

# The Fabulous Real Estate Wealth of a Few

## Twenty Men Who Own More Than a Billion Dollars in New York City Land.

The cities are full of pride. Challenging each to each. That from her mountain-side, to hang the hard of the British Empire when he was a temporary resident in New York. Residing at a Fifth-avenue hotel, he had but to gaze abroad from his windows to absorb the inspiration for his Song of the Cities. For then as now the American metropolis occupied the richest island on earth—a statement which may be realized when it is added that the real and personal wealth revealed by the 74 huge volumes containing the current tax records of Greater New York exceeds in its stupendous total all the money coined or circulated since the golden days of Croesus.

Five billion, six hundred and forty million, five hundred and forty-two thousand and fifty-seven dollars is the value fixed by the Tax Commissioners as representing the taxable property of this richest city in the history of the world. Of this sum more than \$5,000,000,000 represents the valuation of real estate alone, upon which basis the island of Manhattan is worth nearly \$200,000,000 a square mile. As yet, however, the city has not received for real estate on this island of mansions and millions.

**Wealthiest City in the World.**  
Even the mind of a Sage or a Rockefeller, reveling as they do in giant figures, must pause to grasp the enormity of this Patolcan wealth. Nothing like it was ever known. London, as a real estate asset, is a mere dwarf by comparison. Paris is hardly more than a pygmy. For London is \$1,500,000,000 poorer than the American metropolis, and Paris is more than \$2,000,000,000 nearer starvation than its American rival.

If by way of further comparison the three richest cities on earth were reduced to physical proportions—proportions of taxable value—London would not come up to the shoulder of Father Knickerbocker and Paris could hardly do more than reach his hand. The proud cities would have to climb some distance up the Kipling mountain to knock the chip from our Gulliverian shoulder.

**Over a Thousand Millionaires.**  
But by far the most interesting and important secret revealed by the tax records of 1901, when they were thrown open to the public a few days ago, was the fact that while there are 1,350 millionaires residing in New York, the city is practically owned by 20 men. This statement could not have been made ten or even five years ago. For five years ago the tax records of the city bore the titles of 165,000 parcels of real estate held by about 60,000 owners. At that time 20 persons owned and controlled only \$400,000,000 worth of real estate on Manhattan Island, while 97 persons owned nearly \$200,000,000 more property, placing a one-third control of the city in 124 hands.

**Twenty Men Who Own New York.**  
The richest city in the world has come down so rapidly to a mere score of Croesuses? Before answering this absorbing economic question, it is of timely interest to recall the names, which symbolize the actual ownership and relative control of \$1,200,000,000 in Manhattan real estate:

William Waldorf Astor	\$25,000,000
John Jacob Astor	12,500,000
Geisel family	10,000,000
John P. Morgan	10,000,000
Arnold Constable	10,000,000
John D. Rockefeller	10,000,000
Edw. T. and Lorain M. Gerry	10,000,000
John D. Rockefeller	10,000,000
Alfred G. B. S. S. S.	10,000,000
James H. McGraw	10,000,000
John D. Rockefeller	10,000,000
H. H. Landon estate	10,000,000
George B. S. S. S.	10,000,000
D. O. Mills estate	10,000,000
Ed. L. L.	10,000,000
John D. Rockefeller	10,000,000
William F. Furness estate	10,000,000
John D. Rockefeller	10,000,000
D. Willis James	10,000,000
The Vanderbilts	10,000,000

This list of names and figures, which is based upon the tax records, and

which has been carefully verified, will be noticed as representing only \$12,500,000. But every multi-millionaire representative on the foregoing roll controls—and frequently owns—vast and valuable property which is not directly traceable to the real owner and controller by the army of assessors. It is conservatively estimated that nearly \$450,000,000 additional realty is so owned and controlled by the 20 foregoing individual and syndicate realty kings.

