

ture of Hanna's proved unprofitable, however, for the nomination had no other effect than to lift the plurality for the second highest place on the Democratic ticket some 4,500 higher even than Johnson's own plurality. But that blunder of Hanna's was not unnatural, and others brought less obvious punishment. The number of lucrative offices to be voted for had been multiplied by his legislature eight times, thus enormously increasing the difficulty of a straightforward campaign. A select lot of pharisees was lined up, so as to make Johnson appear to be out of harmony with the religious element. The Municipal Association, professedly a non-partisan civic body, but really a collection of stock investors and Republican tax-dodgers, who feared Johnson's just taxation policy, marched out against him with a pronouncement so manifestly partisan that he had no difficulty in tearing it to tatters. The temperance element was set on him because he hadn't closed all the saloons during all the "dry" hours; and the saloon element was rallied because he had closed them as well as the limited police force at his command enabled him to. Civil service reformers were set on edge with stories of spoilsmen in one department; and spoilsmen were reminded of the perfect merit system he had established in another. And so it went. Hanna himself came out into the open, and before the campaign closed the Republican candidate had been forgotten. The contest settled down to a test of strength between Hanna and Johnson—between plutocracy and democracy.

Inasmuch as Mayor Johnson received a plurality of 5,985, while Mr. Lapp, the candidate for vice mayor, received a plurality of 10,436, the inference is natural that Mr. Johnson ran considerably behind his associate. But that is not so. With the exception of Mr. Lapp's vote, Mr. Johnson's was the highest cast; and Mr. Lapp's was only 1,417 more

than Mr. Johnson's. The reason Mr. Lapp's plurality is so much larger is because his adversary was Senator Hanna's "labor" candidate—the labor leader who tried to make it appear that organized labor in Cleveland is opposed to 3-cent fares on street cars, and got the second highest nomination on the Republican ticket in consequence. He polled the lowest vote cast. Some of the Republican voters who "scratched" him gave their votes to Mr. Lapp; the others didn't vote at all for vice mayor. Mr. Hanna's "marriage of capital and labor," in the persons of Goulder for mayor and Sontheimer for vice-mayor (as one of his principal spellbinders called it), was a disastrous nuptial failure.

That Johnson should have won so signal a victory under circumstances so adverse as those that prevailed in Cleveland this Spring is a tribute not to his fidelity and abilities alone, but also to the loyalty of the masses of the people when their confidence is won. Johnson had proved himself to them. Upon the basis of radical and far-reaching democratic principles he had just begun a crusade for 3-cent fares on street cars immediately and municipal ownership ultimately, and in fiscal concerns for just taxation. His policies were opposed by traction company lawyers and obstructed by "gray wolves" in the council, by judges on the bench, by a corporation lawyer in the attorney general's office, and finally by the Supreme Court of the State, which overturned every Ohio municipality and for nearly a year has governed Cleveland by injunction, all for no other purpose than to save Senator Hanna's street car investments from the competition of cheaper lines and to shield rich tax dodgers from the equal operation of tax laws. But through it all Mayor Johnson has proved himself a leader who is both able to lead and worthy the confidence of all good citizens. He has been trusted accordingly, and now the day of the

realization of his plans for municipal improvement, real improvement, begins to dawn.

The reelection of Mayor Jones of Toledo—"Golden Rule" Jones as he is sometimes sneeringly but more often affectionately called—is another tribute to the loyalty of the masses to leaders in whom they believe. Mr. Jones has served three terms as mayor of Toledo, and the genuine democracy of his administration has attracted national attention and inspired local confidence. The political machines are powerless either to control his official conduct or to keep him out of the office.

In the recent campaign he went before the people of his city upon a nominating petition. He was literally what he calls himself, "a man without a party." Worse than that—if such things ever are bad, worse and worst—he had no newspaper support. The local papers (excepting one German paper) refused even to publish his brief address to his constituents, which was reproduced in these columns (p. 810) two weeks ago. Some of them refused to publish it even as a paid advertisement, though others did admit this piece of news, interesting and important to thousands of people, upon those commercial terms. And all through the campaign, both the local press of Toledo and the Associated Press at that point were as silent as the grave about Jones's candidacy. Though he is a man of national fame, it was no fault of the news agencies if anyone knew he was a candidate until the day after election, when his reelection was announced. The papers were in a conspiracy of silence, but the people were on the alert.

Toledo is to be congratulated upon this evidence of civic virtue, though it cannot be congratulated upon its civic prospects. For Mayor Jones will have no support in the city government. As mayor his power is very limited under the new municipal

code of the State; and since he had no associates upon his "no party" ticket, the Republican machine candidates (except mayor) have been elected to positions where they can harass and balk him. Probably the best service he will be able to render his city under these conditions will be as a watch dog and an example.

