

THESE PROSPEROUS TIMES.

How Would Some of These Fellows Who Feel So Prosperous Like to be in Shoes of Others.

You who are well housed, well fed, well clad and in possession of a bank account that banishes from your future all fear of want find this world, with all its drawbacks, not a bad place to live in.

But what would you think of the world if you were a young man with a wife and baby to support and unable to get work, with no coal or food in the house and the thermometer down near zero?

And what would the world seem like to you if you were dying with consumption and your wife went out to work each day to support you and your four children, earning so little, poor thing, that coal could not be bought at trust prices or the rent be paid, so that the landlord had served a dispossession notice on you?

The Rev. Louis Albert Banks, who on Monday night placed where it would do the most good some money with which the American supplied him, found the two families described and others not less near the edge of despair's precipice.

How would you like to be Mrs. Scaterio of 43 Oliver street, where there was no food or fuel? She and her children were starving and freezing when Captain Johnson of the Salvation Army, taking relief from the American, visited this home of want and misery.

How would you like to share the fate of these fellow creatures of yours reported by the same Salvationist?

Mr. and Mrs. Golden of 10 Hamilton street had not eaten yesterday. There was no fuel. Mr. Golden is blind.

Mr. Martin of 608 Water street is lying in bed with consumption. Mrs. Martin's father, who lives with them, is blind, and only a little while ago Mrs. Martin had one of her arms amputated. A big bag of groceries and coal brought happiness to this poor family, and when promised more coal for tomorrow Mrs. Martin fell on her knees and prayed.

"There never were such general suffering and extreme poverty as this winter," said the Rev. Father Tewes in acknowledging money for his poor from the American. "We have children that I know of without shoes and stockings. It is almost impossible to buy clothing, so scanty are the earnings of many. Coal is impossible. They must live in cold rooms."

Thin clothes and ragged clothes, poor food and little of it, and icy air to sit and shiver in while you watch your suffering wife and blue lipped, hungry children—that is what life means for thousands these days in this rich and Christian city.

And the people who live this life are fellow beings, human creatures just like yourself, with the same capacity for pleasure and pain, the same love for wife and little ones.

Your instinct is to turn away from such misery and shut your mind against it, not because you are hard hearted, but because the mass of wretchedness is so vast that you feel helpless to do anything adequate toward its relief.

But you have no right to turn away from it. It is your duty to think about and do what you can to lessen this mass of misery.

You can open your heart and put your hand in your pocket. When you do that, you feed some hungry child, bring hope again to some agonized mother's breast and save some man from desperation.

When you are face to face with dire human distress, it is no time to philosophize about the failure of charity to cure poverty, or about the pernicious effects of almsgiving.

Help the miserable first and philosophize afterward. Be a human being before you are a political economist. Obey your heart. It is a better, a wiser guide than your head ninety-nine times in a hundred.

Don't even stop to reflect that you can't give a dollar to buy a few buckets of coal or a few pounds of meat for a perishing family without the coal trust and the food trust stealing half the money.

The thing to do is to give while this frightful weather is with us. Look at the crowds which gather around the American's free coffee and sandwich wagons every night, and you will get a vision of human need that must keep you awake in your warm bed if you haven't done your duty as a man.

Send a bill or a check to the nearest clergyman—never mind the denomination—with a note asking him to use it for the relief of the worst case of poverty he knows, and you will make no mistake.

The poor are your brothers and sisters. Remember the words of Jesus: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me."—New York American.

Another "Anarchist" Heard From. As a menace to the welfare of our country the socialists are mere pigmies in comparison to the giant combinations of capital for the purpose of squeezing the life blood out of the American people. And if this country is ever the scene of one of the most violent revolutions the world has yet witnessed, it will not be due to the fact that there are people here who believe in the government ownership of certain utilities, but rather that certain men believe with one Baer that they have a divine right to form trusts and combines for the undoing of their fellow men.—Fergus Falls Free Press (Rep.)

