

fenders against the laws and ordinances. Not only is he in favor of pardoning them, but he has now ordered, it is said, that they shall have something more than coffee, bread and molasses for breakfast. He has directed that they be given cream and sugar for their coffee and meat to eat with their bread. He has thus provided for the inmates of the workhouse a better breakfast than is enjoyed by at least half of the people of Cleveland. Tens of thousands of workmen and workingwomen go to their daily toil fortified by a breakfast of bread and coffee, without meat and cream, which in hundreds of homes are regarded as luxuries at breakfast time.

If "tens of thousands of workmen and workingwomen go to their daily toil fortified by a breakfast of bread and coffee, without meat and cream," by what standards are those people to be accounted prosperous? If cream and sugar for coffee, and meat to eat with bread, constitute "a better breakfast than is enjoyed by at least half of the people of Cleveland," upon what theory can it be said that prosperity prevails?

In his crusade for equitable taxation Mayor Johnson, of Cleveland, has one unusual advantage. Every move he makes helps the crusade, whatever happens to the move itself. With him as against the tax dodgers, it is all the time a case of "heads I win and tails you lose." If the courts to which his adversaries invite him decide in his favor, so much is gained for his cause. If they decide against him, so much the more clearly are tax iniquities disclosed to the public mind. It is the same with reference to hearings before taxing boards. Had the county auditors assessed railroad property equally with farm and residence property, the latter would have been relieved of excessive burdens of taxation. But they continued their discriminations in favor of railroads, telling Mayor Johnson to go for relief to the state board, and the tax payers of Ohio heard about it and began to think. Though nominally defeated, Johnson really scored a victory. Likewise with the decision of the state board. He went before that

body, as the county auditors had told him to, and it in turn has nominally defeated him. It decided on the 1st that it has no authority to increase railroad values. But again Johnson wins, because more Ohio tax payers will now learn that the county auditors and the state auditors play into each other's hands, and so allow the railroads of Ohio to escape taxation. As matters now stand the railroad valuations for taxation are less than a third those of farm and residence property; and the decision of the state board as to its own impotence to correct this iniquity will make the fact known throughout the state. Incidentally, also, it may be learned that some of the county auditors and some of the state auditors are beneficiaries of favors from the railroads.

Mayor Johnson's equitable tax crusade is in luck again, through fatuous opposition to the exposures of tax inequalities in Cleveland which the city board of equalization is making, with the aid of the mayor's tax bureau under the management of Peter Witt. An injunction has been obtained, prohibiting the payment of the salaries and expenses of the Witt bureau. Of this last piece of folly the Cleveland Recorder well says:

It is astonishing how the political fools of this town do continually play into the hands of Tom L. Johnson. The latest performance of that sort is the getting out of an injunction against the payment of salaries in the tax department at the city hall. This injunction has been gotten out by one Van Wye, but it is understood to be instigated by the republican committee. This movement on the part of Van Wye will bring the whole matter into the campaign and will demonstrate to the people exactly what Johnson is doing in the matter of the equalization of taxes. If the suit had not been begun it might have been a trifle awkward to drag the business into the fight. Now it is exactly the thing which must be done.

Meantime Mayor Johnson advances the necessary expenses out of his own pocket, and the excellent and enlightening work of the bureau goes on. When completed it will constitute such an exhibit of the values of Cleve-

land lots as to show glaringly the inequalities of real estate taxation.

The acceptance by a large body of Episcopal clergymen of the railroad hospitality of J. Pierpont Morgan for a trip across the continent and back, upon the occasion of the Episcopal convention at San Francisco, naturally excites hostile comment. Conversely, the refusal of two clergymen to accept the same hospitality is approved. To the favored clergymen this attitude of mind is probably inexplicable. They very likely see no more reason for declining Mr. Morgan's generosity than a country minister would have for declining a gift of early potatoes from one of his parishioners. In normal conditions there would be no objection. But Mr. Morgan is a very rich man, whose wealth depends largely upon laws and legal institutions that give him power over the labors and fortunes of others. His type, historically, is the robber baron. The baron depended, however, upon his prowess and his retainers, caring nothing for the law; whereas Mr. Morgan's long suit is legal inequity. Yet the essential principle is the same. Now, the Episcopal church is an influential institution. Laws which its clergy support cannot be easily altered. Inequitous men and methods whom its clergy approve are to that degree strengthened. The clergy, therefore, are objects of peculiar interest to monopolists. They cannot be bribed. No monopolist would think of bribing them. But they can be cajoled. And there is the point. If Mr. Morgan's clerical guests will think seriously, painfully if need be, along the line of these suggestions they may arrive at an understanding of the reasons for criticizing this Morgan junket to San Francisco and for commending the two clergymen who declined to join the party.

In the light of the almost total destruction by Filipinos of a company of American troops, the people of this