**Changes of a Decade.**  
A decade ago the list would have been twice or thrice as long as representing the same real estate holdings. But Tax Commissioner Samuel Strassburger, who, by reason of his veteran service and intimate acquaintance with the taxable wealth of New York, is perhaps the foremost living authority on the subject, explained that the score of multi-millionaires and estates as here chronicled own and control the majority in those sections of the city which have doubled and even tripled in value within the past decade.

During the past 12 months there has been an increase of \$263,912,952 in the real estate valuation and a decrease in the personal property value of \$55,277,414. Commissioner Strassburger has compiled the following illustrative table showing the present taxable wealth of the five boroughs of Greater New York as compared with a year ago.

REAL ESTATE.		
	1904.	Increase.
Manhattan	\$2,982,411	\$13,052,029
The Bronx	261,028,471	15,003,710
Brooklyn	601,999,307	45,234,000
Queens	131,873,235	1,597,202
Richmond	44,208,709	1,081,112
Total	\$5,019,468,719	\$263,912,952

  

PERSONAL PROPERTY.		
	1904.	Decrease.
Manhattan	\$18,618,000	\$41,362,249
The Bronx	14,750,308	5,488
Brooklyn	85,373,125	11,464,000
Queens	7,577,425	2,000,475
Richmond	4,792,070	239,480
Total	\$120,078,878	\$56,787,214

  

Total real estate.		
	1904.	Increase.
Total real estate	\$5,019,468,719	\$263,912,952
Total personal	\$120,078,878	\$56,787,214
Decrease		
Grand total	\$5,040,547,607	\$208,125,738
Increase		

**New York Grows Richer.**  
Really, unlike personal property, cannot be shared. It is on the spot and can always be found by the Assessors. This year they found 105,420 individual parcels of real estate owned by less than 50,000 individuals. The decrease in the value of personal property does not mean that there has been any shrinkage in the personal wealth of New Yorkers, for it is conservatively estimated that with the incoming tide of costly art objects and other luxuries only afforded by the millionaire, New York is \$100,000,000 richer in its luxuries than it was a year ago. It simply means, as the tax officials ruefully acknowledged, that a great many wealthy persons—Commissioner Strassburger estimates the number at 1900—have taken advantage of the swearing-off process this year, thus escaping the tax. Who are the Assessors? Nothing. For the Commissioners are bound by law to accept the word of the man before them, unless explicitly able to prove its falsity. This is generally impossible, although 1000 corporations and 800 individuals were challenged this year.

**Wonders of Tax Lists.**  
One who has the patience or incentive to explore the tax records will discover a mine of information such as may be had from the golden rule by which the vast fortunes of contemporary American millionaires are mainly measured and estimated. All the facts and figures given here have been compiled with infinite care from the tax receipts and other reliable sources of information and subsequently submitted to real estate experts having the most intimate knowledge of the estates or domains of the metropolis.

William Waldorf Astor heads the procession of millionaires who exercise a real estate control over the city. His estate reaches the enormous total of \$150,000,000, or an investment which yields him in rentals alone an annual revenue of \$30,000,000. Thus an expatriated mil-



1—Robert Goelet.  
2—William K. Vanderbilt.  
3—James McCreey.  
4—William Waldorf Astor.  
5—Edw. T. and Lorain M. Gerry, founder of the Gerry Society.  
6—John Jacob Astor.

lionaire, who has chosen to bow his knee to an English King rather than to the Stars and Stripes, is the greatest landowner in this city and country. If not in the world. The Cornwell Van derbilt residence at Fifty-seventh street and Fifth avenue, which is assessed at \$2,000,000, is displaced by the \$2,500,000 William A. Clark mansion as the most valuable single residence in the city.

One of the curios of the tax records is the smallest lot in town, owned by James Cornell. It is situated between Giles Place and Fort Independence road, near Boston road. This diminutive piece of property is valued at \$1 by the Tax Commissioners and is assessed for 2 cents. This year the owner sent a 2-cent stamp to the Assessors in payment of his taxes. Glancing over the foregoing list of the

20 owners of New York the number specified as estates is notable. While each of these estates is represented by one or two individuals, it has become a settled policy with many American millionaires to encumber their estates with prohibitions not to sell during the life of the longest living child of the longest living heir, and in other ways to maintain their estates intact that they might increase from ten to a hundredfold.