In addition to the matter regarding union labor furnished by J. R. Buchanan, THE TRIBUNE will hereafter publish each week a column of matter pertaining to the Granger movement, which is still quite strong in the eastern states. As a reflex of conditions of the farmers of the East and for the spirit of co-operation that it teaches, we hope it may prove interesting to our readers.

A Strong Argument for Public Ownership.

BY FRANK PARSONS, IN THE ARENA.

In 1894 the department of the interior in Washington used the Bell telephone at a total cost of \$75 per 'phone. In 1895 the government put in its 'phones and the cost of the service proved to be but \$10.25—interest, depreciation and all. After a few years the Bell concluded to give the department reasonable rates, down close to the cost as proved by the government experiment (all the way down, perhaps, considering the distance facilities of the Bell service), and the department went back to the Bell 'phones to get the wider service.

When the French government took the telephone in 1889, rates were at once reduced in round numbers from \$120 to \$60 in Paris, and from \$80 to \$40 in other places, except Lyons; and the charge in Paris has recently been reduced to \$60.

Public operation of the telegraph in England reduced rates at once 30 to 50 per cent, and in Switzerland public ownership and control of railroads, express companies, telegraphs, and telephones is said to have "reduced the freight rates, express charges, and tolls more than 78 per cent below the cost for like service under private control."

When Syracuse, N. Y., changed from private to public ownership of the water supply, the family rate was reduced from \$10 to \$5. In Auburn, the rate was reduced from \$8 to \$6 when the plant was made public. In Randolph the private rate proposed was \$10, but the town built the works and made the charge \$4. Taking the whole United States, the charges of private water companies are 43 per cent more per family than the charges of public plants, according to M. N. Baker, of New York, the editor of the Manual of American Water Works and the highest authority on the subject in the country.

When Hamilton, O., entered upon public operation of gas works the price was reduced from \$2 to \$1 per thousand feet. Pittsburg pays a private company \$1.20 and \$1 net, while in Wheeling, near by, the public works supply gas at 75 cents a thousand and 50 cents net (the actual cost to the people considering operation, fixed charges and profits.)

Topeka with a public plant gets her electric light at a cost of \$60 per arc—interest, depreciation, and all; while Fort Wayne, with about the same number of lights and similar service, pays \$120 per arc to a private company. Little Rock, Ark., makes her own light for \$51 per arc, while New Bedford, Mass., under substantially equivalent conditions, pays \$138 per arc to a private company. Peabody, Mass., has reduced the cost of electric light from \$185 to \$73 per arc by public ownership; Elgin, Ill., from \$228 to \$65; Detroit from \$132 to \$73 per standard arc. And these are only a few out of many cases that could be cited.

Public ownership and operation of street railways in Glasgow reduced the hours of labor about one-third, raised wages, lowered fares at once about 33 per cent (the average fare is below 2 cents and over 35 per cent of the fares are 1 cent each), greatly improved the service, doubted the traffic in about two years, brought down the operating cost and fixed charges so that the city makes as much profit per passenger on an average fare of 1.78 cents, as the private company said it made on an average fare of 3.84 cents, and turned several hundred thousand dollars of profit into the public treasury. The 5 cent fare in our larger cities is much too high. Responsible parties have offered to operate street railways in Chicago on a 3 cent fare, and in Detroit on a 3 cent fare with 40 tickets for \$1, taking the whole railway system of the city and paying interest on the cost of its acquisition.

One of the most striking examples of the difference between public and private ownership is to be found in a comparison of the charges on the bridge in St. Louis owned by the Goulds and those on the bridge owned by the cities of New York and Brooklyn:

CHARGES FOR CROSSING. Private bridge—St. Louis bridge (cost \$13,000,000, bought by Gould interests for \$5,000,000): On steam cars 25 to 75 cents per passenger. Street car fare 10 cents, 5 cents for bridge. Foot passengers. . . . . 5 cents

Vehicles, one horse. . . . . 25 cents Vehicles, two horses. . . . . 35 cents Bicycles. . . . . 10 cents Municipal bridge—Brooklyn bridge (cost \$15,000,000): On L roads 3 cents (2 fares for 5 cents) if you simply wish to cross the bridge—if you come from a distance or are going beyond the bridge it costs nothing to cross in either the L cars or the surface cars—the ordinary car fare takes you over without extra charge.

