

to get evidence, and try to compare the conditions of an American-born workman with that of a Hungarian, and then strike an average between the two.

Don't hold your meetings at the Auditorium Annex. The surroundings embarrass our witnesses.

Don't use legal verbiage in rendering your decision. Call a spade a spade. Our men understand it better that way.

Don't be afraid to say what you think for fear of being called a Socialist. Socialism is becoming popular.

Don't be influenced in your decision by the strength of the labor vote. It doesn't amount to anything.

Don't work on the theory that the interests of labor and capital are identical. Each is trying to get all it can; therefore, the interests are divergent. If this was not the case, you wouldn't be an arbitrator.

Don't spend three months in trying to arrive at a decision and then give the men an increase of one cent a day and hand their union a bill for \$5,000. It would be cheaper for the union to pay the increase from its treasury.

Don't meet and exchange cigars, and adjourn for a week, charging the union five dollars an hour for your services. If you employ men yourselves you would not like to have them waste their time in that manner.

Don't hand down a decision covering 384 typewritten pages. There is no time to read it; and, besides, the men are not interested in the science of arbitration. What they want is more money.

Don't lose sleep over the God-given rights of the nonunion man. He is no better than the union man and is entitled to no more consideration.

Both Morton and McGee believe that if these rules were adopted as a working basis better results could be obtained. They intend to have a number of copies printed, and, as each arbitration board is selected, to hand the members of it a copy, with a request that they give the matter careful consideration.

TRUSTS WROTE "ANTI-TRUST" BILLS.

For The Public.

That the Republican party, the legislative tool of the trusts, would in no way injure the trusts is self-evident to all right-minded men. That the so-called "anti-trust" bills which the Republicans permitted to become laws last winter are not bills to in any way curb the trusts and benefit the people, is also self-evident to any man who has carefully read the bills. Nothing in the Party record and nothing in the bills, except the titles, forbodes evil to the trusts. It will, therefore, surprise but few to learn that the real authors of the bills were the trusts themselves—the very ones that tried to further hoodwink the people by sending telegrams to Senators ordering them not to pass these "anti-trust" bills. The facts in regard to the "Nelson amend-

ment" "anti-trust" bill have not yet leaked out, but the New York Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin of March 25 contains the story of the authorship of the Elkins anti-rebate bill. It is as follows:

Chicago, March 25.—During the progress of a meeting of western railway executive officials to-day to discuss the Elkins law, it was stated that A. J. Cassett, president of the Pennsylvania; Paul Morton, second vice president of the Sante Fe, and E. D. Kenna, first vice president and general counsel of the same road, are authors of the bill.

It is stated that the first draft of the bill was made by Mr. Kenna and embodied the ideas of the three men named. This draft was submitted to the President, the Attorney General and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and subsequently was amended. As finally introduced, however, the bill was essentially the bill prepared from the suggestions made by Messrs. Cassatt, Morton and Kenna, after repeated conferences at the Executive Mansion.

Mr. Morton said to-day: "I believe that the Act will secure the maintenance of the freight and passenger rates, and this will be of inestimable benefit to the entire country, to the railroads, to shippers and to consumers."

In view of these facts will the Republicans continue to call the Elkins an anti-trust bill? Do they imagine that the people are such everlasting chumps that they will believe that the trusts are going to cut off their own heads, with a weapon which they themselves forged for that purpose? Mr. Morton says that the Elkins bill will benefit the railroads. His statement that it will also benefit shippers and consumers is a gratuitous insult to our intelligence. The railroads can be benefited only by increased freight rates and these must be paid by shippers and consumers. The railroads will get the benefit and the people will pay the freight. It's a clear case of "heads I win and tails you lose." The people can't beat such a game as long as they let the trust sharks and the Republican political mountebanks shuffle the cards and hold the stakes.

BYRON W. HOLT.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY.

OPENING CAMPAIGN SPEECH.

Mayor Johnson's first tent speech of the present campaign, delivered March 25, as reported in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

I consider it a misfortune that my opponent, Mr. Goulder, has declined to discuss with me the issues of this campaign. I had hoped that when the Republicans nominated a great lawyer, a man, they say, understanding marine law better than any other man in the United States, a man gifted with oratorical ability, that he would probably be only too glad to

join with me in a presentation of the issues and discussion of the aims of our respective parties. I did not believe that he would hesitate to enter into such a discussion with one who has been only a business man. I had considered it but proper that the people should be informed in this manner as to the merits of the claims of either party.

