

RESPECTABLE CRIMINALS OF CHICAGO.

Editorial in the Chicago Tribune of January 12.

Yes; Mr. Jerome was right! The "prominent citizen" of lawless instincts, incited by greed and spurred on by avarice, commits most of the offenses which make Chicago the least desirable place to live in for purposes of pure pleasure of all the large cities in the United States.

"The prominent citizen" creates the soot and smoke which hang over the city, except on Sunday—when, for a pretense, he makes long prayers and thanks God that he is not as other men are.

"The prominent citizen" makes the stench which the winds carry to all parts of the city.

"The prominent citizen" uses the sidewalk as a shipping yard and obstructs the main avenue of communication between the North and South sides.

"The prominent citizen" steals land from the streets and the river for switches and docks.

"The prominent citizen" cuts up the pavements with narrow tire wagons and trucks and grabs all the streets he can for car tracks without compensation to the city.

"The prominent citizen" tries by surreptitious, clandestine and fraudulent means to obtain valuable franchises from the city—and sometimes succeeds.

"The prominent citizen" owns most of the fire traps and filthy tenements in Chicago.

"The prominent citizen" periodically debauches the council and the legislature—when he can.

"The prominent citizen," fresh from his exhilarating and remunerative pastimes, lends the light of his countenance to select commercial organizations and therein expatiates upon the unregenerate nature, the depravity, the villainy of his less favored fellow citizen. He advocates municipal "beautification" for everybody but himself, and the suppression of crime which is inconvenient to him. With simple candor and earnest faith he denounces the violations of city ordinances which restrain poor men from doing wrong, but he "winks the other eye" when any of them infringe upon his own privilege of trespassing upon the rights of his fellow citizens. He who covers the sidewalk with his merchandise is properly shocked at the spectacle of a poor woman or child who throws a banana peel into the street. He, the creator of all pervading stenches, is offended by the mild smells of the alley garbage box.

On all public occasions "the prominent citizen" is an unsparing critic. He holds up the inconspicuous citizen to scorn as the enemy of the cleanliness, the beauty and the decency of the city. He who builds, owns and charges high rent for the rotten, insanitary fire trap in which the tenant breathes an insufficiency of good air, still deplors the man's lack of "sweetness and light" and his predisposition to ill health and stimulants.

The "prominent citizen," as Chicagoans know him, is one of those of whom it was said: "Ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which, indeed, appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness."

We know him, and we don't love him! Admiration for his rare qualities is confined to a rapidly narrowing circle in which he exercises a diminished authority, while elsewhere he is looked upon as one of the throng of law breakers—not better than any of the rest, but even worse; for, with abundant opportunities to do the right thing, he has chosen for sordid reasons to do that which is wrong.

PROSPERITY UNMASKED.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMIST MAKES A CONFESSION—1903 WAS NOT A PROSPEROUS YEAR.

Throughout the entire year of 1903 the American Economist, the organ of the Protective Tariff league (which is composed of 1,000 protected manufacturers who pay \$100 each in dues), was boasting about the wonderful prosperity then existing. In its columns everybody was constantly employed at the highest wages ever known. There was no let-up in prosperity at any time. In the index, which runs from July to December, 1903, 17 lines are devoted to the word "prosperity," and two more to "prosperous." Here are some of these index lines:

Prosperity, Evidence of.
Prosperity, the Facts of.
Prosperity, General, Untouched.
Prosperity, Greatest Ever Known.
Prosperity, Our Unyielding.
Prosperity Rampant.
Prosperity, Solid.
Prosperity Stalks Abroad.
Prosperity, The Wave.
Prosperous Uncle Sam.
Prosperous Year, Bright Future.

During the last two months of 1903 the industrial conditions got so bad that nearly all the leading Republican newspapers had admitted that we were in the midst of a depression. Some estimated that by the end of the year 1,000,000 would be out of employment and the wages of most of those still employed would be greatly reduced.

All the trade papers contained long lists of closed mills and of wage reductions. Only the Economist remained to unflinchingly assert that prosperity was still rampant. It is true that Speaker Cannon and Congressman Hepburn did continue to speak of prosperity in the present tense, and to declare that there was work for every man who wanted to work, and that, too, "at a compensating wage," but their error may have been due to the implicit confidence which they placed in the American Economist, and to their lack of time to read the commercial and trade papers.

But now that 1903 is past and gone it is admitted, even by this protective tariff organ, that it was a year of closed mills, unemployed labor, adversity and disaster. Its leading editorial of January 1, 1904, devotes four columns to explaining why the Dingley tariff was not to blame for the hard times of 1903. It is entitled: "Causes for the Commercial Conditions and Results of 1903." Here are some extracts:

The free-trade orators and editors of this year will point to the adversities of 1903, and attempt to prove that they were due to the Dingley tariff. The echoes of these assertions will be found reverberating down through the ages till a decade or a generation or a half century; hence the voters of those times will be told that protection was a failure because of the calamities of 1903.

During the year more than 100,000 men have been idle a considerable portion of the time.

Fully half a million men have lost time and wages, running from a few days to several months, and it is quite likely that the earning capacity and purchasing power of the people at large have been lessened fully one billion dollars during the last 12 to 18 months, solely because of these so-called labor troubles.

That failures should increase to some extent under circumstances enumerated, is not surprising.

The Economist blames the labor unions, the inflated stocks and the high price of cotton, and declares that but for the protective tariff, the blessed Dingley law, times would certainly have been much worse. It says not a word about the steel and other protected trusts, whose excessive greed and high monopoly prices have sapped the life-blood of the people and exhausted their buying power. It reserves its censure for labor, greedy, foolish labor; utterly ignoring the fact that when the trusts had put prices up 40 per cent. labor was entitled to a similar advance in wages, and that wages had not advanced one-third as much as had the cost of living.

Moral: The tariff is a friend of the trusts but not of labor.

BYRON W. HOLT.