Foot passengers. . . . . Free Vehicles, 1 horse. . . . . 5 cents Vehicles, 2 horse. . . . . 10 cents Bicycles. . . . . Free

The net earnings of the St. Louis bridge are \$1 millions a year, or 25 per cent on the Gould investment, and 12 per cent on the impairable capital (the excavating of the tunnels, etc., will never be done over again.) The St. Louis charges may be objected to, not only as extortionate, but as discriminating. A passenger who buys a ticket in New York or Philadelphia to St. Louis or beyond has to pay 75 cents for crossing the bridge; whereas if he buys a ticket to East St. Louis and then crosses the bridge in a railroad train it will cost him only 25 cents, or 10 cents if he crosses on a street car. The St. Louis bridge is managed for private profit; the Brooklyn bridge is managed for public service, the aim being to make the bridge as useful to the people as possible.

A normal public plant gravitates to a lower rate level than a normal private plant, because the latter aims at profit while the former aims at service, and the rate level for the greatest service is much lower than the rate level for the largest profits. Moreover public ownership under good management is able to achieve many absolute economies, not merely making lower rates but producing at lower cost and saving industrial force.

Some of the reasons for the great economies effected by public ownership are as follows:

- 1. Public ownership has no lobby expenses or corruption funds to provide for.
2. Nor any dividends on watered stock to pay.
3. Nor overgrown salaries or monopolistic profits.
4. Nor heavy litigation expenses and lawyers' fees.
5. It saves on interest and insurance.
6. It gains through the co-ordination of services, the civic interest of the people, and the higher efficiency of better paid and more contented labor.
7. It does not have to bear the burden of costly strikes and lockouts.
8. It saves the cost of numerous regulative commissions and endless investigations into secrets of private monopoly.
9. The diffusion of wealth and the elevation of labor accompanying public ownership tend to diminish the extent and the cost of the criminal and defective classes.
10. The elimination of conflict and antagonism carries with it the cost of all the useless activities prompted by that antagonism. Legislation would cost us less, for example, were it not for the private monopolies, for a large part of the time and attention of our legislators is given to them.

Great as are the benefits of the low rates secured by public ownership, there are other and still more weighty reasons in its favor.

- 1. Justice—The outrageous discriminations in freight rates, etc., that have done so much to injure honest farmers, merchants, and manufacturers and to build up the most objectionable trusts, could not exist under real public ownership of the roads. Another injustice would also vanish: the taxation without representation, and for private purposes, which the private monopolies levy upon us through excessive rates—a taxation by the side of which King George's efforts were insignificant deceptions.
2. Good Government—It is a matter of common knowledge that the great private monopolies constitute the most corrupting influence in our politics today. The public ownership of monopolies will remove that influence. It is not the public water works but the private gas works and street railways, not the postoffice but the telegraph, telephones, and railroads that maintain the lobbies that infest our legislative halls.

It must be noted that public ownership and government ownership are not synonymous. Russia has government ownership of railroads, but there is no public ownership of railroads in Russia because the people do not own the government. Philadelphia has not had real public ownership of gas works because the people do not own the councils. Where legislative power is perverted to private purposes, where the spoils system prevails and the offices are treated as private property, where government is managed in the interests of a few individuals or of a class, anything that is in the control of the government is really private property, although it may be called public property. If councils and legislatures are masters instead of the people, they are likely to use the streets and franchises for private gain instead of the public good. If the government is a private monopoly, everything in the hands of the government is a private monopoly also. At the heart of all our philosophy about the public ownership of monopolies lies the necessity for public ownership of the government. The monopoly of making and administering the law underlies all the rest. If the people are to own and operate waterworks, street railways, and other industrial monopolies, they must own and operate the government. Public ownership of the government is necessary to trustworthy public ownership of any other industry; wherefore direct legislation, civil service reform, and direct nomination by the voters (through which alone the people can thoroughly own and operate the government) must form a part of every true plan for the public ownership of monopolies.—Frank Parsons, in The Arena.

