idly and lamentably ending the day of small merchants, small manufacturers, and independent mechanics.

The sole issue of the campaign in New York is succinctly summed up by a leading Bryan man of that city, Henry George, Jr., who in a letter of the 18th to George Foster Peabody, says:

Permit me to commend the position taken in your published letter from Lake George dissenting from the belief that there can be no salvation for the New York city government except by and with the support of the party still controlled by Senator Platt. That, it seems to me, embodies the real issue in this municipal campaign—whether the democratic party or the republican party shall control New York. By all the standards of his opponents, Edward M. Shepard is in character and ability worthy of the mayoralty; and they do not any more pretend that he has made discreditable bargains or that he can be used by bad elements than that Mr. Low has made such bargains or can be so used. Yet they do deny that Senator Platt effected the anti-Democratic nomination, and that that nomination has a bearing on national politics; whereas, it is well known that the senator and his able adjutant, Lieut. Gov. Woodruff, were from the start, openly or covertly, the champions of Mr. Low, and that the senator made the fusion nomination possible only on national Republican lines by repeatedly declaring that he would oppose for such nomination any man who had voted for the late Democratic candidate for the presidency—Mr. Bryan. The municipal situation is, therefore, unlike that of 1897, insomuch as there are no independent mayoralty candidates. The choice for the voter lies between the Democratic and the Republican nominees. For myself, I shall make the choice that most nearly expresses my views, and shall vote, as I am certain my father would likewise have done, for the Democrat.

During the past week the Democratic campaign opened vigorously in northern Ohio. It began with a large meeting in Cleveland, presided over by John H. Clark and including Mayor Johnson among the speakers. Republicans as well as Democrats were invited to this meeting, both as auditors and speakers. Republican candidates for the legislature were offered the platform, turn about with Democratic candidates, and guaranteed fair play and a respectful hearing, the subject being taxation. But the republican candidates did not respond. They were sturdily trying to stand by the policy of their party, which insists that national and not state issues are at stake this year in Ohio.

This policy was somewhat petulantly maintained by the speakers at the opening meeting of the Republicans at Delaware on the 19th. They referred to the issue of taxation in state and municipality as a sort of foreign substance which Johnson is trying to inject into the state campaign. Whether or not this policy of evading the question of taxation succeeds in the rest of the state, it has proved a dismal failure in the Western Reserve. Dismayed by the hold the question of taxation has taken upon the people in Cuyahoga county in consequence of the disclosures of Mayor Johnson in Cleveland, the Republican candidates for the legislature have been forced to break the silence imposed by the state managers of their party and formally to address the people upon the taxation subject. It would seem that the state managers were right. Silence upon this subject could not have been worse for them, and might have been better, than this weakly defensive address. They say, for example, that "substantially everything that has been done in Ohio to lighten the burden of taxation upon real estate has been done by the Republican legislature." To lighten the burden upon real estate! But what galls the people is not the burden as a whole, but its inequality. It is this inequality that Mayor Johnson is endeavoring to correct, and in that the Republican party has opposed and obstructed him.

When he sought to raise the assessment of railroads to 60 per cent. of market value, so as to bring it within the rule as to farm and residence property, Republican auditors overruled him. When he went before the state board, that body, all Republicans, also overruled him. It did so upon the basis of an opinion furnished by the attorney general whom Mr. Hanna's party had nominated in place of the Republican attorney general, Monett, by way of punishing Monett for prosecuting trusts. When Johnson asked the decennial board of appraisers to equalize real estate valuations in Cleveland, and offered to demonstrate its feasibility, they refused to consider the matter, contenting themselves with raising the appraisement generally, so that real estate owners already overassessed were overassessed still further. In spite, however, of these obstacles, thrown in his way by Republican officeholders, Mayor Johnson has reduced the tax rate of Cleveland from 3 per cent. to 2.67 per cent. He did this through the local equalization board, a majority being appointees of his own, which added $20,000,000 to the tax duplicate, by increasing the values of street car and other public franchise companies.

But he has done still more important work in fiscal lines. Through the tax bureau which he organized under the management of Peter Witt, he has made public the gross inequalities of real estate taxation which the Republican decennial board refused to correct. Mayor Johnson's explanation of this work is of universal interest. He has addressed the people of Cleveland in a letter in which he not only makes that explanation, but couples with it other explanations of equal value regarding points referred to above. He says:

