

# Federal Inquiry or Railroad Strike?

Faced by demands from the conductors, engineers, firemen and brakemen that would impose on the country an additional burden in transportation costs of \$100,000,000 a year, the railroads propose that this wage problem be settled by reference to an impartial Federal tribunal.

With these employes, whose efficient service is acknowledged, the railroads have no differences that could not be considered fairly and decided justly by such a public body.

## Railroads Urge Public Inquiry and Arbitration

The formal proposal of the railroads to the employes for the settlement of the controversy is as follows:

"Our conferences have demonstrated that we cannot harmonize our differences of opinion and that eventually the matters in controversy must be passed upon by other and disinterested agencies. Therefore, we propose that your proposals and the proposition of the railroads be disposed of by one or the other of the following methods:

1. Preferably by submission to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the only tribunal which, by reason of its accumulated information bearing on railway conditions and its control of the revenue of the railroads, is in a position to consider and protect the rights and equities of all the interests affected, and to provide additional revenue necessary to meet the added cost of operation in case your proposals are found by the Commission to be just and reasonable; or, in the event the Interstate Commerce Commission cannot, under existing laws, act in the premises, that we jointly request Congress to take such action as may be necessary to enable the Commission to consider and promptly dispose of the questions involved; or
2. By arbitration in accordance with the provisions of the Federal law" (The Newlands Act).

## Leaders Refuse Offer and Take Strike Vote

Leaders of the train service brotherhoods, at the joint conference held in New York, June 1-15, refused the offer of the railroads to submit the issue to arbitration or Federal review, and the employes are now voting on the question whether authority shall be given these leaders to declare a nation-wide strike.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is proposed by the railroads as the public body to which this issue ought to be referred for these reasons:

No other body with such an intimate knowledge of railroad conditions has such an unquestioned position in the public confidence. The rates the railroads may charge the public for transportation are now largely fixed by this Government board. Out of every dollar received by the railroads from the public nearly one-half is paid directly to the employes as wages; and the money to pay increased wages can come from no other source than the rates paid by the public.

## A Question For the Public to Decide

The railroads feel that they have no right to grant a wage preferment of \$100,000,000 a year to these employes, now highly paid and constituting only one-fifth of all the employes, without a clear mandate from a public tribunal that shall determine the merits of the case after a review of all the facts.

The single issue before the country is whether this controversy is to be settled by an impartial Government inquiry or by industrial warfare.

## National Conference Committee of the Railroads

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| ELISHA LEE, Chairman  | G. H. EMERSON, Gen'l Manager, Great Northern Railway.               | N. D. MAHER, Vice-President, Norfolk & Western Railway.        |
| P. R. ALBRIGHT, Gen'l Manager, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad.        | C. H. EWING, Gen'l Manager, Philadelphia & Reading Railway.         | JAMES RUSSELL, Gen'l Manager, Denver & Rio Grande Railroad.    |
| L. W. BALDWIN, Gen'l Manager, Central of Georgia Railway.           | E. W. GRIGG, Gen'l Supt. Transp., Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.        | A. M. SCHOYER, Resident Vice-Pres., Pennsylvania Lines West.   |
| C. L. BARD, Gen'l Manager, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. | A. S. GREGG, Asst. to Receiver, St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad. | W. I. SEIDON, Vice-Pres., Seaboard Air Line Railway.           |
| E. H. COAPMAN, Vice-President, Southern Railway.                    | C. W. KOUNS, Gen'l Manager, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway.    | A. J. STONE, Vice-President, Erie Railroad.                    |
| S. E. COTTER, Gen'l Manager, Wabash Railway.                        | H. W. McMASTER, Gen'l Manager, Wheeling & Lake Erie Railroad.       | G. S. WAID, Vice-Pres. & Gen'l Mgr. Susquehanna Central Lines. |
| P. E. CROWLEY, Asst. Vice-Pres., New York Central Railway.          |   |  |

S. Platt Jones is the Chautauqua sparkler. He ignites the enthusiasm on the opening night that gives Chautauqua things in general a momentum



S. PLATT JONES.

that whirls at top speed until the last night, when the Hawaiians play and sing "Aloha" ("Farewell and Love-to You"). Who is Jones? What is he? Tens of thousands of Chautauqua enthusiasts have heard him and hear him at every possible opportunity. They know that Jones is, but not one of them could describe him any more than they would attempt to describe Eddie Foy or Harry Lauder. He is just S. Platt Jones. That's enough. To say anything more about him would be "much too much."