A JOB FOR PARROTT.

Crickett's Friend Has a Touching Interview With an Aspirant for Senatorial Honors.

Jack Parrott has struck a new job and will be back in Minnesota party soon, ez the following letter will show: Washington, B. C., Jenevery 28, 1903. Fred Jimminy: I hev got important noos fer yu. Last nite Low Tomry kawl on me. I kood sea by hiz rinkeld brow thet he hed sum hevvy berden on hiz mind. After sidjetting arond fer a spell he blerted it out. "Jask," sez he, "I am in a peck of trubbel and I want yur help."

"Yu shall hev it," sez I, fer I no thet Low always ekspekts to pay fer what he gets. "Jest pore yur tail of woe into my simpathetick eer and I am at yur surviss."

"I want to go to the senait," sez Low. "Thet is, I don't kair a rap fer thet plais myself. I think it is an infernel sham thet sum of us rich fellers hev to go to the senait owrselves insted of sending ovr hierd men. They kood do lots moar than we kin do owrselves. When a millyunair proposes sumthing thet peepel ar alwaze suspheus about it, while if sum one of ovr tools made it he kood maik a lowd holler abowt being a frend of the peepel and doing it fer theiir saik. But sum of us hev wifes and gurls thet is ambishus. Thet is my fix. My wimmenfolks hev konkurd evrything in site at hoam and ar now reachng ovt fer sum new worlds to lay hands on. Thar was one faital mistak maid when ovr konstitooshun forbid thet giving of titels. Sposing it haddent dun thet, I kood hev bawt the titel of Dook of Minneapolis or Markis of Soo Sant Marie. Then my wif wood hev bin a dutchess, which wood be much moar satisfaktory to her than to get me into the senait, which wood-ent giv her enny titel at awl. But ez thet is unpossibbel I sposas I will hev to go to the senait." And Low heevd a hevvy sye.

ship and government ownership are not synonymous. Russia has government ownership of railroads, but there is no public ownership of railroads in Russia because the people do not own the government. Philadelphia has not had real public ownership of gas works because the people do not own the councils. Where legislative power is perverted to private purposes, where the spoils system prevails and the offices are treated as private property, where government is managed in the interests of a few individuals or of a class, anything that is in the control of the government is really private property, although it may be called public property. If councils and legislatures are masters instead of the people, they are likely to use the streets and franchises for private gain instead of the public good. If the government is a private monopoly, everything in the hands of the government is a private monopoly also. At the heart of all our philosophy about the public ownership of monopolies lies the necessity for public ownership of the government. The monopoly of making and administering the law underlies all the rest. If the people are to own and operate waterworks, street railways, and other industrial monopolies, they must own and operate the government. Public ownership of the government is necessary to trustworthy public ownership of any other industry; wherefore direct legislation, civil service reform, and direct nomination by the voters (through which alone the people can thoroughly own and operate the government) must form a part of every true plan for the public ownership of monopolies.—Frank Parsons, in The Arena.

1. Public ownership has no lobby expenses or corruption funds to provide for. 2. Nor any dividends on watered stock to pay. 3. Nor overgrown salaries or monopolistic profits. 4. Nor heavy litigation expenses and lawyers' fees. 5. It saves on interest and insurance. 6. It gains through the co-ordination of services, the civic interest of the people, and the higher efficiency of better paid and more contented labor. 7. It does not have to bear the burden of costly strikes and lockouts. 8. It saves the cost of numerous regulative commissions and endless investigations into secrets of private monopoly. 9. The diffusion of wealth and the elevation of labor accompanying public ownership tend to diminish the extent and the cost of the criminal and defective classes. 10. The elimination of conflict and antagonism carries with it the cost of all the useless activities prompted by that antagonism. Legislation would cost us less, for example, were it not for the private monopolies, for a large part of the time and attention of our legislators is given to them.