But Mr. Goulder won't discuss. He won't debate. He says he is not afraid, and I shall have to take his word for this, for Mr. Goulder is an honorable gentleman, but I think, my friends, that the reason why he declines my invitation is that he does not wish to have to answer embarrassing questions. He says we are following him about. If we are, there doesn't seem to be any danger of his allowing us to overtake him. If he is unwilling to discuss with us we will have to content ourselves with a sort of long-distance debate. I have a stenographer who attends each one of Mr. Goulder's meetings, and who takes down verbatim all he says. The next day I read these reports and then I proceed to answer Mr. Goulder at my own meetings. This is not entirely satisfactory, but it is the best we can hope for under the circumstances.

Up to date Mr. Goulder has made three principal charges against the present city administration. He has said that we have not kept our promises. He has said that we have conducted the city's affairs extravagantly. He has said that we have made Cleveland a football for political ambitions, and that we have devoted our time to the promulgation of "fads" and "isms."

He says that we have not kept our promise to obtain three-cent fare for the city of Cleveland. This charge sounds strangely, coming from a member of the firm which labored most diligently at Columbus to prevent our obtaining three-cent fare. We had done everything in our power. We had advertised routes for three-cent fare lines. We had obtained bids on these lines. Capitalists had come forward who were willing to construct these lines, and who deposited \$50,000 as a pledge of good faith. We had awarded the lines, and had successfully conducted the long struggle against the money and influence of the old companies to obtain the consents of the property owners. We even changed the names of streets to obtain this end. Then we were enjoined on a technicality by the circuit court. Not discouraged,

we commenced all over again, making our ordinances correspond to the orders of the court. Then it was that Mr. Goulder's partner, Mr. Sam Holding, went to Columbus and obtained the injunction from the supreme court which bound the city hand and foot, and prevented the granting of any franchises whatsoever. We did all that men could do, and the charge that we have not kept our promise comes in bad taste from Mr. Goulder, who did nothing to help, and whose partner was chiefly instrumental in driving the last nail in the coffin of our efforts.

Again Mr. Goulder says that we did not keep our promise to equalize taxes. Did we not get \$20,000,000 added to the duplicate from the public service corporations, and did not the board of Republican State officials, friends of Mr. Goulder, and very particular friends of Mr. Hanna, throw it off again? Do you wonder that Mr. Goulder does not wish to debate? Do you wonder that he does not wish to answer these questions?

Mr. Goulder says that the city of Cleveland has been made a football for political ambitions. When he makes this charge he probably refers to your humble servant. How could Cleveland be made a football for political ambitions? What can I do to induce the people to send me a step higher? I must have accomplished some good, some benefit for the people. But I am in the fight right here in Cleveland, to stay until it is won. I do not feel the slightest doubt but that I'll be elected on April 6 by a larger majority than two years ago. But it makes no difference whether I win or lose. I'll be in the fight clear to the end just the same.

Fads and isms! Is it fads and isms to open the parks to the people of the city, to make them attractive to all classes, to establish public playgrounds in the heart of the crowded districts for the children, to establish public bath houses where they have long been needed, to complete the water-works tunnel at a reduced cost to the taxpayers when it had been left in such a state by the contractors engaged under previous administrations that its completion baffled many of our best engineers, to provide for water meters to equalize the cost of water and prevent waste—are these fads? If so, let's have more fads! Is it a fad to have cleaner streets, more lights? Does Mr. Goulder complain of our extravagance in obtaining 60 new policemen, in cleaning the

streets, in replacing the antiquated flat burners on the street lamps with Welsbachs, in laying sewers and paving streets where these improvements are needed? Mr. Goulder does not specify his charges of extravagance. Would he go back of any of these steps in advance? Does he not rather know that whatever useless additions have been made to the city's expenses have been caused by the last Republican legislature, and that the additional expense thus caused far exceeds anything which has been caused by the city administration?

In his speeches up to date Mr. Goulder has made four glaring errors. He has made others, but I will confine myself to four.

