austro-German diplomacy for many years past. Yet a third section of opinion is inclined to think that the letter when written was a perfectly genuine re-

section of Austria's desire to save herself at any cost from the consequences of what she believed to be the ultimate, inevitable defeat of the central empire, and that she has been frightened out of adherence to this view solely by the bullying pressure of her German ally. Prince Sixtus is a patriotic Frenchman and is a member of the Belgian army.

the home of his daughter, Mrs. W. M. Hicks, 401 South Sheridan avenue, Wednesday afternoon, April 10, at 3 o'clock. The service was conducted by Rev. John Hastie of Faxon with the assistance of Rev. M. E. Reusch of the Willard Street M. B. church. The pall bearers were sons and daughters of the deceased. Interment took place in the Shaul cemetery.—Contributed.

### DINNER STORIES

"Have you seen the presents, old chap?" said Mr. Nabob to a nervous guest at his daughter's wedding.

"No, but I'd like to awfully," said the nervous guest.

"Well, just a moment and I'll get a detective to show you around," cordially said Mr. Nabob.

The young private had been posted as sentry on B squadron stables. But when the sergeant of the guard came round on his visit he was nowhere to be seen. The sergeant was about to depart to make inquiries when there came a rustling noise from a heap of minus his boots and looking very sleepy.

"Hallo!" cried the sergeant, "where were you when I came around just now?"

"Marching round," was the sentry's reply, given in tones of conscious virtue.

"Marching round, were you? Why, you've got your boots off!"

"Yes, sergeant; I took 'em off so that I wouldn't wake the bloomin' 'orse!"

In a recent examination of a boy for a clerk's post was the following question:

"If the premier and all the members of the cabinet should die, who would officiate?"

Robert, a boy of fourteen, thought for a time, trying in vain to recall who came next in succession. At last, a happy inspiration came to him and he answered: "The undertaker."

A colored recruit said he intended to take out the full limit of government insurance, \$10,000. On being told by a fellow soldier that he would be foolish to pay on so much when he was likely to be shot in the trenches, he replied: "Huh! I reckon I know what I've done. You all don't s'pose Uncle Sam is gwine to put a \$10,000 man in the first-line trenches, do yuh?"

### COURIER WANT ADS READ THEM

### Children's Evening Story

MR. CHIPPY'S SON Rusty Wren was hurrying out of his house to find some supper for his family, when he almost bumped into the young chap who was gazing at the sign "Boy Wanted," which still hung outside Rusty's door. He was a likely-looking lad, who wore a bay cap on his head. And he had excellent manners. Rusty was pleasantly and touched his cap. No doubt he would have taken it off had it not grown right on his head. "See you want a boy?" he observed. "What's your name?" "What's your name?" "I'm Rusty Wren."

"That's just it," Rusty exclaimed. "Then you must be Mr. Chippy, who lives in the wild grapevine on the stone wall by the roadside." Chippy, Jr., nodded brightly. And when he said, "Chip, chip, chip," Rusty knew that there could be no doubt about it. "Wait a moment!" he told Chippy, Jr. "I want to speak to my wife about you." And then he darted back into his house. "My dear," he said to Mrs. Rusty. "I've found the very person! Little Rusty's son is outside and I'm sure you ought to be glad to have a modest young man like him to help us." "He comes from a good family," Mrs. Rusty admitted. "But don't you know that the Chippys are bigger than we are? Not much bigger, to be sure. But Mr. Chippy certainly couldn't get through our doorway."

"Quite true, my love!" Rusty Wren agreed. "But it's his son—got his—got wants to work for us. And this Rusty was hardly my size."

Though his wife hesitated, she could think of no further objections, so at last she told Rusty that he might ask Chippy, Jr. to come back in the morning. "But I have a feeling that this is going to lead to trouble," she said gloomily. Mrs. Rusty Wren said, "Nonsense!" He was overjoyed at the prospect of having a spry young helper. And he hurried out to tell Mr. Chippy's son that he could start to work at day-break. That polite young man touched his cap and promised that he would return without fail, and then went chipping away toward home, for it was already his bedtime. For all he was still hungry, Rusty Wren slept better that night than he had for a long while. He felt as if a great load had been lifted off his shoulders. He slept so soundly, in fact, that he never waked up at all when Fatty Ooze and Tommy Fox came at midnight to view his sign, "Boy Wanted."

They made a good deal of noise, tumbling not a little because there was not the least sign of a sign anywhere. As soon as he had engaged Chippy, Jr. to work for him, Rusty Wren had taken down his sign, "Boy Wanted." And so all further callers were bound to be disappointed. Rusty Wren was without a helper.