

dated" at an up-town office in New York within two hours of boarding trains, some of which were distant from that office a good proportion of two hours.

\*   \*

#### Financial Benefits of the Panama Canal.

Early though it is, indications are already abundant showing the direction of the natural flow of the financial benefits of the Panama Canal. Building lots in the business district of New Orleans are booming. Why? Because it is expected that upon the opening of the canal New Orleans with its nearer proximity to this great water course, will become a great seaport. But why should that make a boom in New Orleans building lots? Because, if New Orleans does become a great seaport, its building sites must be availed of for business purposes. Hence the owners of these lots, with an eye to the growth of the city, are discounting the future by holding their property at values based upon expectations of growth. Already the prices of sites in the business district of New Orleans are so high that a very great growth must take place to enable their users to earn enough to pay interest on the price. This is not an isolated instance. It is typical of the effect of all improvement on the locations financially affected by it. Financial benefits tend to go to the forestallers of sites.

\*   \*

#### Competition and Monopoly.

One of the new magazine writers who is making a strong impression—we refer to William Hard—recently pictured labor conditions in the Chicago stockyards in this vivid fashion: "The Bohemian is willing to work for 18 cents an hour. But beside him stands a Lithuanian. The Lithuanian is willing to work for 17 cents an hour. The two men are equally strong," etc. "Which of the two men ought Mr. Armour's timekeeper to hire?" Mr. Hard writes of this illustration that it "is the bottom of the labor question in the stockyards of Chicago." True enough. But not that alone; it is the bottom of the labor question everywhere. Mr. Hard's interpretation of it, however, that the bottom of the labor question is competition, falls to pieces. Competition for a job, indeed it is; but competition for a job is caused, not by general competition but by restraint of general competition,—in other words by monopoly. To the extent that general competition is repressed by this monopoly or that, to the same extent and with even greater intensity does competition for jobs arise.

#### Labor and Land.

The builders of San Francisco are keeping wages down with imported strike breakers. If they could import vacant lots they might keep the landlord's blackmail down, but they cannot literally import vacant lots. Yet they could produce the same effect by exempting buildings from taxation and correspondingly increasing the tax on lots. This would import into the market a large supply of vacant lots which, while literally in San Francisco, are held at prices so exorbitant that for building purposes they might as well be thousands of miles away.

\*   \*

#### Bryan's Baggage.

On his baggage upon returning to this country, Mr. Bryan is reported to have made a full and frank declaration (something that nobody is expected to do, although it is the law, but which he did because it is the law), and the custom officials fined him \$500, which he had to pay. It would be interesting to know how much Congressman Longworth paid in duties on his baggage. The comparison might furnish an entertaining object lesson in tariff protection.

\*   \*   \*

#### ROBERT BAKER.\*

The name of Robert Baker is inseparably identified with the history of the abolition of railway passes. To him belongs the credit of having stirred up public sentiment on the subject and thereby of having brought about the suppression of this insidious mode of bribery. But his service in that particular is not the only public service he has rendered. Both in Congress and out of Congress he has for twenty years or more missed no opportunity to help in the cause of genuine democracy.

His fitness for this service may be inferred from a characterization of him which was recently made by Gov. Lind of Minnesota, who served with him in Congress. When introducing Mr. Baker to an audience in the Universalist Church at Minneapolis on the 22nd of last April, Gov. Lind said:

I told Mr. Baker a few moments ago that I would not have come into Minneapolis from my farm today to hear any other man on earth, and I repeat it. For I have never known but one man in all my political experience that always spoke the whole truth as he saw it under any and every circumstances, and that man is Mr. Baker. I admit that I do not always state all that I believe in, although I never deny my faith; but I never knew Mr. Baker to hesitate or

\*A portrait of Mr. Baker accompanies this issue of The Public as a supplement.



*Robert Baker*

equivocate, or deny what he believes. Because of this I am here to-day to testify to my high regard for him.

✱

Mr. Baker is an English-American. He was born at the historical English town of Bury St. Edmunds in 1862. His parents being poor, he was obliged to leave school at the age of thirteen to earn his own living. Seven years later he came to the United States, going westward from New York to Kansas City, Mo., but soon returning eastward as far as Albany, New York, where he made his home.