Other instances, as with the Astor family, may be cited in which there has been a family policy of centralization that almost paves in steadfastness the policies of the strongest governments on the face of the earth. No passing sentiment has been allowed to interfere with the de-

termination of the Astors to have and to hold their realty heretofore. John Jacob Astor the Great, with marvelous foresight, anticipated the growth of his adopted city by actually buying the heart and principal arteries of the modern American metropolis. His heirs retain nearly all of their original inheritance to which they have added from generation to generation, until it is almost impossible to set foot in the center of the island without trespassing upon Astor property.

**Astor's Humble Beginning.**  
The founder of the family and fortune in its bought a lot in the Bowery near Elizabeth street. Foot by foot and lot by lot he added to his real estate holdings until 21 years after his initial purchase he was the reality king of the New World. His crown and scepter are still respectively worn and wielded by Colonel Astor and William Waldorf of England.

The original Astor policy was to never dispose of a lot or building. Sons and grandsons have steadfastly adhered to the policy. A few parcels that have been sold by them were outlying and for purposes of developing the family possessions were unsuitable. Astor estates cannot be purchased for love or money.

**Astor's Million-Dollar Farm.**  
A remarkable feature of the Astor estate is embodied in a square of sunken ground—a sort of fertile hollow on fashionable West End avenue—which is used for farming purposes. This farm is per square foot the most valuable one on earth, being assessed at an even million dollars.

Other notable Astor properties besides the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and the older Astor House in lower Broadway are as follows: The Hotel Knickerbocker, which is building at Forty-second street and Broadway, at a cost of \$2,500,000; Hotel Astor, at Forty-fourth street and Broadway, at a cost of \$2,500,000; Hotel St. Regis, at Fifth avenue and Fifty-fifth street, at a cost of \$2,500,000, and 54 handsome apartment houses and business blocks scattered over the city representing \$75,000,000.

**Other Great Estates.**  
Broadway and Fifth avenue are plastered with the name of Eno. Ames R. Eno began in the early '50s to follow in the Astor footsteps by purchasing a chain of lots upon which he subsequently erected the Fifth Avenue Hotel. The famous Flatiron Building, at the junction of Fifth street, Broadway and Twenty-third street, is built upon the Eno property. None of the Eno ever figure in the market as a seller of real estate. Eno property is not for sale.

Of such estates as the Arnold-Conatoble, the Alfred Corning Clark, James McCreey, George Ehret and Solomon Loeb, it is not necessary to speak in detail. The money which went to establish them was wrung from trade and finance and put away in real estate. The widow of the late Alfred Corning Clark recently married Bishop Henry C. Potter, and she is worth between \$20,000,000 and \$25,000,000, mostly in improved and virginal real estate. She and her son own some of the most magnificent apartment-houses on the western fringe of Central Park.

**The Great Realty Fortunes.**  
The Wendel, Rhineland, Langdon, Furness, Roosevelt and Stokes estates have reached immense figures through generations of heirs who were shrewd enough to let well enough alone. Broadway crops out on the records of these estates as their backbone with anatomical portions reaching into the suburbs and corners of the town. D. O. Mills and the contemporary Vanderbilts have made a specialty of office buildings, while the Astors, the Morgans, the McKays, the Belmonts and comparatively unknown, owns probably more property in the financial district than any other individual.

Matthew Wills has the noteworthy distinction in real estate history of having paid for a tiny lot at the southwest corner of Broad and Wall streets the highest figure per square foot ever obtained for land in the United States. Only 20

complete the site for his present building he bought from the late John Jacob Astor in 1885 a few yards of ground at \$20 per square foot.