Buy Your Season Tickets to **Chautauqua** Now and Buy Them With a Smile

Gullotta Trio to Appear In Concert

Trio of Soloists to Present Strong Musical Program at Chautauqua



The Gullotta Trio, concert ensemble, presenting a repertoire of instrumental and vocal numbers, sound the quiet keynote of the musical portion of the Chautauqua. This is their second western Chautauqua tour, the ovations accorded them last year render a return engagement imperative. Each member of this trio alone has been a star attraction. The combination is fortunate. It was of Vincenzo Gullotta, the violinist, that the famous Mary Anderson wrote: "I shall never forget your most wonderful sea before us and the roses of Taormina around us, your playing was a dream of beauty."

## Mexico.

Partisan defenders of Mr. Wilson's erratic courage in the past complacently congratulate the nation upon the circumstances that the issue of peace or war rests with the men whom he made ruler of Mexico. They cite this condition as though it were highly creditable to the government of the United States. Rather would it seem to be degrading that the tranquility of this nation and the lives of thousands of its citizens should be admittedly at the mercy of an irresponsible, scheming politician, whose power was conferred upon him, as a reckless gamble with fate, by the Washington administration.

Those who have the patience and industry to read the five or six columns of type embodying the latest State Department note cannot fail to be convinced that the indictment of Carranza's duplicity and treacherous hostility is just. But the expressions of painful surprise and petulant re-primand are as misplaced as they are futile. No one save President Wilson and the infatuated supporters of his diplomacy ever expected consistency or honorable dealing from the intriguing adventurer who flings insults at the government which seated him in power. \* \* \* The events of the last three years have made the people of that country believe that Americans are a race of incompetent triflers and cowards; that the American marines were driven out of Vera Cruz by fear; that this nation's courage and efficiency are as bankrupt as its statesmanship. And no sure way could have been found to solidify that belief than to employ half measures and reveal indecision in the pursuit of Villa's marauding band.

We have been compelled to discuss so often the calamitous record of the administration regarding Mexico that the reiteration has become wearisome. The reckless denunciation of Huerta the de facto ruler; the meaningless fatuity of "watchful waiting"; the secret deals with bandits! the astonishing invasion at Vera Cruz and the skulking withdrawal; the stern announcement that no one would be permitted to interfere with anarchy in Mexico, and the subsequent ultimatum of the factions; the expedition against Villa and the humiliation negotiations—Carranza's tricky lieutenant—the whole story is heedlessness, aggression, vacillation and compromise is depressingly familiar.

But from it all one fact stands out that clouds even the fine spirit and national resolve in the present emergency—the administration never had a logical, coherent Mexican policy, and there is no reason to hope that it has one now.

Treachery and truculence in Mexico distrust throughout Latin-America, and uncertainty, rather than enthusiastic confidence, at home—these are the conditions under which the American people are being committed to the subjugation of a people whose government their own officials have arbitrarily made and unmade.

Under such circumstances mere partisan criticism would be unwise and unpatriotic. If the evil results of the administration's policy were all in the past, the imperative duty of all loyal citizens would be to forget them and to concentrate upon the problems of the present.

But the perturbing fact is that even now the purpose of the government is obscure. No one knows with certainty whether intervention or withdrawal will be the next move. The country is ready, is eager, to obey the familiar and worthy injunction to "stand by the president." And we have no doubt it will do so, as soon as he comes to a stand himself.

## Willful Waste of Life.

There is time when plain speaking is a relief to the soul, but it is impossible to express in words the grief, anger and humiliation of patriotic citizens when they read accounts of such a slaughter of our soldiers as that which occurred at Carrizal, when two troops of the Tenth Cavalry were practically annihilated. Their loss is directly due to the stupidity, blindness and perversity of an administration that would not recognize the necessity of making adequate preparations to deal with any emergency that might arise in our relations with Mexico—until the emergency arrived.