Always interested in politics, his attention was soon attracted to the evils of the spoils system; and as this system had no place in British politics, where the merit method of civil service already obtained, his earliest political activities were in advocacy of this reform in American politics. For political leadership, therefore, he naturally looked to Grover Cleveland, who in 1882 was elected Governor of New York.

In 1886, while yet unnaturalized, Mr. Baker took a deep interest in the contest between Abram S. Hewitt and Henry George for the office of Mayor of New York. But he did not sympathize with George. He was what was known in the slang of the time as a "society savior," a term that had been satirically applied to the Hewitt men because Mr. Hewitt had in one of his public addresses declared that he entered the contest to "save society" from spoliation and destruction by the followers of Henry George. Mr. Baker himself has described his attitude at that time in these words:

During the last days of the 1886 campaign I was worked up to a very frenzy of alarm over what appeared to be the imminent danger that confronted the people of New York City in the possible election of Henry George as its Mayor. Absorbing the heated views of the plutocratic press, which skillfully and deliberately misrepresents every movement whose purpose is a real amelioration of the condition of the masses, I viewed with the greatest alarm the growing strength which the agitator, anarchist and demagogue had developed. To me his possible success appeared as nothing short of a national calamity. Disorder and chaos were the least of the evils which his election would certainly bring, and I fervently prayed that the cataclysm I anticipated might be avoided. Better that anything should happen, than that the very foundations of society should be destroyed, all progress stop, and the best elements be overthrown by such a man.

Doubtless Mr. Baker breathed a sigh of relief when he saw the election returns and learned that Henry George had been defeated. Yet he was himself destined to become a national leader in the

movement that George began. What he then regarded as social order, he has long since repudiated as social disorder.

✱

His conversion began in 1887, when George was the United Labor party candidate for Secretary of State of New York, on the same platform upon which he had stood the year before in the mayoral contest. The New York Herald and the New York World sent able correspondents with George in the campaign of 1887, to report the speeches he made at the series of large meetings he addressed throughout the State. Through reading the Herald's reports Mr. Baker began to realize that he had been deceived regarding George's doctrines, and when George spoke in Albany he attended the meeting with an open mind. Impressed with the speaker's argument, and especially moved by his obvious sincerity, Mr. Baker procured a copy of George's "Progress and Poverty" and soon became a thorough convert to its doctrines.

Subsequently he assisted in the organization of the Albany Single Tax Club and became its secretary. His tireless activity in any cause to which he devotes himself was illustrated at that time by the daily pilgrimages he made into the country with another industrious enthusiast to paint single tax hints on the road side fences. So persistent in this work were Baker and his coadjutor that it soon became impossible for anyone to drive anywhere on the roads running into Albany without facing some such suggestion as that "the single tax will raise wages, lower rents, and increase profits"; or "the single tax will help the farmer"; or "land speculation, the curse of the industrious, will cease under the single tax"; or "the single tax is the only just tax."

In 1889 Mr. Baker moved to Brooklyn, where he became secretary of the Brooklyn Single Tax League and promoted the single tax movement in various other ways. It was he who secured by far the largest number of signatures (1,600) to the single tax petition which Tom L. Johnson filed with Congress in 1892. At the Single Tax Conference of 1893 at Chicago he was made secretary of the national committee, Tom L. Johnson being chairman, and Baker being also chairman of the executive committee.

✱

After settling in Brooklyn Mr. Baker entered larger fields of public work than direct agitation for the single tax offered, although he declares that the success of single tax principles has been

all along, as it still is, the sole object of his public life.

The first collateral work he did was in behalf of the Australian ballot system, which was then regarded as a foreign exotic, but now flourishes in all the States. For four years he was secretary of the New York Tax Reform Association, and also of the Brooklyn Revenue Reform Club, and he had charge of their joint plans for establishing home rule in taxation. In 1892 he was instrumental in inducing the Democrats of one of the strong Republican districts of Brooklyn to nominate Alfred J. Wolf, a single taxer now residing at Fairhope, as candidate for the lower house of the legislature. A single tax campaign led by Mr. Wolf and Mr. Baker was carried on with vigor, and Mr. Wolf was defeated by only 426 plurality in a district usually returning a Republican plurality of 2,400. Mr. Baker himself was a Democratic candidate for the legislature in 1894 on what was known as the Edward M. Shepard independent ticket, but the whole ticket was defeated. In 1896 he took the stump for Bryan, and in 1897 he was in charge of the petitions placing Henry George in nomination for first mayor of Greater New York. Absence in London prevented his participating in the campaigns of 1898 and 1899, but in 1900 he was again on the stump for Bryan, speaking throughout New York State.