**Owns Land by Square Blocks.**  
D. Willis James is one of the towering figures among owners of West Side property. He has probably furnished more money to builders for developing that section than any other living man, owning himself some 39 square blocks of apartment houses and fine private dwellings in other sections of the city.

New York has made most of these millionaires. Perhaps it can be truthfully said that the 120 other millionaires are making New York. For a great majority of them reach their millions in the metropolis after amassing their millions in other sections of the country. Nowhere and in no city under the sun have so many money lords congregated within the brief space of 84 years.

**New York's Millionaires.**  
Prior to the advent of John Jacob Astor—the first American millionaire—in 1820, the wealthiest New Yorker was Isaac Clinson, who swore that he was worth \$750,000. In 1839 there were five members of the millionaire colony—John Jacob Astor, Robert Lenox, John G. Conter, Stephen Whitney and Nathaniel Primeau. Clinson's wealth was at that time struggling with his ferryboat business.

Among those who lighted and carried on the torch of fortune were William B. Astor, worth \$5,000,000; J. G. Astor, \$3,000,000; John Hargarty, \$1,000,000; Peter Harmony, \$1,000,000; Joseph Kerochach, \$1,000,000; James Lenox, \$1,000,000; Jacob Lorillard, \$2,000,000; Gouverneur Morris, \$1,000,000; Thomas C. Pearsall, \$1,500,000; Stephen van Rensselaer, \$1,500,000; A. T. Stewart, \$1,500,000; Peter G. Stuyvesant, \$4,000,000; Herman Thorne, \$1,500,000; and Cornelius Vanderbilt, \$5,000,000.

**Barbaric Splendor of Life.**  
Life with them was a simple affair, as compared with their successors of today. For how do the owners of New York spend their royal revenues? There is no form of material splendor which is not within their reach. Buildings, monuments, parks which would give enjoyment to thousands of people are reserved for the exclusive use of private individuals. America has become a fairland—a hidden one for the most part. The soundings recall those of a Lancelotti, a Croesus, a Maecenas, a Cosmo de Medici, a French grand seigneur of the old regime or an English duke of today.

If any American wants to feel that he is in the midst of riches, all he needs to do is to stroll up Fifth avenue from Fifth street. Within 30 minutes he will have passed 200 mansions whose owners might pay off the National debt and still be millionaires. He will have passed not only the homes of most of the 20 representative owners of Manhattan Island, but those of the greatest financiers the world has ever known.

**The Romance of These Fortunes.**  
Stories rivaling an Arabian entertainment can be told of the history of many of these houses and their occupants and the great enterprises that have been founded by the men who built them. Railroads have been projected, epoch-making financial broths have been brewed, mines have been figuratively opened and explored, sunshine, in the form of coal and oil, has been wrung from the nether regions and the earth has been discovered anew by the men and millions scheming and dreaming in their Manhattan Island mansions.

They are all wealthy beyond the visions of avarice. They all employ an army of servants. They all entertain and undoubtedly spend more money in luxury than any similar number of persons living on an equal space anywhere in the world. Five billion dollars in realty sustains the lives of 10,000,000 people. Tax Department probably loses more sleep in weighing and measuring the possessions of the 20 men, among the 1200 metropolitan millionaires, than it does in dominant interest in the island, than in gathering out and doles from the remaining \$300,000,000 residents and taxpayers of Greater New York. (Copyright 1904, WILLIAM GRIFFITH.)

# IRELAND, "THE LAND OF THE POOR"

John Mitchell Writes of Conditions Which For 100 Years Has Steadily Grown Worse.

**DUBLIN, Aug. 4.**—(Special Correspondence of the Sunday Oregonian. Copyrighted, 1904, by John Mitchell. All rights reserved.)—In crossing the narrow seas which separate Great Britain from Ireland, one feels that one is migrating to an entirely different country. Although England and Ireland are under the same government, although the same language is spoken and the same laws followed, there could be no wider difference than between these two lands. Like England, Ireland is beautiful, and one looks out of the train window upon cultivated lands and smiling valleys; but here the resemblance ends. While in England one sees everywhere signs of comparative prosperity, the basis of Irish life is poverty and misery.