Our relation with Mexico have been delicate ever since Mr. Wilson became president. We have had ample time in which to raise, train and equip an adequate force to deal with Mexican hostility. The administration was warned over and over again that an adequate army could not be conjured out of nothing at a moment's notice. In response the president talked airily about an "armed citizenry," and was ably abetted in his folly by Mr. Bryan with his picture of "a million men springing to arms between sunrise and sunset." \* \* \* While a brave effort was made to fool the country into the belief that the Hay-Chamberlain army reorganization bill represented a genuine advance in the direction of preparedness, events have marched so rapidly that its exposure as a hollow sham is already in progress. No longer ago than two weeks, the day the troopers of the Tenth Cavalry were lured to their deaths, the army appropriation bill was under discussion in the House. Chairman Hay, under the cross-examination of Representative Gardner and other Republican members, acknowledged then that no item had been placed in the bill for machine guns for the militia, or for increasing the number for the regular army, although Gen. Crozier had asked for \$3,000,000 for that purpose.

This refusal is all the more amazing because Chairman Hay admitted in the same debate that the army had only about 700 machine guns. But it was no more amazing than the fact that Chairman Hay and the members of his own party could not agree on the number of men actually provided for in his bill for the regular army. He insisted that provision "be made for an army of 105,000 men, while others said that the Philippine scouts would have to be deducted from this total, leaving the actual strength of

the army, before the Democratic party launched itself on a career of preparedness, was about 97,000 men. The Hay-Chamberlain bill increased the nominal strength of the army to 175,000 men, but this increase is spread over the next five years. The most that the army can be increased the first year is to 120,000. It was the boast of the orators at St. Louis that President Wilson had "kept the country out of war." That boast recoils on their own heads in the presence of the facts of the shameful waste of life on Mexican soil.

## Chicago Shocks Democrats.

It is not necessary to read between the lines of the dispatches from St. Louis to know that the managers of the Democratic party are very much dissatisfied with the work accomplished by the Republicans in Chicago recently. Four weeks ago the leading Democrats were unable to conceal the delight which they felt over the prospective split in the Republican ranks. They felt certain that it would be the 1912 campaign over again and that Woodrow Wilson was virtually assured of four more years in the White House.

The grief of some of the elder statesmen among the Democrats is pathetic. The saddest of these is Senator Stone of Missouri. He cannot comprehend the idea of a Progressive voting the Republican ticket, not pausing to consider that the platforms of the two parties are almost identical. Also he is in tears because Col. Roosevelt will not promise to run for the presidency. "This," says Brother Bill, his voice quivering with emotion, "is one of the most pitiful and tragic betrayals ever recorded in American history." One is tempted to feel for the gentleman from Missouri, but really it is impossible to shed any real tears. A harmonious Republican party means a Republican president and a Republican administration at Washington, and that is the best thing possible for the American people.

## The Colonel Comes Home.

Col. Roosevelt has returned to the Republican party and announced that he will "strongly support Hughes." The logic of events left him nothing else to do. If he had chosen any other course he would have justified the insinuations of his enemies when the Progressive National Committee issued its statement in January, when he gave out his interview at Trinidad and when he sent his telegram to ex-Senator Jackson while the two conventions were at Chicago. His acceptance of the Republican platform and recommendation of the chairman of the Platform Committee for president made the final declaration for Hughes inevitable. In fact, when the nomination of Hughes became a political certainty, it was easy to predict the Colonel's course.

The colonel's statement to the Progressive National Committee does not give all the reason why Hughes should be elected. It was not so intended. The supreme issue, in our opinion, preparedness against the economic conditions at the end of the great war, was barely mentioned. Whether our mills, factories and mines shall close and thousands of employes be thrown out of employment, while the millions of gold that have been flowing into this country since the war began flow back to Europe, is the great issue for November. But the colonel's statement does cut the ground out from under all individuals who declare that his election as president meant the salvation of the country. There is nobody who really believe that who can consistently refuse to support Mr. Hughes. The only Progressives who can stand out against the colonel's advice are those in the South, who sought to give Southerners a chance to vote their views on current national problems without violence to their civil war prejudices. Elsewhere the Progressive movement was not a party at all, but a protest against incidents and conditions that have passed away.