Great as are the benefits of the low rates secured by public ownership, there are other and still more weighty reasons in its favor. 1. Justice—The outrageous discriminations in freight rates, etc., that have done so much to injure honest farmers, merchants, and manufacturers and to build up the most objectionable trusts, could not exist under real public ownership of the roads. Another injustice would also vanish: the taxation without representation, and for private purposes, which the private monopolies levy upon us through excessive rates—a taxation by the side of which King George's efforts were insignificant deceptions. 2. Good Government—It is a matter of common knowledge that the great private monopolies constitute the most corrupting influence in our politics today. The public ownership of monopolies will remove that influence. It is not the public water works but the private gas works and street railways, not the postoffice but the telegraph, telephones, and railroads that maintain the lobbies that infest our legislative halls.

It must be noted that public ownership and government ownership are not synonymous. Russia has government ownership of railroads, but there is no public ownership of railroads in Russia because the people do not own the government. Philadelphia has not had real public ownership of gas works because the people do not own the councils. Where legislative power is perverted to private purposes, where the spoils system prevails and the offices are treated as private property, where government is managed in the interests of a few individuals or of a class, anything that is in the control of the government is really private property, although it may be called public property. If councils and legislatures are masters instead of the people, they are likely to use the streets and franchises for private gain instead of the public good. If the government is a private monopoly, everything in the hands of the government is a private monopoly also. At the heart of all our philosophy about the public ownership of monopolies lies the necessity for public ownership of the government. The monopoly of making and administering the law underlies all the rest. If the people are to own and operate waterworks, street railways, and other industrial monopolies, they must own and operate the government. Public ownership of the government is necessary to trustworthy public ownership of any other industry; wherefore direct legislation, civil service reform, and direct nomination by the voters (through which alone the people can thoroughly own and operate the government) must form a part of every true plan for the public ownership of monopolies.—Frank Parsons, in The Arena.

"It will be an uphill job," sez I, "but yu undowdiedly hev grate kwalitifikashuns fer the plais. Hev yu got yur riting materials handy? It may talk sum ellokvent artikels from yur mity pen to konvins sum of the pollytishens thet yu ar the man fer the plais."

"It is reddey," sez Low. I hev a new check book and a fownten pen in the outwaid pocket of my kote so ez to hev them handy."

"I sea yu ar a thawful staitzman, Low," sez I. "Wood yu mind giving me a sampel of yur ability ez a riter?"

"Not etawl," sez Low, and he proceeded to rite ovt one of the moast tutching and effektiv polittickel arggements I ever hev thet pleshewr of resewing.

"What's the mane argement to be ewsd in furthering yur kandidaay?" I inkwierd.

Sez he: "With the pollytishens I think the kind I jest now gaily yu will prove the moast fetching. With the peepel we will ews the anti-Jill argement. I am agin Jill evry time and am jest the galoot to leed the peepel in an attack on the bullwarks of plotookkrasy. I hev bin praktissing in sekreat fer kwile a spell, and I think I hev got so I kin spring thet argement without smiling. Do yu think yu kin do it?"

"It will be sum strane on my fase musels," sez I, "but I think I kin praktiss up on sum of the pollytishens hoo wont mind if I grin a littel at first."

"Then," sez Low, "it is understood thet yu start fer Minnesota ez soon ez possibel and start a popewler demand fer me to kom to the front and save the stait from the dredfull klutches of H'm Jill. When the demand bekoms lowd enuff I will kom ovt and tell the deer peepel thet I wood mutch prefer to remane in pryvat life, but thet I kant resist theiir appeels. With the ade of the paper I kontroal I think we kin wurk up a sho of popewler enthewsyazem fer me."

Hoora fer Low Tomry! The peepel! Down with Him Jill! Thet is the batelkry thet will resownd awl oaver Minnesota ez soon ez we kin hier enuff showters to maik a good shoing. Yurs trooly,

JACK PARROTT. Chareman of the kommity fer arwing enthewsyazem fer Low Tomry, the champyun of the peepel.

JIMMINY CRICKETTS.

Wealth's Share of The Taxes. Most people will admit that tax-paying capacity increases relatively faster than does an individual's wealth. A man with a million dollars has proportionately larger tax-paying capacity than a man with a hundred thousand dollars. Yet the effect of the personal tax law as applied in this city is to make the man with less money pay relatively larger taxation than the man with more money.—Wall Street Journal.

