

tion by 10,343, and the Labor candidate won the other without Liberal opposition by 10,189; the Tory candidates received respectively 8,038 and 7,953.

In one Division of Manchester on the 15th the Tory won by a plurality of 107 in a triangular contest in which the Tory got 3,111, the Liberal 3,004, and the Labor only 1,218, thereby changing the representation in the House of Commons from anti-Lords to Lords. In another division of Manchester the Liberals did not oppose the Labor candidates, and he was elected, taking a Liberal seat but counting against the Lords as before.

At Shoreditch on the 17th the Liberal was elected to a Tory seat by 3,041 to 2,585 for the Tory and 701 for a Socialist, although the Tory had carried the seat at a by election two years ago by 2,867 to 1,724 for the Liberal and 986 for the Socialist.

At Blackburn on the 17th a Liberal and a Labor—the latter being Philip Snowden—were elected by 12,065 and 11,896 respectively, to 9,307 and 9,111 for the Tories, there being no Socialist opposition to the Liberal and no Liberal opposition to Snowden. These two seats were Tory and Labor (the latter being Snowden) in the last Parliament.

A triangular contest at Gateshead was won by the Liberal by 6,800, to 6,323 for the Tory, and 3,572 for the Labor. The seat had been held in the last Parliament by Labor because the Liberals did not contest the Labors. On the same day at Portsmouth two progressive seats were lost in a triangular contest though not for that reason. The Tories got 16,777 and 15,592 respectively, to 12,397 for one Liberal, 9,965 for another and 3,529 for Labor.

A Labor gain at Wigan was due to the Liberals making no contest and giving the Labor candidate their vote. The vote was Labor 4,803 and Tory 4,293.

The only Wales (the country of Lloyd-George) constituency that has voted yet, Swansea Town, gives the Liberal 6,020 to 5,535 in 1906, the Tory 4,375 to 4,081 in 1906, and Labor (Ben Tillett) 1,451.

L. F. P.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

THE ALASKA COAL LANDS.

Concord, N. H., January 26, 1910.

Why at this time cannot a popular movement of such magnitude be organized that the United States government will neither lease nor sell its priceless coal fields in Alaska but will retain them entire to be ultimately worked by the nation for the equal benefit of the whole people? No other method of conservation as applied to them conserves. Coal is being rapidly exhausted; its value is certain to rise by leaps as the supply diminishes; the methods of private mining are cruelly and criminally wasteful, utterly neglectful of the next and after generations; nothing is gained by parting with these rich deposits, while the tragic popular loss from the operation is that it will pass over more power to the rich who are already more than threatening the nation's life. If these lands are retained by the people the popular gain through the act will not be merely the huge wealth which they contain, but will be the power

conferred by their possession to curb the piratical plans of other combines.

Now is the time to act. To-day's Washington (D. C.) dispatches state: "John E. Ballaine of Seattle, said to be the largest individual property owner in Alaska, to-day made a proposition in writing to the Senate Committee of Territories, of which Senator Beveridge of Indiana is chairman, offering to the government a royalty of 50 cents a ton for coal mined, for the lease of 5,000 acres of some of the choicest coal lands in Alaska, in the Katalla and Matanuska districts. Such a tonnage-royalty would net to the government, Mr. Ballaine claimed, as much as \$2,000,000 per 100 acres." Why should not the people have not only this sum but the tremendous additional amount that Mr. Ballaine will place in his pockets in excess of it?

Another proposition from the old line capitalists who want to get everything for absolutely nothing, is "embodied in a bill which has been prepared, but not yet introduced, designed to permit the sale or lease of such lands at a rate of \$10 per acre."

Can something be done? By acting quickly these people's possessions can be saved from alienation by Congress, and if not saved such a protest can be registered as will amount to a popular referendum rendering their cession to private parties on any terms morally void and making them recoverable by the next Congress. Senator Beveridge is standing with the people and showers of private letters and signed petitions sent to him will have their effect. The same work done to every man's congressman and senators will increase that effect, while clubs, meetings and papers taking the matter up can spread the agitation far.

We have reached the psychological moment, for this private monopoly of public resources is a vital factor in the high prices of necessaries against which the people are revolting in their great meat boycott. And let us not forget the lessons of the last coal strike, the hardships of the miners disclosed, the greedy inhumanity of the coal barons, the sufferings of the people for want of fuel, and the powerlessness of the whole nation and its government to do anything against those mighty lords of coal. All would have been changed if there had been mines publicly owned ready for use. The same situation will recur—should we not be prepared? We have such mines in Alaska, let the people issue their mandate to keep them.

MORRISON I. SWIFT.

* * *

When wilt thou save the people?

O God of mercy! when?

Not kings and lords, but nations!

Not thrones and crowns, but men!

—The Corn-law Rhymer.

* * *

Twenty thousand thieves landed at Hastings. These founders of the House of Lords were greedy and ferocious dragoons, sons of greedy and ferocious pirates. Such, however, is the illusion of antiquity and wealth, that decent and dignified men now existing, actually boast their descent from these filthy thieves.—Ralph Waldo Emerson, in "English Traits."