

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