That is rather a surprising acknowledgment, coming as it does from a newspaper intended for circulating only among moneyed men, but it is an undeniable truth. The effect of the personal tax law in New York City is but a repetition of its effects everywhere. The burden of taxation falls most heavily on the poor and middle classes. It is for this reason that the peoples party advocates an income tax; and because the millionaire, as the Journal says, has a larger proportionate tax-paying capacity, the party recommends that, that income tax be graduated so as to fall most heavily on those who have the ability to pay it. This "populist vagary" is becoming recognized more and more as a simple demand for justice. Our cause is marching on.

The vote on the populist state ticket of Texas was only about 15,000, but the old guard down there does not appear to be discouraged.

AN OLD FAVORITE

PHILIP, MY KING

By Dinah Maria Mulock Craik

THIS poem is considered one of the finest apostrophes to childhood ever written and is honored as such by being given first place in the "Poems of Infancy and Youth" in Bryant's "Library of Poetry and Song." The "Philip" referred to was Philip Bourke Marston, an English poet, who was born in 1850 and died in 1887. Despite the blindness that afflicted him from an early age, he wrote a number of metrical works. He was also the subject of the poem, "A Blind Boy," by Thomas Gordon Hake.

"Who bears upon his baby brow the round And tops of sovereignty."

LOOK at me with thy large brown eyes, Philip, my king! For round thee the purple shadow lies Of babyhood's royal dignities. Lay on my neck thy tiny hand With Love's invisible scepter laden; I am thine Esther, to command Till thou shalt find thy queen-handmaiden, Philip, my king!

Oh, the day when thou goest a-wooing, Philip, my king! When those beautiful lips 'gin suing, And some gentle heart's bars undoing, Thou dost enter, love-crowned, and there Sittest love-glorified!—Rule kindly, Tenderly over thy kingdom fair; For we that love, ah! we love so blindly, Philip, my king!

I gaze from thy sweet mouth up to thy brow, Philip, my king! The spirit that there lies sleeping now May rise like a giant, and make men bow As to one Heaven-chosen amongst his peers. My Saut, than thy brethren higher and fairer. Let me behold thee in future years! Yet thy head needeth a circlet rarer, Philip, my king!

A wreath, not of gold, but palm. One day, Philip, my king! Thou too must tread, as we trod, a way Thorny, and cruel, and cold, and gray; Rebels within thee and foes without Will snatch at thy crown. But march on, glorious, Martyr, yet monarch! till angels shout, As thou sittest at the feet of God victorious, "Philip, the king!"

AN OLD FAVORITE

THE LAND O' THE LEAL

By Caroline Oliphant (Lady Nairne)

CAROLINE OLIPHANT (Lady Nairne), called "the sweetest and tenderest of all the Scottish singers," was born in Perthshire on Aug. 15, 1766, and died Oct. 28, 1846. She was married to Major (later Lord) Nairne in 1806. Lady Nairne's life has long been considered a model of goodness, though her fame was entirely posthumous. "Leal" is Scotch for loyal, "the land of the leal" being, of course, heaven. "Fain" is loving.

I'm wearin' awa', John, Like snaw wreaths in thaw, John; I'm wearin' awa' To the land o' the leal. There's nae sorrow there, John; There's neither could nor care, John; The day's aye fair In the land o' the leal. Our bonnie hairs' there, John; She was bath gude and fair, John; And, oh! we grudged her sair To the land o' the leal. But sorrow's sel' wears past, John— And joys a-comin' fast, John— The joy that's aye to last In the land o' the leal. See dear that joy was bought, John; Sae free the battle fought, John; That sinfu' men e'er brought To the land o' the leal. Oh, dry your glist'ning e'e, John! My soul langts to be free, John; And angels beckon me To the land o' the leal. Oh, haud ye leal and true, John; Your day it's wearin' thro', John; And I'll welcome you To the land o' the leal. Now, fare ye weel, my ain John; This warld's cares are vain, John; We'll meet, and we'll be fain, In the land o' the leal.