

owner certainly does not, for it is all pay, pay, pay with him, and if he does sell his surplus birds, he will only get back 2s. to 2s. 6d. a bird. But the public gets the benefit, for they can purchase these costly reared birds for the price of chickens. One day those people, the farmers, tradesmen, working-classes, and laborers, will wake up to what they have lost, when they find the country house shut up, and shooting, as it used to be, a thing of the past. They can only then thank themselves, for it is by the votes of these very people that a government was returned to power bent on mischief. To ruin the gentleman and landowner, to upset everything which has done so much to keep good relations between the upper and working-classes, has been their intention. And this is their idea of benefiting the poor, by ruining owners of estates, by killing sport, and by introducing socialism of the worst type.

* * *

THE SECURITY OF PROPERTY.

From a Speech by Winston Churchill, of the British Ministry, Delivered at Abernethy, October 16, 1909. Reported in *Liverpool Daily Post* and *Mercury* of October 18.

The security of property depends upon its wide diffusion among great numbers and all classes of population, and it becomes more secure year by year because it is gradually being more widely distributed. The vital processes of civilization require, and the combined interests of millions guarantee the security of property—I speak of the immediate security of property; but, ladies and gentlemen, the security of property over long periods of time requires another condition. It must be supported by the moral convictions of the people; and if those moral convictions of the nation are to be retained, there must be a constant and successful effort to reconcile the processes by which property is acquired, with ideas of justice, of usefulness, and of general benefit.

A society in which property was insecure would speedily degenerate into barbarism; a society in which property was absolutely secure, irrespective of all conceptions of justice in regard to the manner of its acquisition, would degenerate not to barbarism, but death. And that is, I think, the message, the main message, which is to be found in the heart-stirring speeches which my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer [Lloyd George] is delivering in the country, and which are arousing people to face all sorts of awkward facts which hitherto they have been glad to leave neglected and unattended on one side.

No one claims that a Government should from time to time, according to its conceptions of justice, attempt fundamentally to recast the basis

on which property is erected. The process must be a gradual one, must be a social and a moral process, working steadily in the heart and in the body of the community. But we do contend, when new burdens have to be apportioned, when new revenues have to be procured, when the necessary upkeep of the state requires further taxes to be imposed—we do contend that in distributing the new burdens a government should have regard first of all to ability to pay; and secondly—and this is a newer point—that they should have regard to some extent, and so far as is practicable, to the means and the process by which different forms of wealth have been acquired, and that they should make a sensible difference between wealth which is the fruit of productive enterprise and industry or of individual skill, and wealth which represents capture by individuals of socially created values.

* * *

SUFFRAGETTE VIOLENCE.

From a Criticism by Edwin D. Mead in the *Boston Transcript* of October 20, 1909.

It is a great mistake, but I find it is not an uncommon one, to think that the recent violent proceedings in London and Birmingham and Newcastle, the attempted assaults on the Prime Minister, and the rest, really represent the main body of English woman suffragists, or have their approval. Nothing of the kind. These things are condemned by the sensible progressive people of England as emphatically as they would be condemned here. In suffragist circles especially it is keenly realized how damaging all these follies and excesses—yes, and crimes—are to the cause.

I do not speak of the conservative wing; it was with the radicals, scores of them, that we talked everywhere. Read the articles in the *London Nation* and the *News* during the last month; these show the feeling of the stanch English radicals towards the recent recourse of Mrs. Pankhurst's women to brickbat arguments. The *Nation* is the ablest radical weekly journal in London. The *News* is the ablest Liberal daily. Both have been strong defenders of the radical suffragists, even the "militant" suffragists; but neither of them will stand for this new sort of thing.

No sober person can stand for it, and the strong leaders of the woman suffrage movement in England see clearly that that movement least of any in the world can itself adopt what has latterly become the pet principle of its opponents, that the ultimate political tool and sanction is force. On that battlefield women will ever be doomed to defeat; on the intellectual and moral field their victory is sure and will come rapidly, as victories go in great movements.

Naturally condemnation of such able and devoted leaders as Mrs. Pankhurst is not pleasant and