In local politics he had been prominent as an independent. The Citizens' Union of Brooklyn, of which he was secretary in 1893, owed its establishment and success to his efforts. Part of the time he was chairman of its executive committee. He revived the Union in 1901, devoting himself to the task of fusing the radical Democrats and the independent Republicans. In that year he was named by the Citizens' Union as fusion candidate for Sheriff, but the Republicans rejected him as "unfit." To preserve harmony Baker therefore withdrew, but on condition that Michael J. Flaherty\* be named for coroner. The fusion ticket agreed to was elected and the "fit" man for sheriff, who had been accepted instead of Baker, was subsequently removed from the office by a Republican Governor on charges of pre-election bargaining.

+

Baker's election to Congress a year later was a result of the energetic work of the Radical Democracy of Brooklyn. This body, of which Baker was one of the organizers, had been estab-

\*Mr. Flaherty is now sheriff, having been elected last Fall. A biographical sketch appeared in *The Public* of March 17, 1906, vol. viii, p. 834.

lished in the Spring of 1902. Its platform declared for immediate withdrawal of tariff protection to trusts, for free raw materials, ultimate abolition of all tariffs, municipal and national ownership of all public utilities, the initiative and referendum, and the power of popular recall of delinquent officials from office. The Radical Democracy demanded Baker's nomination for Congress in the fall of 1902 and the party conceded it. Prospects of election were not bright, for Baker's district had gone for McKinley in 1900, only two years before, by 4,577 plurality. But election was not so much Baker's object as radical democratic agitation. He succeeded, however, in both particulars. Despite the great Republican majority to be overcome, and the rancorous opposition of the Brooklyn Eagle, nominally a Democratic paper, he was elected by 500 plurality.

In Congress Mr. Baker was indefatigable. Though he acted with the Democratic caucus in party matters, he refused to be hampered by any Congressional conventionalities calculated to defraud the people of their legislative rights. In consequence, the usual courtesies, by unanimous consent, were denied him, and he did not get them again until he had fought the whole House by objecting to all requests for suspensions of the rules requiring unanimous consent. While this fight lasted, Mr. Baker found it necessary to stay in his seat from the beginning of every day's session till the close. If he left the hall for but a moment, some member whom he was "holding up" would get unanimous consent and rush his measure through. Many were the tricks tried upon Baker to get him out of the hall for that purpose; but only a few succeeded, and after a time the House surrendered. Upon his agreeing to raise no objections without cause against the other members, they agreed to extend the same courtesy to him. From that time onward Baker's place on the floor of the House was secure. He had won his Congressional spurs, and no matter to what extent any of his fellow members might disagree with him they thereafter respected his Congressional rights and privileges.

+

Even apart from the railway-pass question, which will be considered below, Mr. Baker's record is well worth summarizing, both upon its merits and as an indication of the character of the man. Here it is:

Refused to appoint cadets to West Point and Annapolis because of his opposition to war and the cultivation of the war spirit.

January 30th, '04, opposed amendment for fraudulent mileage, page 1418 of Congressional Record. Same date, page 1423, endeavored to amend bill to open Rosebud Indian Reservation, so as to provide for periodical leases with new appraisement instead of continuing previous policy of outright sale. Received no support, the vote being 110 to 1.

Inserted in Record on March 18th, '04, proof of wholesale stuffing of the mails by Congressman Babcock, chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, during the four-yearly weighing period, so as to make the mail larger than it usually is and thereby enable the railroads to get pay during the following years for hundreds of tons of mail they never carry. The entire speech was expunged from the Record three days later, on the ground that it constituted an abuse of privilege, the motion to expunge being made by Hepburn.

March 10th, '04, introduced resolution condemning the acceptance by the President of the statue of Frederick the Great without the consent of Congress, as an act of Executive usurpation.

