

national highway because we happen to have the management of it. Moreover there is a treaty. But Great Britain doesn't talk war. Fortunately her government is not now in the control of her "jingo." She proposes arbitration at The Hague. This is an appeal from the peaceable element of Great Britain to the peaceable element in the United States. Shall our "jingo" element be allowed to make us reply in war-provoking terms?



### Francis Neilson, M. P.

New York papers tell of the arrival in this country for a lecturing trip to the Pacific Ocean and back to London in time for the reassembling of Parliament in October, of Francis Neilson. Mr. Neilson might almost be said to be an American member of the British Parliament, for he lived in this country, traveling it over, from 1885 until 1897. He is a successful playwright, a captivating lecturer, a newspaper man, and in British politics an enthusiastic supporter of Lloyd George. Also a land-value taxer, he is president this year of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values, a member of the all-British United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, and one of the "Land Values" group ("caucus" as we should call it in Congress) of Parliament, where he has sat since 1910 as a member from Cheshire. He was one of the active campaigners who won the recent by-elections for radical Liberals in three constituencies, including Outhwaite's victory in Hanley. American theatergoers who were fortunate enough to see "A Butterfly on the Wheel" last winter may recall Mr. Neilson as its co-author with E. G. Hemmerde, the Recorder of Liverpool and also of the "Land Values" group in Parliament. Mr. Neilson is to make his American trip through Canada to the coast, and, by a more southerly route, back to St. Louis—with a possible stop at Chicago on his way from St. Louis to New York. While in Oregon and Missouri he is to campaign for the tax amendments to be voted on at Referendum in those States next November.



### Congressman William Kent of California.

This is the man who redeemed his Congressional district in California two years ago. Against all the power of President Taft's administration plus that of the Southern Pacific Railroad ring, he won the Republican nomination at the people's primaries and the seat at the election. He won as a democratic Republican, and in Congress he has made good. But this is no new role for him.

As a democratic Republican he has been making good from the day, years ago, when he began war upon the "gray wolves" in Chicago and became an alderman "to carry the war into Africa." This year Mr. Kent drops his partyism altogether and stands on his own platform. He stays out of the primaries and makes an independent canvas for nomination by petition. Although co-operating with the Progressive Party, he draws the line at Protectionism. As to the social welfare demands of that party, they sound like echoes from his own career; and of course he is in absolute accord with its platform on the Initiative and Referendum. Congressman Kent's re-election will probably be opposed by a Republican and a Democrat, both appealing to the progressive sentiment. But their appeal ought to be in vain. The democratic Republicans of his district should see to it that Mr. Kent is not defeated by the Republican candidate; the democratic Democrats may be relied upon, we should suppose, to save the Democratic candidate from Congressional responsibilities and temptations, so long as William Kent is in the field as an independent candidate. It would be a reflection upon that constituency if they allowed the Southern Pacific ring to recapture their seat in Congress when a man like Kent has once taken it out of the ring's clutches.



### Judge Hanford's Successor.

When Judge Hanford resigned "under fire" as a Federal judge in Seattle—"a bad judge, too"—a judicial vacancy was left for President Taft to fill. He has filled it. "Filled" is the word. Hanford himself couldn't have fitted into his old place any more snugly. Mr. Taft's appointee is Clinton H. Howard, lawyer for the Great Northern and for the monopolized traction interests of the Seattle region; also a corporation lobbyist.



### The Mystery in the McNamara Case.\*

There are mysteries in the McNamara case which we never expect to see unraveled, but the one that most concerns the public welfare may fairly be considered a mystery no longer. It relates to the motives that prompted the McNamara crime. Were these men tools of employers? or were they "labor-sluggers"? or were they "direct action" revolutionists? The theory that they were tools of employers has not been without circumstantial plausibility, but it probably has no substantial basis. The alternative, therefore, is that

\*See The Public of April 12 last, page 338.