Everywhere one notes evidence of this obvious poverty. In the cities, as in the country districts, the people seem poor, and the indigent population is large. Outside of Belfast one sees but few industries, and in the small towns, through which one passes, the people seem poverty-stricken in many cases watched. One notes the comparative absence of large factories employing thousands of men, of mines, of iron works and textile mills, of large thriving cities, with great industrial populations, for the people themselves seem to lack initiative and spirit. They seem oppressed, and, despite a certain occasional gaiety, there appears to be among them a spirit of sadness which manifests itself even in their songs.

**Suffering for 150 Years.**  
Ireland has suffered, and is still suffering, from the evils of the past hundred and fifty years. During the 18th century the English government adopted towards Ireland somewhat the same policy that it sought to adopt towards the American colonies. The industrial development of the island was crushed out by the commercial policy of England, and the industries of the country died under the influence of the competition of its stronger rival. The Irish, driven out of industry, were forced into agriculture, and as they lost ground, especially after the adoption of free trade, which removed the duties from foreign grain. In the competition with the great grain-producing countries of America, Russia and India Ireland was left far behind, and the failure of the potato crop 90 years ago crushed the last remnants of hopefulness out of the people. The peasants were ground down between the upper millstone of falling prices for their produce and the nether millstone of rising, or, at least, stationary, rents for their lands, and as each year passed the condition of the population grew steadily worse.

The result was that the Irish were squeezed out of Ireland. Hundreds of thousands died during the famine of 1847, when the food, for want of which the people were starving, was shipped out of the island. Those who could sought

refuge in America, and during the last 60 years a steady stream of emigration has poured out of the country. At every census the population has decreased. In 1841 there were almost eight and a quarter millions of Irish in Ireland. At the present time there are less than four and a half millions. Sixty years ago Ireland had over three times the population it has today. The population is less than that of the northern peninsula. Sixty years ago there were over 1,000,000 Irishmen as there were Englishmen in Ireland. At the present time the population of Ireland is less than one-seventh of that of England and Wales. There are today in Ireland fewer people by almost a million than there were a hundred years ago at the time of the Union.

**Low Birth Rate.**  
The country naturally shows all the depressing signs of a depletion absolutely unprecedented in the history of the world's migrations. In these 60 years over four million Irishmen have left their native shores—a population almost as great as that which now remains. The Irish who emigrated were the pick of the nation. It was the men and the women with initiative, with courage, with hopefulness, who left the Emerald Isle to seek a new home in America, or to beat a hasty retreat to the more favorable conditions in England, Scotland, or the British Colonies. It was the young people who left, and it is the old people who remain. The birth rate in Ireland is low. The people who are capable of giving birth are for the most part out of the country, so that for every hundred births among a given number of Englishmen or Scotchmen there are only about 80 births among the same number of Irish. For the same reason, namely, that Ireland is overburdened with old men and old women, the death rate is higher in Ireland than in Scotland or England. The difference between the births and deaths leaves but a small margin for the increase of the population. The marriage rate is also low, there being only five marriages per thousand among the Irish population, while in the same country there are a thousand in Scotland. Even without emigration, it would be difficult for the country to keep up its present population. The birth rate, however, still continues to a considerable extent, and the emigration and the constant drain on the population still go on.

Perhaps much of the poverty of the Irish is due to the fact that, unlike England, Wales and Scotland, it has not a large manufacturing industry. Only one out of every 11 males in England and Wales is employed in agriculture, whilst in Ireland the proportion is one in three. Over a half of all the males in England, Wales and Scotland are employed in industrial enterprises, but in Ireland the proportion is less than one in five. Unlike England and Scotland, Ireland is not a country without great cities. There are, of course, Dublin and Belfast, with populations over 200,000 each, but with the

exception of these two places and of Cork there is no city or town in Ireland with a population as great as 40,000.

