

Johnson was getting on. He answered with enthusiasm that he was doing splendidly and would be reelected by a larger majority than ever. 'I am a rock-bound republican,' said he, 'but it is the republicans who made Tom mayor and will keep him so; why, they can't find a decent man to run against him. We all hate Mark Hanna; he is in politics for personal profit; but I should like to see anybody approach Tom Johnson with a dishonest proposition. Don't be worried over Johnson's election.'

"To-day I met another Cleveland man casually on the beach and sounded him about our friend. 'Tom Johnson,' said he, with enthusiasm also, 'he's fine.' He laughed when I suggested a fear that he might fail of election, and declared: 'Nobody can beat Tom Johnson.' I thought, these confident predictions from men who were not partisans would cheer you up. When men from Cleveland look at you with surprise for even thinking the mayor can be 'downed,' it is most encouraging."—San Francisco Star.

"CHILDREN OF THE EMPIRE."

Patriotic associations of young people are being formed, called League of Children of the Empire.—Daily English Papers.

A policeman on his beat meets one of the Leagues.

Policeman—What are you a doin' of, makin' a row and wavin' that dirty flag?

Children of the Empire—We're Children of the Empire, sir. The flag didn't ought to be dirty, but this boy, Bob, let it fall in the mud.

Policeman—O, you're Children of the Empire, are you? What d'ye mean by throwin' mud at that colored gentleman just now?

C. of E.—We wanted to teach him the dignity of labor, sir, and he wouldn't clean our boots.

Policeman—O, that's it, is it? And what d'ye mean by walking all abreast and hustling that poor man into the gutter?

C. of E.—He's only a shepherd, sir.

Policeman—"Only a shepherd!" What's that got to do with it?

C. of E.—Shepherd means pastoral, sir, and the clergyman told us that pastoral people must give way before Empire. He wouldn't get out of our way, so we had to push him into the gutter.

Policeman—I see. Now, look here, Children of the Empire. Go home and wash that dirty flag before you bring it out again. And don't let me catch you at any of them games any more, or I'll have you all in the lock-up.

That's the place for Children of the Empire what don't know how to behave themselves.—The New Age, of London, for March 12.

MINE, THINE AND OURS.

By Louis F. Post, in the February number of The Booklovers' Magazine, published monthly from 1223 Walnut street, Philadelphia. Reprinted by the courteous permission of the Editor of the Magazine.

The recent strike in the anthracite coal regions forced anew into the forum of the public conscience the ancient issue over the doctrine of "mine and thine." But that issue is a false one. What is really in question is not the moral validity of the doctrine of "mine and thine," but the moral reasonableness of its legal application. Whether "mine" ought to be mine and "thine" thine does not depend upon mere legality. In the forum of morals, rights of property depend upon the moral character of the asserted ownership.

To artificial objects the doctrine of "mine and thine" does morally apply. If I lay but one brick in the construction of a house, that house in part is morally "mine." If, then, I and all who have cooperated with me in building it, freely sell or give our interests to you, whether for wages paid as the work goes on or for a purchase price after it is done, the whole house is morally "thine."

Not so with natural objects in their natural place and condition. To treat them as private property is an abuse of the moral doctrine of "mine and thine." Just as legislation and social institutions exceeded their legitimate powers when in the last century they made property of black men, so they exceed their legitimate powers now when they make property of such things as natural coal deposits. These are in morals neither "mine" nor "thine." They are "ours."

Between what may be "mine" or "thine," then, and what can only be "ours," there is a distinction which is now legally ignored. But by recognizing artificial objects as "mine" and "thine" in proportion to the work we have respectively done to make them, while regarding natural objects in their natural place and condition as "ours" according to our common needs, this distinction defines a moral law of property which cannot be rationally questioned. To that law human institutions must conform or stand condemned, and by obedience to it civilization must survive if it survive at all. "Mine" and "thine" will be secure only when "ours" is held sacred. The dif-

ference between individual rights and common rights is vital.

MAYOR JOHNSON'S WAY. A REPLY TO CHARGES AGAINST HIS ADMINISTRATION.

Mayor Johnson yesterday sent the executive committee of the Municipal association the following communication in reply to the charges against the administration in the association campaign bulletin:

"It would be manifestly impossible for me to answer in writing all the statements made with regard to the present administration by the army of men who, as I think, are wilfully distorting and misusing municipal statistics in the newspapers of this city, though I have, I think, replied in detail in my speeches to all such criticism. I am satisfied that most of these statements are either knowingly false or else are such half statements of fact as render them equally misleading and untrue.

"For the reason that I have above stated it would be equally impossible for me to attempt an extensive review of your recent bulletin, coming as it does at the eleventh hour, but I cannot refrain from saying a word with regard to your statement that you condemn as inimical to the public interest the lax treatment of the midnight and Sunday closing ordinances with which you charge this administration. I am especially moved to comment upon this statement, for the reason that I heartily approve the work of your association in disseminating information bearing upon unknown candidates for public office, and I have every confidence in the candor and honesty of your committee.

"So far as I know, no member of your committee has ever made any investigation of the condition which you condemn; you have never called upon me or the director of police or the officers who have charge of the police force, nor, so far as I know, have you sought by direct evidence from any source, a fair knowledge of the condition which you criticize. Certainly a knowledge of the facts is a prerequisite to any intelligent treatment of the problem. I appreciate, however, that if the fact which you state remains and can be corrected, this statement of a lack of information on your part would not be an excuse for any public officer.