The colonel will feel at home again in the Republican party, which gave him all his opportunities for service.

## Hughes and Wilson.

It should now be quite evident, to those who have questioned it, that Mr. Hughes has definite and positive opinions and that he does not seek for softly padded words in which to express them. His message of acceptance of the nomination indicated a belief that language is made to reveal thought, not to conceal it, and his communication to the Progressives is made up of plain words that say what they are meant to say. No man can misunderstand them. There are no rhetorical flights that dazzle the eye and leave the mind bewildered. Some of the Democratic papers have been saying that Hughes is a man of the same type as Wilson, so why change? Nothing could be further from the truth. There is the difference between strength and weakness, between decision and indecision, between courage and timidity. Mr. Hughes has shown by his entire career that he will decide what is right to be done, and then do it, promptly. Mr. Wilson has shown neither the power of decision or of action.

"The most serious difficulties the present administration has encountered," says Mr. Hughes in his message to the progressives, "have been due to its own weakness and uncertainty." That is the conviction of all Americans whose minds are not swayed by partisan bias. And Mr. Hughes points out the evidence of that "weakness and uncertainty" in the long list of outrages against America and Americans cited in the note to Mexico of June 29, a series of crimes extending over three years, to which no self-respecting nation should submit for a moment. That series has reached the height of diabolism in the massacre of Carrizal, and still we are temporizing. Is it conceivable that we would have been in our present position, with a man in

the White House having a proper conception of international duties and national rights, with the firmness to perform the one and to demand the other? There would have been no war and no occasion for war. Nor would the difficulty with Germany have been so long drawn out and so irritating. Mr. Hughes indicates what his course would have been when the warning notices in regard to the Lusitania were published. He would have issued a warning of his own. Therein is the fruit of the difference between the two men. Hughes would act; Wilson would temporize. Do we want a man of action, or a man of inaction for our president?

## As Others See It.

Commenting on the nomination of Mr. Hughes as Republican candidate for president, the foremost British metropolitan paper, the Times utters these words: "The campaign between Mr. Hughes and President Wilson probably will be the most important since the civil war, for behind the immediate issues involved lies the whole problem of the future attitude of the United States toward the most important questions of international policy." The Times is right.

Never in its history has this country had such momentous issues awaiting decision. And never in its history has the need of a strong man at the helm been so obvious.

The present Democratic administration has emphasized that need.

The Times may well speculate as to the effect the result of the election will have upon international affairs.

For four years we have been the cat's-paw of the nations—their "fool in the middle"—their sport and laughing stock.

The Wilson administration has discredited us in the eyes of the world and has earned for itself the reputation of cowardice and faint-heartedness.

But the slate is about to be wiped clean. A new chapter is to be written in American history and it will be in a firm bold hand—that all the world may read.

Mr. Hughes may be depended upon to defend American rights and privileges everywhere and to uphold our constitutional principles.

**CARRIES HARP VALUED \$1,000**

Harp Soloist Carries Valuable Instrument.

Elizabeth de Barrie Gill, harp entertainer, is one of the Chautauqua's most unique offerings, luminarily presenting, as she does, a splendid vocal and instrumental concert, delightfully interspersed and combined with delectable character stories and impersonations.

Mrs. Gill is wonderfully proficient on the harp, and the \$1,000 gold instrument which she plays is a masterpiece of workmanship, of a vibrant lyric depth and tone resonance of surpassing power and sweetness. Mrs. Gill has a rich contralto voice and, singing to her own accompaniment on the harp, affords an ideal combination. She features English, Irish, Scotch and negro folk songs, and the crowning acme of the instrument proves most effective.



MRS. GILL.

In a generous repertoire of harp solos especially pleasing on the great lyre, such as the old plantation melodies and "The Marseilles" from "The Trovatore," Mrs. Gill's rendition of "The Rosary" is a distinct accomplishment. In this number she demonstrates the supreme rank of the harp as a musical instrument when played by an artist.