**Other Signs of Poverty.**  
There are many other signs of the poverty of the Irish population, even if that poverty was not perfectly obvious. The Irish pay a tax on their land, the same tax which falls on all incomes over \$50, but although there are many individual rich men in Ireland, the income from this source of the Emerald Isle is only one-twenty-second part of that from the whole kingdom. In Ireland the railroad traffic, both as regards freight and passenger is very much less than in England or Scotland. The number of letters carried, the number of telegrams sent, the tonnage of shipping, the number and size of the factories, the amount of coal used, the quantity of imports and exports are all very much less than they should be in proportion to the population.

The taxation, which in the United Kingdom falls heavily on the poorer classes of the population, bears with extreme weight on Ireland, which has an undue proportion of poor people, and while the amount of the tax is the same in the country, the poverty of the people, as compared with that of the English or the Scotch, is constantly and continually increasing.

When we speak of the Irish as being an agricultural nation, we must not confound the situation there with that in our country. The Irishman who tills the soil is not in the position of an independent farmer holding his 100 or 150 acres, but is rather a peasant with a precarious holding of a piece of land small in extent and value, and with a rent in excess of what the land should legitimately bear. The farms, such as they are, are extremely small, over two-thirds of all the holdings are less than 20 acres in extent, and almost one out of every three farms is less than ten acres in size. To a certain extent co-operation has been introduced among these farmers, but as a rule the poverty of the individual and his ignorance of the general conditions of farming render it difficult for him to combine. The farms are upon the whole ill-kept, and the conditions under which they are held are such as to discourage any particular thrift or uncommon energy.

**Low Wage for Artisans.**  
The men engaged in industry and in transportation in Ireland earn considerably less than do their brethren in England and Scotland, and upon the whole the proportion of unskilled workers in Ireland is much larger than in the two other countries named, while the pay for the same grade of work is less. In general, it is true to say that the Irish workman earns on an average about half the amount earned in the industrial countries of England and Scotland. The common laborer in England, who will earn \$4.75 per week in Northumberland or Durham, or \$5.50 in London, will earn only \$3.25 in Belfast and \$4.10 in Dublin, and about \$3.00 in other places in Ireland. The general surface laborer in mines will

# THE WEAK LINE IN MACBETH

Shakespeare's Great Tragedy Lacks Sympathy and Has Structural Faults.

It has long been recognized that Macbeth is a tragedy, but somewhat deficient on the purely esthetic side. It works by terror alone, and through this still stands the crowning glory of that terrible impersonality which more and more kept Shakespeare from loitering too long behind the scenes of his creation. There is not a tear in it, Homer, and in the same way there is not a tear in all Macbeth. It has no pathos and tenderness; and it leaves untouched the springs of Aristotelian pity. Macbeth himself goes down to his end as grimly and as objectively as did the husband of Andromache. To the modern reader or the modern audience, therefore, the play must lack that conciliating appeal which appeals from what we have to call "the humanities," clothed in tenderness. In plain words, appalling and powerful as it is, Macbeth lacks charm.

Yet from the purely structural point of view, there is a serious and notable defect in the play, as it stands before us today. This is the relative feebleness, the dramatic weakness, of the fourth act. It is weak, not only in its own right, but in its unsteady rush of action and onward-sweeping horror. Although a number of the commentators have questioned or resented this point, it is clearly the case, being by a hand other than Shakespeare's (Pisay branding as spurious two portions of the first scene, and the more authoritative editors have been unanimous in rejecting the Hecate portion), still, the wealth of the vocabulary, the sheer prodigality of the fancy, and the sustained dictatorial strength of the opening lines, all combine to show pretty clearly that Shakespeare himself is responsible for much of the act.