March 25th, '04, introduced amendment to post-office appropriation bill to appropriate \$50,000 to pay for special trains, cars, food, wines, etc., supplied to the President during the previous two years. Amendment provided that it should not be construed as conferring any power upon the President to contract for any similar service without the express authority of Congress. The object of the amendment was to have the President's traveling expenses paid out of the public treasury instead of being contributed as courtesies by railroad companies.

April 11th, '04, defeated the attempt of Congressman Gardner of Michigan to secure the enactment of a bill "detailing retired officers of the army and navy to assist in military instruction in schools."

Dec. 5th, '04, introduced resolution exposing hypocrisy of the claim that tariff on steel is for the purpose of "equalizing" differences in wages between this and foreign countries, and directing that the Secretary of the Treasury suspend the further collection of the tariff of \$7.84 per ton on steel rails until such time as the Steel Trust furnish conclusive proof that the amount paid to their employees for producing a ton of steel rails is greater than that paid by English steel rail manufacturers. Same date, a resolution asking the Attorney General what step he had taken to prosecute the Steel Trust as a combination in restraint of trade.

January 4th, '05. The President having directed the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to proceed criminally against the Washington Electric Company for maintaining a smoke nuisance adjacent to the White House, Baker introduced a resolution reciting the language used by the President, "It would seem to be wise to go to the very limit of the law and arrest the head of the company, again and again, at the shortest possible intervals," and asking whether he had instructed the Attorney General to "arrest, again and again," the heads of the various trusts for their "flagrant violation of law." Same date, a resolution instructing the Attorney General to report whether the acts of Paul Morton (then Secretary of the Navy) as vice-president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry. in granting rebates to the Colorado Coal and Iron Co. were not

also a "flagrant violation of law," and to report what steps he had taken to prosecute Mr. Morton criminally. Same date, a resolution that it was the opinion of the House of Representatives "that nothing would so surely restore public confidence in the administration of law as the arrest and prosecution of the Secretary of the Navy for his "barefaced disregard of law."

January 6th, '05, amendment to strike out provision that munitions of war imported by the U. S. government "shall be admitted free of duty," on the ground that "if the foreigner pays the tax" as contended, the tax should not be remitted.

January 23d, '05, resolution asking the President to dismiss his Secretary of the Navy, Paul Morton, and to direct his prosecution "as a conspicuous violator of law."

January 23, '05, page 1276, Congressional Record, resolution to adjourn in order to "express our indescribable horror at the wanton massacre of the people of St. Petersburg." Received no support from anyone on this motion. Only one vote cast for it. It referred to the massacre of the previous day, January 22d, by Russian troops. Same day, page 1290, speech in denunciation of massacre. Same day, amendment to reduce the salary of the Washington assessors for their "deliberate, perpetual and continuous violation of law in refusing to assess land according to its value."

February 20th, '05, speech in denunciation of President Roosevelt for his cablegram on the death of Sergius, although three weeks before he had refused to express the horror of the American people at the St. Petersburg massacre. Same day, page 3043, resolution in re Sergius cablegram.

February 27, '05, page 3686, secured adoption of amendment providing that if the national government or the city of Washington should at any time acquire the property of the Western Union Telegraph Co., nothing should be paid for the franchise right then about to be granted to lay conduits in the streets of Washington. Same day, speech (page 3704) opposing any increase in the Presidential salary.

March 1st (page 3940), raised point of order which prevented a vote on the proposition to increase the President's salary to \$75,000.

✦

Mr. Baker's principal speeches in the House were the following, many of the titles of which are indicative of their value:

- Dec. 14th, '03—A Compensating Wage.
- Jan. 12th, '04—Jug-Handled Prosperity.
- Jan. 14th, '04—Cincinnati's Corrupt Government.
- Jan. 21st, '04—War is Hell!
- Jan. 28th, '04—George B. Cox.
- March 26th, '04—Ship Subsidies.
- March 30th, '04—Increase in Freight Rates.
- April 14th—Single Tax: Farmers Emigrating to Manitoba.
- April 18th—District of Columbia Tax Bill.
- Jan. 25th, '05—Blizzards and Protection.
- Feb. 1st—To Abolish Railroad Evils.
- Feb. 2d—Judge Parker's Nomination.
- Feb. 8th—Government Ownership.

Feb. 13th—Source of Giant Fortunes.  
 Feb. 16th—Basest and Foulest of Crimes.  
 Feb. 17th—War, Diabolical, Unchristian.  
 Feb. 22d—Who are the Beneficiaries?  
 Feb. 24th—The Single Tax.

