

done when the elections are all over and Parliament assembles, as it will about the middle of February. It may not get into working order before the early days of March. But not long after that time, perhaps before, the significance of the election results will begin to become concrete.

Opinions here differ as to what will be done. Presumably, since the Tories are in the minority, the King will ask Mr. Asquith, the Liberal leader, to form a cabinet. As Mr. Asquith has declared that the Liberals will not take governmental responsibility unless assured that the Lords shall no longer baffle progressive legislation, he will doubtless require the necessary assurances before undertaking to form a cabinet.

These might be given in one of three ways: the King could appoint about 500 new peers, nominated by Mr. Asquith, thereby "swamping" the present majority in the House of Lords; or he might summon to Parliament only such Lords as Mr. Asquith names; or he might prevail upon the Lords to acquiesce in Mr. Asquith's demand for a modification of the Lords' veto. If he does undertake to form a cabinet, it may be safely assumed that one or another of those assurances has been given him.

If somebody else is named to form a ministry, it may be assumed that the King has refused to accede to Asquith's conditions. In that case, Mr. Balfour would probably be the person called into form a cabinet. He might decline, on the ground that he could not control a majority; or he might accept, with a view to being voted down in the Commons and going to the country for a new general election to be held at once; or he might come to an understanding with the Irish party to give him a majority. The latter is what William O'Brien (Irish, Tory and marplot) would like, but it is not what John Redmond, the real Irish leader, would like. It probably could not be done without a concession of complete home rule to the Irish, and this it is inconceivable that the Tories would assent to, for it would be party suicide.

Should Mr. Asquith take up the job of forming a cabinet, the Budget would probably be adopted by the Commons at once, under strict closure, and sent up to the Lords, and the general belief is that they would adopt it unchanged. But they would do so, if they did it at all, on the ground that they had referred it to the people, and the people had approved it. As this would leave them free to take the same course with any future Budget, the Commons would thereby be divested of control over the national purse strings, and the House of Lords would be able at any time to turn out of power a party it did not like, by simply "referring" its Budget to popular vote.

Precisely that is what Mr. Asquith, with the Liberals and Labor men and the Irish behind him, insists that the Lords must not be permitted to do. It may be expected, therefore, if Mr. Asquith does form a cabinet, that he will very soon take up the Campbell-Bannerman resolution, and, passing it through the Commons, send it to the Lords.

The Campbell-Bannerman resolution provides (1) that if the Lords reject a measure of any kind adopted by the Commons, a conference of the two Houses shall be had; that (2) if the conference fails to agree, the measure may be voted upon a second time by the Commons, and if it is again adopted a second

conference shall be held; and that (3) if the second conference fails to agree and the Commons adopt the measure a third time, it shall be law notwithstanding the opposition of the Lords.

It is as near a certainty as anything in the future can be, that under these circumstances the Bannerman resolution would be adopted in the Commons by the joint vote of Liberals, Labor and Irish. It is also as certain that it would be adopted by the Lords (either through "swamping" appointments, preferential summonses, or a "coming down" of the Lordly coon), for it is unthinkable that Asquith would undertake to form a cabinet without assurances from the King guaranteeing acquiescence by the House of Lords in his demands regarding the veto claims of that non-representative body.

Should an Asquith ministry hold a progressive majority in the New House of Commons together until the completion of this much of the progressive program, it is reasonably believed that the next general elections would be far off, and that meanwhile much reform legislation would be enacted. Such legislation would probably include a reapportionment of seats, a reformation of the franchise so as to extend voting rights and abolish "outvoter" privileges, and a full measure of home rule in home affairs for Ireland.

But if Asquith is baffled at the outset, early elections would be the probable result—perhaps long before summer. And this is what all the Interests over here are now praying for.

L. F. P.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

ABOLITION OF POVERTY.

Morrison, Tenn., Jan. 29, 1910.

Twenty odd years ago Father McGlynn of New York organized the Anti-Poverty Society. It held enthusiastic meetings. It attracted much attention. But it did not abolish poverty. Its enthusiasm and efforts seemed wasted. But it was not so. Words of truth are immortal. The word of the Lord does not return to him void, but like the rain, does good in the world.

