

them. An interesting Presidential campaign on economic questions along radical lines looms up in consequence in the political sky.

+ +

A Lesson of the British Labor Strike.

In this country great labor strikes evoke hysterical demands for the military; and it is customary in that connection to insist upon mercilessly "shooting down the mob." If one tries to argue that these "mobs" may have just grievances, a heartless reply comes sharply back. In effect it is that the time for considering grievances is past, the only consideration now being "law and order." To persons who have argued in this way, the time they speak of as past had never come. They were wholly indifferent to grievances until aroused by fears of violence, and then they thought of nothing but slaughter. Americans are not alone in this hellish attitude of mind toward "the lower classes." Precisely the same spirit animated British Tories when the recent strike broke out in Great Britain. Some military shooting was indeed done; but one death-dealing volley in Wales aroused the indignation of all humane Britain. Had Tories been in power, the slaughter might have gone on in spite of public opinion, but Tories were not in power. The Ministry, supported by the Liberal-Labor-Irish coalition, cast aside all that "upper class" nonsense, criminal nonsense, about "law and order first and grievances afterwards," and sanely considered that grievances which cause lawlessness and disorder are the primary consideration for a government trying to re-establish law and order. Consequently—and note that it is *consequently*—a gigantic labor struggle has been averted with peace and in honor. A man like Grover Cleveland wouldn't have believed it possible, and wouldn't have tried it; men like Asquith and Lloyd George did believe it possible, and trying it in good faith have proved it.

+ +

The British Federation.

A brief news item that went through the American newspapers last week, is prophetic of the future of Great Britain. It was to the effect that a Scottish member of the British Parliament had, on the 16th of August, introduced a bill in the House of Commons providing for a local legislature for Scotland. This is a natural sequence of the abolition of the absolute veto heretofore held by the House of Lords. The purpose of the Scottish bill will doubtless follow, if indeed it does not accompany, the granting of home rule to Ireland. As long as the House of Lords controlled legislation

by its veto, home rule for any of the amalgamated nations within the British empire was impossible. But abolition of the Lords' veto was a preliminary condition to home rule for Ireland; and home rule for Ireland means inevitably home rule for Scotland also, and for Wales and for England.

+

None of those countries has a local legislature. There are city councils and county councils, but no sub-Imperial autonomy. Parliament governs all. On the other hand, nearly two score British dependencies scattered over the world and having local self governments, such as Canada and Australia, have no representation in the British parliament, as have Ireland, England, Wales and Scotland. All this is to be changed. The abolition of the Lords' veto absolute, makes it possible. With Ireland in the lead, local legislatures will be established in Scotland, Wales and England as well as in Ireland; and all four, together with the world-scattered autonomous dependencies of Great Britain, will be represented in the Imperial parliament. The whole Empire will be as in Canada with her Provinces, and in Australia with her States, or as in our own country with its State legislatures and its Federal Congress. Here, then, is in the making the greatest federated empire of history—and a democratic empire at that, albeit the shadow of a throne and the ghost of an hereditary legislature may for a time remain. It is no new thought. Richard McGhee, an ex-member of Parliament from Ireland, and now a member of Parliament again, told the City Club of Chicago about it two years ago. Mr. McGhee saw then what was coming; it is easier to see it now.

+ +

President Taft's Statehood Veto.

To appreciate the significance of President Taft's veto of the Statehood bill, three things are necessary to be understood. In the first place, Mr. Taft's legal education was got at a time and under circumstances which bias him in favor of the sacrosanctity of the judiciary. A bunch of wigs and gowns, with corporation lawyers concealed within them, is to Mr. Taft what crowns and scepters are to imperial flunkies. In the second place, his political, business and social connections have a tendency to make Mr. Taft see the patriotic importance of morganistic government. In the third place, New Mexico is absolutely under the thumb of morganistic combines through their control of its natural resources, whereas Arizona is as yet above the control of those powers. Gladly would Mr. Taft have admitted New Mexico with its prac-