+

The mantle of national reputation fell upon Congressman Baker's shoulders several months before he took his seat. It was both unexpected and unpleasant, but he bore the honor of it modestly and the jibing and jeering with patience.

It was in the summer following his election that he received from the law department of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company an annual pass and the following letter:

Washington, D. C., July 21, 1903.—Hon. Robert H. Baker, Brooklyn, N. Y. Dear Sir—Heretofore, under the regulations of the company, annual passes have not been issued to members-elect until the Congress to which they were elected had convened. I am glad to inform you that this regulation has been modified, and from now on annuals will be sent to members residing in company's territory the first day of July following their election. I am, accordingly, pleased to forward to you under this cover a card of travel good for 1903. Yours very truly, G. E. Hamilton, Division Counsel.

This was Mr. Baker's introduction to what at that time was a universal custom. Congressmen, legislators, judges, etc., etc., were regularly the recipients of railway passes, as a method of securing small favors and establishing pleasant relations with a view to larger favors at higher prices. If for no other purpose than to present an important part of the history of the abolition of that nefarious custom, we shall be justified in reprinting Mr. Baker's reply in full:

544 Carlton avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., July 27, 1903. George E. Hamilton, Esq., Division Counsel, Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, Century Building, Washington, D. C.: Dear Sir—On my return to the city I find yours of the 21st enclosing an annual pass and announcing officially the policy of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company in supplying passes to members of Congress. In returning the pass I desire to say that I am unable to understand on what grounds a pass is tendered, if it be not with the expectation that it will influence me to act in my official capacity to conserve what your company regards as its "rights," regardless of the rights of the people, or may be to aid in securing for the company additional privileges. There is, I am aware, another possible construction to be put upon this tender of a pass, and that is, that if the pass be not given, then, in my official acts in matters affecting the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, the company assumes that I will be guided, not by a determination to deal justly with both the American people and your company, but to harass and annoy if not to cause it pecuniary loss. I am no more disposed to accept this as an excuse for the company's action,

than to believe that it assumes the pass would induce me to look with a lenient eye on legislation designed to confer extensions of its existing privileges; either view would constitute a reflection on the integrity of my actions, which I reject. As the language of your letter unmistakably implies, not only, that the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company has presented passes to members of previous Congresses "residing in company's territory," but that the pass sent me is simply one of many tendered to members of the Fifty-eight Congress, and as the language used precludes the possibility of your action being regarded as a personal favor to me alone, I consider it a duty to give the widest publicity to the matter, and shall therefore send a copy of this and of your letter to the press, for my constituents are entitled to know that a great railroad corporation has—in effect—openly, certainly without concealment or evasion, done that, which, if not resented, would lay my actions in all matters affecting railroad legislation open to the suspicion of having been corruptly influenced. In view of your language, "under the regulations of the company . . . this regulation has been modified, and from now on annuals will be sent," etc., I must conclude that a number of its high officials, presumably its board of directors, have directed that these passes be sent to members of Congress. As it must be assumed that these officials are acting for what they regard as the interests of the stockholders, and as, so far as I am aware, no report of the company has ever disclosed the approximate cost to the company in furnishing free transportation to members of Congress, both the stockholders and the public generally—who in the last analysis pay for such free rides in higher rates—are entitled to know that such a practice is being systematically prosecuted, and that so great a temptation is being put before the people's representatives. It is frequently asserted that railroad and other "special privilege" corporations are forced to comply with demands from legislators for these and other pecuniary favors, and were it not for such blackmail (as the companies term it) the companies would not bribe officials. In view of this official action of your company, in tendering through you these passes without solicitation, and apparently—judging from your language—on a wholesale scale, else why are "regulations" "modified"—those who have heretofore regarded your company as possibly a victim, must now revise their opinion and regard it as an instigator of official misconduct. Yours respectfully, Robert Baker.