For three years, in a feeble way, but the best I could, I have been calling attention to God's promise in Deuteronomy, 15: 4-5: "There shall be no poor with thee." Like all God's promises, it is conditional. The condition is national obedience to the principles of political justice revealed in the Law of Moses. Individual obedience to the Bible will abolish the poverty that springs from individual wrong-doing; and national obedience will destroy the economic or involuntary poverty that springs from national sinning. I have been much encouraged during the last months; for the sneers that formerly met my assertion that Christ had promised to abolish poverty, have ceased. And this week my heart sings for joy, for I read in the Outlook of January 29, on page 246, the following words from Lloyd George, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer:

"This is a War Budget. It is for raising money to wage implacable warfare against poverty and squalidness. I cannot help hoping and believing that before this generation has passed away we shall have

advanced a great step toward that good time when poverty and the wretchedness and human degradation which always follow its camp will be as remote to the people of this country as the wolves which once infested its forests."

JAMES B. CONVERSE.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, February 8, 1910.

Closing Days of the British Elections.

The final results of the Parliamentary pollings (p. 106) seem to stand as follows, according to press reports:

Ministerialists.	
Liberals	274
Labors	41
Irish Nationalists, under leadership of John Redmond.....	70
Total.....	385
Opposition.	
Unionists	273
Irish Independent Home Rulers, under leadership of William O'Brien.....	12
Total.....	285

+

The apparent indifference to the suffragette agitation, on the part of both Ministerialists and Opposition when in the heat of conflict (p. 58), seems to have had a pacifying effect upon suffragette violence. According to press dispatches of the 3rd, their newspaper has announced that militancy is to be abandoned, not to resumed "unless we are convinced that the Government will yield to nothing else. We hope the need of it is over and that militancy has done its work," the article goes on. "Opposition to the government will be continued and the suffragettes will take the field in every by-election to urge the electors to vote against the government."

+

The strength of the vote against tariff reform ("protection," as we call it in the United States), is dwelt upon in the later mail advices as well as in T. P. O'Connor's letter to the Chicago Tribune of the 6th. Says Mr. O'Connor:

Protection in England is dead. That, at all events, issues clearly from the results of the general election. * * * The sharply divided lines between different sec-

tions of English life never were more clearly drawn than in this great contest. The south of England, that beautiful, sleepy, feudal land, which you meet from Dover to London, remains inert in its century of sluggishness. Without manufactures, without commerce, without education, without freedom, or any instinct for change, it has reverted to its inherent Toryism and once more crawled under the heel of the parson and the squire. It is no more like the north of England than old Salem is like Chicago. In Yorkshire, in Lancashire, and in the great iron and coal regions of Scotland and Wales, life is whirling with the same activity as the gigantic mills, and the people are robust physically, mentally and politically. All these portions of the country have not only declared against protection, but have done so with even greater strenuousness than at even the mighty landslide Liberal election of four years ago. It is evident that no ministry could propose a protective tariff in face of such a verdict for free trade from these portions of the three kingdoms. Sleepy Sussex dare not tax progressive Yorkshire and Lancashire. If any such attempt were made, especially if it were accompanied by a tax on food, there undoubtedly would be a violent and perhaps revolutionary outbreak in all the industrial parts of England which would sweep away the ministry, and perhaps a good many other things before it was done with. Amid the loss of many hopes this great triumph for the progressive forces of England stands out in bold relief.

The Times (Conservative), with a suggestion of a sneer, said in its issue of January 18, "Where cotton fills men's minds the entry of novel commercial ideas seems to be difficult." The Nation (Liberal) of the 22nd, points to the same cleavage as "Tay Pay," claiming that—

The most significant features of the election are, first, the appearance of two Englands—North and South—one Radical, Constitutional, Progressive and Free Trade, the other Protectionist and indifferent to or ignorant of the constitutional issue; and, secondly, a class stratification similar to the geographical one. The Government has the great middle mass, the Opposition the top layer and some of the bottom. The Government has organized, independent labor, the Opposition the more dependent classes.

With lists of the Free Trade and Protectionist cities of Great Britain the Nation makes it strikingly evident that active, powerful, industrial England is for Free Trade. "On the other hand," says the Nation, "as we approach the smaller populations, the homes of the little industries—which would be swept up into trusts under Protection—the valetudinarian resorts (Bath, Bournemouth, Brighton), the suburban, sub-London constituencies (otherwise the Home Counties), the cathedral towns (with the exception of Norwich, York, and Lincoln), the dockyard and arsenal centres, and finally the hole and corner boroughs, relics of an obsolete electoral system, like Falmouth, we find Protectionist strength growing stronger and stronger." It is to be deduced, in a word, that "the moral force of the Protectionist