He had stated that when the lower court enjoined us in the three-cent fare matter we did not appeal to the supreme court. Mr. Goulder is a lawyer. He well knows that the Republican legislature passed a bungling bill known as the Royer bill, which specially prohibited the appeal of any such cases to the supreme court. The bill was evidently a mistake, and Mr. Goulder, as well as every other lawyer in the city and state, was cognizant of it. To repeal this bill was one of the specific causes of the calling of a special session of the legislature. Mr. Goulder must have known these facts, and, in making the statement that we refused to appeal from the circuit to the supreme court Mr. Goulder has left a false impression, and has made a mistake which he ought to correct.

Mr. Goulder's second mistake is in saying that we promised to obtain a three-cent fare within two years. I never made any such promise. I said it was my aim to point out facts as they existed, to prevent the renewal of franchises without provisions for three-cent fare, universal transfers and ultimate municipal ownership, to show that three-cent fare lines could be constructed and profitably operated, and to do all in my power to obtain three-cent fare. We tried so hard that it took the combined efforts of Mr. Goulder's law firm, Mr. Hanna, the Republican managers, the Republican legislature, and the supreme court to tear down our city government, to abolish the federal plan; all to prevent the completion of our plans to establish three-cent fare in Cleveland. Mr. Goulder well knows that I did all that was humanly possible to obtain three-cent

fare. It was Mr. Goulder and his friends who stopped me.

Further, Mr. Goulder declares that you can safely leave this street railroad question to such men as Mr. Henry Slatmeyer, Mr. Spencer Knight and Mr. Towson. These are the candidates on the Republican ticket for directors of public service. Certainly Mr. Goulder, the candidate for mayor, has studied the new municipal code. If he has done so he must know that these three officials, of all the officials to be elected, have nothing in the world to do with the street railroad question. They will not even be called upon for advice. The matter will come before them at no stage of the proceedings. It is the council who will pass upon this street railroad question. What Mr. Goulder should have said is:

"You can trust this street railway question to Mr. Bernstein, to Mr. Beilstein and Mr. Hawkins."

Mr. Goulder has mentioned the names of three men who will have nothing to do with the matter from start to finish. He has said nothing in regard to our distinguished fellow citizen, Mr. Harry Bernstein, nothing in regard to our distinguished fellow citizen Mr. Beilstein, nothing in regard to our distinguished fellow citizen Mr. Hawkins. This is another mistake which Mr. Goulder certainly should correct.

His fourth mistake is less important. He has said that the west franchises do not expire for seven years. He has only added two years to the time admitted by the companies themselves, who own up that their franchises run out in five years.

If Mr. Goulder is a fair man he will take occasion to correct these mistakes and misstatements.

The Republican candidate for mayor is a great lawyer. He is the attorney for the Lake Carriers' association. He says he is not in any way interested in the Cleveland street railroads. Probably he is not personally interested. But the chief men in the Lake Carriers' association, his clients, are the men who own the Cleveland street railroads. Mr. Goulder represents these people and these interests. He says that he does not know whether he is for three-cent fare or not. He says he wants to end the agitation quickly and find some solution to end the uncertainty and dispute. But we do not desire to be in such a hurry. The supreme court injunction expires May 4. Two

years ago we could not tell you of men on hand with \$50,000 guarantee already deposited, ready to build three-cent fare roads.

Will you elect Mr. Goulder and his associates, or will you elect those who will represent the people, and who will not get tired and go to the railroads with a proposition to settle the question in accordance with the railroads' terms?

In conclusion I would say a word in regard to Mr. Goulder's statement that the reduction in fare would mean a reduction in the wages of employes, and that it is not permissible on this account. There is absolutely no foundation for this allegation. In Detroit, where the fare is lower than in Cleveland, the wages of the men are higher. In Cincinnati, where the fare is higher than in Cleveland, the wages are lower. Reduction of fare means competition, more business, an increased demand for conductors and motormen, and consequently higher wages.

THE MAKING OF A CAPTAIN OF INDUSTRY.

For The Public.

ACT III.

Scene I. Library of Push mansion. J. Head Push and Frank Push discovered at curtain seated at table, R. 2 E., conversing.

Mr. Push—But I tell you, lad, the two great factors of business are push and pull. Lacking the latter, you must have an immense deal of the former. I do not altogether like the term "push." It's too weak. "Crowd" comes much nearer to expressing the fact.