"It is not true that I have made any promises, express or implied, to the interest to which you refer, but on the contrary it is true that the present administration has done more to

check and repress vice than any of its predecessors; it has for the first time in the recent history of the city closed the dives and forced the low resorts where liquor is sold to go out of business; it has practically put an end to public gambling in the city, an achievement which no other administration can boast, and this it has done by placing uniformed patrolmen before the doors of such resorts; it has passed an ordinance for the regulation of dance halls; it has put an end to periodical raids and fines and public participation in the earnings of vice.

"The Sunday closing ordinance has prevented disorder; no administration has ever been able to enforce it, though its enforcement under the present administration has been as successful as under any of its predecessors. The city contains more than 2,000 saloons; we had up to March 1 of the present year but 292 patrolmen; of these 100 were on duty in the daytime. It would require from two to three men to make an arrest and secure evidence leading to a conviction, or one squad for every 60 to 100 saloons; at most, working constantly and uninterruptedly, they could make no more than 150 arrests a day, which would mean that every saloon keeper would be arrested once every three months, and the saloon-keepers could afford to pay the fine and continue the business.

"Such an administration as you suggest would involve the devotion of every available energy of the police department to this single end—it would involve the attendance of the entire day force of policemen at the police court from three to six days in each week and would result in the complete withdrawal of police protection from every other part of the city, the entire clogging of the machinery of the police court and the introduction of a system of secret blackmail and discrimination in the police department such as has been the discredit of many of our American cities.

"I have deemed the protection of the city from crime the most important use of the limited police force at our command, and for this reason I have not been willing to withdraw the entire force from its urgent duties to devote them to a spasmodic, discriminating and dangerous attempt to enforce ordinances impracticable of enforcement with the force at my disposal. I say impracticable, for I believe that it would require at least 300 men, an additional police judge and an expenditure of many thousands of dol-

lars a year, devoted exclusively to the purpose of closing the saloons on Sunday and after midnight; and as I have said before, I think such an attempt would inevitably lead rather to a corruption of the force than to a suppression of the evil.

"The present administration has sought to discriminate between crime, misfortune and vice—an effort has been made to prevent the first—the second helped to help itself—the third we have endeavored to minimize, and it is with no intention of disrespect, either for the men who compose your association or the honesty of the purpose at which it is aiming, that I say the public service corporations have in this matter attempted to create public apprehension and mistrust as a mere blind to cover their sinister efforts to secure an extension of their valuable franchises in fraud of the rights of the people and without a just return for the privileges which they seek to enjoy. Very respectfully,

"TOM L. JOHNSON."

—Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 5.

NEW ZEALAND LAND REFORM.

For The Public.

The following account of New Zealand reforms varies somewhat from the accounts that usually reach this country; but it comes from a competent and sympathetic observer, for whose integrity we vouch, though we neither adopt nor condemn his conclusions.

On the 9th of February, 1902, after visiting Brisbane and Sydney on our way out, a friend and I landed at Auckland, New Zealand, with the object of seeing for ourselves what advantages that much lauded land offered to home-seekers.

On bicycles we went south from Auckland through the Waikato and Waipa valleys into the "King" country, returning by way of the Rotorua, or Thermal Springs district, and the Thames valley, to Auckland, being three weeks on our wheels. Our personal investigations were confined to Auckland city and land districts in the North Island, but we met numbers of people from every section of New Zealand on our trip inland (land hunting is as active in that country now as in America 20 years ago), and were able to form, I think, a correct opinion of conditions obtaining over the whole colony.

The climate is one of the best in the world. The soil, though the country is somewhat broken and mountainous, compares favorably with the best sections of America. The people, though hospitable to strangers, and intelli-

gent and progressive in some respects in politics, are pervaded by an even more intensely jingo spirit than Canadians or Australians. New Zealand is a country of schools and churches. The Anglican denomination greatly predominates, both in numbers and influence, and from this influence comes their militant disposition.

The legislation so far adopted to remedy social inequality is purely socialistic—in the direction of public ownership and operation of public utilities as railways, telegraphs, etc., and in government regulation of conflicting individual interests as between employers and employed. New Zealand furnishes no evidence (either for or against) the theories of Henry George from actual experience. No single tax legislation has as yet been adopted by the central government for their own guidance. The most they have done is to grant power to municipal bodies to tax land values exclusively for local purposes.

The effect of this legislation has not yet been felt to any great extent, and under their system of government can never be very great. The governmental system of New Zealand is patterned after that of the England of half a century ago. Almost the whole collection and expenditure of public moneys is in the hands of the central government. Municipal bodies, such as we have in America or they are now getting in England, do not exist outside of the cities, and even there their collecting and spending powers are very limited. In country districts the road boards are the most important bodies of a municipal character, and so limited are their powers that in many sections they have been allowed to become defunct.

The effect of land taxation as applied by the central government in New Zealand is mischievous and pernicious, tending to complicate rather than settle the question of land monopoly, intensifying rather than correcting the evils it sought to remedy. The policy is to discourage large holdings by a progressive land tax according to size and value, and to encourage small holdings by exempting them from taxation altogether.

All holdings above \$25,000 value are subject to a progressive tax, which is increased with the size and value of the holdings. All holdings of \$25,000 or less are subject to the ordinary rate of taxation only, and are granted an exemption from taxation on the amount of \$2,500, holdings of \$2,500 or less being totally exempt from taxa-