The work in the so-called tax school, though not finished, has progressed far enough to show what the final result will be. Small shops and homes, including the rented homes of the poorer people, are assessed relatively higher than any other real estate in the city. A great majority of these small properties, valued at less than $2,000, are assessed at more than 60 per cent. of their true value, some being actually assessed at more than the owners offer to sell the property for. If all of this property were reduced to a 60 per cent. basis it would, in my opinion, reduce the tax duplicate at least $10,000,000. The more

valuable properties, those assessed at more than $2,000 each, show great variations, and generally the more valuable pieces are assessed at the lowest rates. If this property were raised to 60 per cent. of its true value the effect would be to increase the duplicate more than $70,000,000. There are some cases where small properties on one side of a street are assessed at six dollars per foot front and the valuable property of a single owner on the opposite side of the street is assessed at less than one dollar per foot front. The rule is almost universal that the valuable properties are assessed low, while the least valuable are assessed high. The reason for this is that the small property owners have neither the time nor the means to look after their assessments, while the larger interests employ the highest skill to secure an undervaluation. This whole question was fully presented to the decennial board of revision. While their action isn't complete they have done enough to show their inability or unwillingness to deal with the question. The changes they are making are insignificant. They are making no effort whatever to correct these inequalities, though they have full power to do so. The annual city board of equalization has devoted much time to investigating these inequalities and will, in all probability, be able to make a report during the month of December that will throw great light on this subject. In the meantime they have actually raised the tax duplicate nearly $20,000,000 by assessing at something near 60 per cent. of their value the municipal monopolies of this city. This one fact has been the greatest triumph in the equalization of taxation yet accomplished in this state, and it was due to this increase solely that the rate of taxation was lowered from three per cent. to 2.67 per cent., so that the old rate was 12 1-3 per cent. higher than the present rate. If the decennial board and the county auditors had proceeded in the same way the tax duplicate would have been increased nearly $100,000,000, the effect of which would have been to reduce the rate to less than 1.78 per cent., without any decrease in revenue to either the city, county or schools. Every small property owner in the city would have realized the benefit by a reduction of one-third in the amount of his taxes.

Judge Kohlsaat's injunction against the striking machinists and all who aid and abet them—whether parties to the lawsuit or not, whether served with the injunction order or not—an injunction which is said by the plaintiff's attorneys, though that is possibly only a professional advertisement, to be the most sweeping labor injunction yet issued, brings the question of "government by injunction" once more into prominence. It is somewhat difficult to sympathize with the organized workingmen who voted for this very principle in 1896 and again in 1900. It was distinctly in issue in the national campaigns of both those years, and every organized workingman who voted for the Republican candidates voted for the injunction order which Judge Kohlsaat has granted. But the question is too broad and cuts too deep to be dismissed with an admonition to its victims who voted for it that they deserve what they have got. This innovation of "government by injunction" strikes at the vitals of free government.

How deadly is its aim may be realized by considering one point in the argument of Leon Hornstein, the lawyer who represented the strikers before Judge Kohlsaat. "It is not," said Mr. Hornstein, "the old chancery remedy of injunction that these employers really want. It is a law. They want a law which no congress and no legislature would enact, and which no court could sustain as constitutional if it were enacted. But precisely such a law is what this court will assume to enact if it grants this injunction." Mr. Hornstein elaborated his idea. We cannot spare the space to do so, but a suggestion will suffice. Suppose congress or a state legislature should pass a law making it a crime, for any person knowing of the existence of the law, to interfere with the business of another, by assaulting, threatening or intimidating his workmen, or persons who wanted to become his workmen, or the families of any such, either upon his premises, or in the streets or at their homes, with the object of causing them to quit or refuse to enter his employment; or to attempt to accomplish that object by the use of any act or language tending to induce such persons to quit the employment or to refuse to enter it. Suppose such a law were enacted, and suppose it provided that any person charged with offending, knowing the law to have been passed, should be liable to be brought before a judge and summarily tried for the crime, without indictment by a grand jury. And suppose that this impossible law left it to the discretion of the judge whether he would confront the prisoner with the witnesses against him, whether he would take testimony orally in open court or by affidavits prepared and sworn to in secret, and whether he would call a jury or not. Suppose further that this law should empower the judge not only to decide whether the prisoner knew of the law and knowing of it committed the act, and therefore to convict without witnesses or jury, but should also leave the extent and severity of the penalty of fine or imprisonment, or both, absolutely to the whim of the judge. Suppose such a law did work its way through congress or a state legislature, what court which had the slightest respect for the constitutional safeguards of innocence could possibly sustain it? No competent judge could sustain such a law if it were passed, and no legislative body would pass it if it were presented. Yet precisely such a law was asked for in the labor case under consideration, and precisely such a law was enacted by Judge Kohlsaat. We defy any lawyer to distinguish any substantial difference between the impossible law we have outlined and the Kohlsaat injunction. The only difference is in the name. One would be a "law," the other is an "injunction." And that is what "government by injunction" means. It is government by autocratic judicial power.

When ex-Congressman John J. Lentz, acting as a lawyer, applied recently for an injunction against strikers, he was criticised for inconsistency. Why he was any more inconsistent in this than the lawyer who is politically opposed to capital punishment but professionally prosecutes a capital