Frank—It does, all right, in your beautiful New York.

Mr. Push—Ah, boy! If I could but make you see the glory of that metropolis as I see it. How could it be grander? Is it not all pure business? See how it leads the race in cities. Mark its evolution. Once it was moral, even as most other places have been moral; then it became to a considerable extent immoral, again like most other places; but at this point it left the great mass of the world behind, and passed on to the grand third ethical stage, the un-moral, where all that foolish sentiment regarding "right" and "wrong" gives place to the grand utilitarian commercial "can" and "can't."

Frank—Which last term, father, leads me to ask how it happens that you, with your peculiar views, are a pillar in the Presbyterian church? It

doesn't seem to me quite consistent.

Mr. Push—What was that our Concord philosopher said about consistency? You'll remember that he did not think much of it as a test. I must confess, my son, that from your point of view, my course needs explanation. Now, there is in this world a factor called "public opinion"—a sort of trial balance struck from the beliefs, the prejudices, and the superstitions of the masses. This public sentiment is too powerful to ever be safely allowed to properly estimate its own strength, and we captains of industry find it wisest to use as a tool that which, as a weapon, we might be powerless to resist. For this reason, we subsidize the press; we drown the voice of the pulpit in the clink of our gold; we "salt" the springs of learning under ground; we make spellbinders golden-tongued with specie; we endow libraries and found institutions—in short, we spend money wherever we can do so, in a spectacular way likely to modify this aforesaid public opinion in our favor.

Frank—But do you consider that honest?

Mr. Push—I consider it good business, and that should be enough. I may add, however, as a gratuity, that it is perfectly honest. Public opinion is a commodity we need in our business. We buy it and pay the market price.

Frank—But you do not always create a true opinion.

Mr. Push—Frank, there are times when I almost wonder if you haven't an open-circuit intellect, you so palpably fail to connect! I particularly insisted that at college you should be well filled with classics and German philosophy. The latter has been of inestimable service to me. Do you not remember that sublime utterance of one of these sages, to the effect that only our friends deserve the truth?

Frank—No.

Mr. Push—What! Why, that grand postulate constitutes the very basis of the present Philippine investigation, and you know it not. When will you ever get into affairs? I forget the philosopher's name, but he said it, and the Republican party has, therefore, good authority for its course. How has it helped me? Add to it that equally just, beautiful and true saying: "There is no friendship in business," and you will see just how I stand on the conclusion that

there is no need of truth in business. No friend, no truth; in business no friend, therefore, no truth; Q. E. D. See?

Frank—The reasoning is sound, whatever one may think of the premises. It has been said, however, that nations have lost their liberties through a chain of right reasoning from wrong premises.

Mr. Push—Don't you worry about us captains. We don't bury our heads in the sand and fancy ourselves invisible. We know that the source of our power was, is and ever must be in our own correct discernment of a few primary essentials. Who was it that said there were but a few things to learn if we but learned the right few?

Frank—Pope.

Mr. Push—What! Not Pope, the industrial captain?

Frank—No. The "little interrogation point."

Mr. Push—Hum. Just so. As I was saying, we ourselves must know thoroughly the few primary essentials, while we hopelessly confuse the public in a maze of tertiary non-essentials. "A mighty maze, but not without a plan," but we high priests are the only ones that hold the labyrinthine clew to it. We must know all about wampum, money cowries, the "macute" of the African tribes, by which value is computed as we compute it in terms of dollars, only in their case their unit is purely an abstraction, there being no such thing as a piece of money called a "macute." We must know all about the first trade relations of primitive society preceding that common denominator of all desires, that greatest of labor-saving inventions, which we call "money." We must learn all this—learn thoroughly how few articulations there are in this skeleton which we rattle with such tremendous and complicated effect; and then when we talk, we must be careful not to allude to this simple, fundamental bony structure, but invite attention to the astral body of finance, and skyscraper like a Theosophist or a Christian Scientist. You know our argot: gold "standard," complicated banking, international exchange, in short, anything that will keep the farmer from realizing that he buys his mortgage money with wheat, as truly as he buys his coffee with money. Anything, I say, which will prevent the laborer from realizing that he is rich in terms of what he has, and poor in terms of what he must pro-