

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,