But Shakespeare, at this stage of his artistic career, was not in the habit of disrupting the very main-arch of his dramatic action. With the beginning of the fourth act of "Macbeth," however, begins a distinct and dramatic progress of the play. This structural oddity, from the standpoint of the theater, leaves the fourth act a startlingly weak one. It is a distinct and prolonged pause in the tempest of movement, a nerve-racking lull in the storm of seeming uncertainty. Now, according to the usage of Shakespeare himself, and according to well-established traditions of dramatic structure, this precise portion of any tragedy should sweep on with unhesitating and ever more and more gripping action. The motive here, above all places, should be absorbing and desperately sustained, and the main characters should be always "in the picture." It is so in "Hamlet" and "King Lear," just as it is so in "Othello" and "Romeo and Juliet." After the tumult and theatrical effect of the first act, the dramatic fourth act opens with the prolonged apparent irrelevance of the witches, in the cauldron scene. Although the line, centering in Macbeth and Lady Macbeth at this point, is depicted and naturally impatient, the King remains "up stage" throughout the lit-

# THE WEAK LINE IN MACBETH

Shakespeare's Great Tragedy Lacks Sympathy and Has Structural Faults.

ter portion of the act in which he furnishes the entire arch of the drama, with its essential keystone? For the irony of the tragedy, by such a move, is made grimly double. A blind clinging to superstitious belief has heretofore been the chief cause of the tragedy; he once again goes to the Weir Sisters and once again hangs his fate on this so-called supernatural enchantment. He is, in other words, by doubt up to this point, and tortured by suspense. The newer message and the ambiguous oracles of the Weir Sisters now fill a dim recess of a great, mocking, fallacious calm, a hope and contentment that is withering in its tragic irony. For it can easily be seen from the first that the play is somewhere been said, means simply spiritual mortification. As with the freezing limb, the stage of acute pain has passed, and the patient, placed the relapse into unconsciousness, the more poignant must be the ultimate awakening.

This comparatively quiet and placid fourth act supplies the mocking lull before the second storm; and in the next act we see the character caught up and hurled along to final and absolute ruin, mocked by the very calm that suspense, of which, as a man of action, he was passionately intolerant. Now all that remains is a great interpolated fourth act, which is both a pathetic reluctance to too hurriedly dispatch a victim already writhing on the spearhead of tragic misfortune, and also a timely recess from a torrent of huddled and hurried horrors which, emotionally, might be too exhausting to be endured by an already overtaxed audience.

Impatient Young Man—Nellie, how is our romance—yours and mine—going to end? You'll remember, I'm sure, that I told you, Geoffrey, you don't want to skip to the last chapter yet, do you?—Bangor News.

# Every woman covets a Shapely, pretty figure, and many of them deplore the loss of their girlish forms after marriage. The bearing of children is often destructive to the mother's shapeliness. All of this can be avoided, however, by the use of Mother's Friend before baby comes, as this great liniment always prepares the body for the strain upon it, and preserves the symmetry of her form. Mother's Friend overcomes all the danger of child-birth, and carries the expectant mother safely through this critical period without pain. It is woman's greatest blessing. Thousands gratefully tell of the benefit and relief derived from the use of this wonderful remedy. Sold by all druggists at \$1.00 per bottle. Our little book, telling all about this liniment, will be sent free.

The Bradford Regulator Co., Atlanta, Ga.

**Mother's Friend**

Every woman covets a Shapely, pretty figure, and many of them deplore the loss of their girlish forms after marriage. The bearing of children is often destructive to the mother's shapeliness. All of this can be avoided, however, by the use of Mother's Friend before baby comes, as this great liniment always prepares the body for the strain upon it, and preserves the symmetry of her form. Mother's Friend overcomes all the danger of child-birth, and carries the expectant mother safely through this critical period without pain. It is woman's greatest blessing. Thousands gratefully tell of the benefit and relief derived from the use of this wonderful remedy. Sold by all druggists at \$1.00 per bottle. Our little book, telling all about this liniment, will be sent free.

The Bradford Regulator Co., Atlanta, Ga.