It is to be regretted that Mayor Hinkle, of Columbus, Ohio, failed of reelection. He was an honest and progressive mayor and a democratic Democrat; and his defeat was a triumph not of the Republican party, but of the corporation interests that have preempted that party in some places. Writing from Columbus of Hinkle's defeat, ex-Congressman John J. Lentz says:

We had an election here yesterday, the result of which was to defeat the most thoroughly honest mayor we have had for years; but three of the subsidized newspapers of the city have maligned and villified him throughout the entire two years in behalf of the franchise grabbing corporations, and they succeeded in planting a certain impression in the minds of a few hundred people, who are so easily gulled as to be incapable of self-government. In addition to this class, who believe that whatever is in print is inspired, we had a certain set of traitors within our own ranks, who are in politics for their own benefit and not for the purpose of promoting any cause for the general good. Personally, looking the whole State over, I feel that the cause of democracy is just as strong, and probably a little stronger in Ohio than it has been for several years. The election of Tom Johnson, in Cleveland, keeps the fire burning on the altar.

While President Roosevelt boasts on his travels of the "period of great material prosperity" we are passing through, the evidence of which is derived from the increased incomes of monopolists, it will be well to consider the increased outgoes of the masses of the people and the actual suffering from want to which many are obliged in these "marvelously prosperous times" to submit. Only the other day the Fresno Federated Trades Council of southern California sent out an official warning to the workers of the country in which it stated that average wages in the or-

chards and vineyards in that especially prosperous region are only \$1.25 a day, while cottage rents range from \$20 to \$30 a month, and all food products are very dear. Similar or worse conditions exist on the Atlantic coast. We have all heard of the starvation wages of the anthracite miners whom Providence has for some inscrutable reason entrusted to Mr. Baer's profitable guardianship. And now from New York City we are told by an investigator who sends the facts to the New York World, that opportunities for paying work are oppressively scarce. A well known medical man had advertised for a healthy person willing to take \$5 in exchange for a small quantity of his blood. The replies crowded the physician's mails, most of them coming from men who were unable to find work to do. "In almost every case," says the writer, "the applicant was out of work." When times are really prosperous no man is out of work. Even beggars and tramps are drafted into industrial service. But Mr. Roosevelt says that this is a period of great prosperity. So does Mr. Morgan. So does Mr. Hanna. So does every other man of the type that Kipling referred to when he wrote, "There are some men who, when their own front doors are closed, will swear that the whole world's warm."

When a legislator has the courage to do what Clarence S. Darrow did in the Illinois legislature last week, his action should be reported far and wide as an example of faithfulness to public obligation in trying circumstances. A bill had come before the lower House appropriating \$5,000 to the widow of Gov. Altgeld. As appropriations go it was a legitimate bill. Many appropriations of public money much more personal in character than this, and far less deserved, have been made and approved. But any appropriation of public money for private purposes is wrong, and so it appeared to Mr. Darrow. Yet John P. Altgeld was his friend. Every personal consideration, every

individual emotion, naturally called upon him to vote for that measure. It is all the more to Darrow's credit, therefore, that he voted against the bill. We give his explanation as he made it upon the floor:

No man ever lived whom I respected and loved outside my blood relations as I did John P. Altgeld. There is no woman more worthy of respect than the woman who is to be relieved in this bill. I know, and we all know, what John P. Altgeld sacrificed for the State of Illinois and for his devotion to duty as he saw it and as he believed it to be; and no man ever followed his duty more devotedly than did John P. Altgeld. A few weeks ago I voted against a bill to erect a monument to the memory of a good and great woman who lived and died in Illinois (Frances E. Willard). I voted against the appropriation to give \$5,000 to the Swedes and Finns who doubtless were in need. I do not intend to vote against all appropriations. There are appropriations which must be made and which should be made liberally. But I do not see how we have the right to vote the money that must be paid by the property holders of this State, great and small, to any private individual, no matter how much I respect them, no matter how high they stand in the common esteem. Much as I regret it, I believe that this sort of legislation is not proper legislation and that there is nothing for me, at least, to do but to vote no on this bill.

If the weekly newspaper which calls itself Public Opinion were as non-partisan as it pretends to be, or as frank in its partisanship as it surreptitiously is therein, it would be less misleading and correspondingly more useful.

In his recent campaign, Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, set a valuable example in Democratic campaigning which may also prove valuable elsewhere. He completely frustrated one of the methods which, under Hanna, the Republicans have adopted for coercing the employes of big establishments. Mr. Hanna's candidate for mayor, true to the Hannaistic method, had begun a speaking campaign at noontime in the big factories. His meetings there were called by the proprietors; and everything was put in shape to create an im-