Looking back upon Mr. Baker's letter, it does him the highest credit. Yet at the time, it was made the subject of jeering editorials by pass-holding newspaper men from one end of the country to the other. The Commercial Tribune of Cincinnati, for example, remarked that "by striking from his pass the first letter Congressman Baker of Brooklyn might ascertain what he has made of himself." Even among the pass-holding papers that lacked the temerity to jeer at Baker's return of the pass, there were many that criticized his making the matter public; even among his

friends there were those who thought it would have been in better taste to have returned the pass without comment, or at any rate without publishing his comment. But time has proved that Mr. Baker was right. As his chief object was to expose the system of free pass bribery, he argued that silence would have been futile. This is evident now. It was the publicity he gave to the subject that produced the downfall of the system.

Nor did he stop with that exposure. At the first caucus of Democratic Congressmen he attended, November 7, 1903, he introduced the following resolution:

Whereas it becomes increasingly apparent that the trusts owe their existence in large part to the fact of their having been the beneficiaries of outrageous and illegal freight rate discriminations, and it is also evident that the Republican party is controlled and directed by railroad and trust magnates; and whereas it is both right and expedient for the Democratic party to attack these monopolies, making it clear that no permanent relief from these oppressive conditions can be had until the illicit and criminal relations between the trusts and the railroads are terminated; and whereas the time has come to present to the people convincing evidence that no one charged with the formulation or putting into effect Democratic principles is in any way a party to or countenances these violations of law and morals; therefore be it resolved: That regardless of the practice of the Republicans, it is the sense of this caucus that its members do not accept passes or other favors from the railroads.

As Bryan's Commoner of November 20, 1903, editorially said, that resolution "should have been promptly adopted by the Democratic caucus." But it was not promptly adopted, nor adopted at all. A few votes supported the resolution; but the majority sent it to a committee which Mr. Baker was never able to get together.

His next effort was to secure action by the House of Representatives. On the 26th of January, 1904, he introduced a resolution for an investigation by the judiciary committee into the question of the criminality of the Baltimore and Ohio in issuing passes to Congressmen. But a House-full of Congressmen with pockets full of passes speedily buried the resolution out of sight.

Congressman Baker could not get the ear of the Democratic caucus on this subject, nor a hearing from the House of Representatives, but he did get a hearing from the people; and although the newspapers jeered him, the people took him soberly. And now that the giving and taking of passes has been made a crime, the name of "Anti-Pass Baker," as the corporation newspapers jeeringly called him three years ago, is worthy of perpetua-

tion as the honorable title of the real father of all anti-pass legislation, both State and national.

+

Mr. Baker was renominated in 1904, but the landslide against the Presidential candidate carried him down with his ticket. He received 1,800 more votes for Congress than Judge Parker received in the same district for President, but these were not enough. After the mayoral campaign in Greater New York last year, in which he was one of the most effective speakers for Mr. Hearst, the municipal ownership candidate, Mr. Baker was offered and accepted the position of secretary of the Department of Docks and Ferries, under Mayor McClellan. He is a poor man and this office paid him \$4,000 a year; but upon learning three days after his acceptance, that he would be expected to refrain from publicly discussing public questions, he resigned the office.

Mr. Baker's most valuable place of service is in Congress, and it is to be hoped that his district will send him back at the next election. He is a tireless worker, an effective speaker, a ready and fair debater, and a man of intelligent convictions, of sterling loyalty to his convictions, and of enviable courage. Such men are needed in Congress. A group in Congress of half a dozen such democratic Democrats as Robert Baker would go far toward making the Democratic party democratic, if indeed it did not also revive the latent democracy of the Republican party.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### BRYAN'S NEW YORK RECEPTION.

New York, Aug. 31.—Yesterday was Bryan day here, and last night capped the climax of such a reception as no private citizen not in nomination for office ever received in New York before. Madison Square Garden, which covers four acres of ground—an entire block bounded by Fourth Avenue, Madison Avenue, Twenty-sixth Street and Twenty-seventh Street—and rises four tiers high, was packed when the speaking began, from street level to roof. After Bryan had spoken ten minutes, those who had come from motives of curiosity and found the heat of the August night unbearable, left their seats in the upper galleries to seek the fresh air of the streets; but their places were taken as fast as they vacated them, and at the very end the great auditorium was nine-tenths as full as at the beginning.

+

Mayor Johnson of Cleveland presided, his introduction as chairman being made by Gov. Folk of Missouri. The other speakers were Henry W. Walker of the Commercial Travelers' Anti-Trust League and Augustus Thomas, the playwright. Mayor Johnson