

ond Assistant Fire Marshal William J. Burroughs, Captain Dennis Doyle, Captain Patrick E. Collins, Captain Alexander D. Lannon and eighteen other firemen were crushed and burned in a collapse of the walls of the burning Morris plant at the stockyards. Besides those twenty-three killed outright, seven other firemen were wounded, one of whom afterwards died. An explosion of some kind within the burning building is supposed to have toppled over the wall.

* *

Labor Politics in Chicago.

The political action committee of the Chicago Federation of Labor (p. 758), appointed on the 24th by John Fitzpatrick, president of the Federation, is composed of—

Charles Dold, W. W. Rodriguez, William Taber, Hugh Brady, A. W. Smith, J. E. Quinn, William Neer, Oscar F. Nelson, M. B. Philp, V. A. Olander, Charles Fry, W. F. Moran, Joseph Thornton, Joseph J. Galvin, James McGuire, Charles Earnst, John O'Neill, G. Dal Jones, C. D. Wheeler, Joseph W. Winkler and Miss Margaret A. Haley.

* *

Step by Step in China.

The Regency's refusal of the Imperial Senate's demand for a constitutional cabinet (p. 1211) was followed by the preparation on the 24th by the Senate of a defiant memorial, in which it was argued that a constitutional regime had already begun, and that therefore the government was no longer vested in its entirety in the person of Prince Chun, the Regent, and the Throne had not the right to autocratically reject the proposition for a constitutional cabinet. This memorial was not, however, presented, for on the 26th the Throne issued an edict which, though non-committal, was interpreted as a call to the people to prepare for a program providing ultimately for the establishment of a constitutional cabinet. This was accepted by the progressives as an Imperial pledge that their demands will be eventually granted.

* *

A report from Hong Kong states that six wealthy elderly Chinamen of that city recently publicly set an example to their fellow countrymen by cutting off their queues, and that the movement had been so widely followed that in Hong Kong alone in three days 11,000 men had voluntarily followed their lead.

* *

Final Result of British Elections.

Later reports from the British elections (p. 1210) slightly alter the result, though not in any important respect. The only change is in the relative strength of the two factions of the Na-

tionalist (the Irish) party. Following is the revised returns:

	Old. Parliament.	New Parliament.
Liberal	275	271
Labor	40	43
Nationalist	71	73
Independent Nationalist	11	11
Tory	273	272

Thus the Liberals lose 4, the Labors gain 3, the Nationalists gain 2, the Independent Nationalists make no change, and the Tories lose 1. If the Independent Nationalists voted with the Tories, which is where their sympathies lie, the Ministerial majority would be 104 as compared with 102 in the old Parliament; if they voted with neither party, it would be 115 as compared with 113 in the old Parliament; but if they vote with the Ministry, as it is assumed in the dispatches that they will, the Ministerial majority will be 126 in the new Parliament as compared with 124 in the old one.

* *

While these elections were in progress, the cable dispatches as printed here gave confused accounts of a speech by Lloyd George (p. 1140) which drew a bitter response from the Duke of Marlborough. Following are the principal parts of the speech as reported by the London Daily News of November 22. It was delivered on the 21st of November at the Paragon Theater, Mile End (in the East End of London), to an audience of 5,000. Mr. George said:

It was the rejection of the Budget that precipitated the crisis we have come together tonight to confer about . . . and now that I have come to the East End, where I started my campaign for the Budget, I have got to give an account of what I have been doing. The Budget has been in operation six months; some resolutions have been in operation eighteen months. Out of the money from the Budget we voted twenty millions last year to raise the old people above need. What more have we done? They talk as if we had done nothing for the Navy. Why, out of the money raised by that very much abused Budget we have spent ten millions more upon building ships and upon the equipment of the Navy, and we have found every penny of it. But that is not all. We are going to bring in an additional 200,000 poor old people who are now branded with pauperism. We are going to make them state pensioners—like the Dukes. What is more, we have got the cash to start an insurance scheme that will insure two millions of workmen against the evils of unemployment. That is not all. We are starting a scheme next year, and all the money is arranged to ensure 15 millions of work-people—men and women—against the anxiety and distress that come to households when the bread-earner's health breaks down. All the taxes are coming in, including whisky. All the estimates have been justified. We have these great schemes for keeping the invader from our shores—yes, for keeping hunger and want away, and distress from

invading the hearths of the people—all that is in this Budget; and they threw it out, these Lords, as if it were an unclean thing. We will reckon with them when we get back. Why did they do it? We dared—we dared—to touch the Ark of the Covenant—the land. We taxed the landlords' rents. They will say to us, Raising money is not the sole test of the Budget. No; it is not. You must raise money in a way that does not injure business, trade, commerce, and industry. Of course, you must. That is why I object to tariffs. Now, did we injure trade? Before the Budget, trade was depressed; we were down in the trough of the wave. Since then the good old ship has been rising, and rising, and rising, and we are not yet on the crest. Since the Budget, trade has gone up. Our foreign trade is leaping up by millions. Is that all due to the Budget? I don't say so. All I say is, by means of this fiscal instrument we have extracted 25 millions a year without injuring business. Not only has the Budget been a complete financial success, but trade and industry and commerce have improved since then. But, said Mr. Balfour the other day, What about the building trade? Well, before the Budget was brought in there was no doubt the building trade was in a very bad way. Things have improved ever since. The figures of unemployment in the building trade during the last six months are better by forty per cent than they were in the month before the Budget was introduced. I do not say it is what it ought to be, but it has improved, and it is going to improve. I believe the Budget will open a new era of prosperity for the building trade. It has unlocked the land, for you notice how the landlords are beginning to sell. I knew they would do it sooner or later, but I never thought they would begin so soon.

But stop a minute. It is not the Budget that is worrying us. We are doing all this at the dictation of Mr. Redmond. The Tory party must always have a bogey. There are certain tribes in this world—savage tribes—who are addicted to devil worship. The Tory party are one of those tribes. Last election the Germans were the bogeys. In 1900 it was the Dutchmen. In 1895 it was the Irishman. In 1885 it was Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. Now, having exhausted the list, they are going round to the Irishman again. But he is a different Irishman from the Irishman of '95. That Irishman, if you remember, was a midnight assassin—ragged, tattered, fierce. But the Irishman of today is a gilt-edged bogey—he is framed in American dollars. What I should like to know is this: Since when have the British aristocracy started despising American dollars? [A Voice: "Marlborough."] I see you understand me. Many a noble house tottering to its fall has had its foundations underpinned, has had its walls buttressed by a pile of American dollars. I am credibly informed that there is a newspaper, even in London, a Tory paper, run by American dollars. [As-tor's.] What about the Irish landlords and their cruel rack rents? Who paid these rack rents? The children of the Irish peasants, driven across the seas into exile in far-off lands, used to send their earnings to Ireland to keep the poor old people from being thrown out of the cottage they had built with their own hands. Do you know how many American dollars passed from America to Ireland to pay Irish

landlords in twenty years? It was all in a Royal Commission—eighty million dollars. The leader of the Tory party in the House of Lords, who flung out the Budget, was an Irish landlord. Had not he better ask how many American dollars he received? Let Mr. Balfour ask him before he delivers his next speech. Mr. Redmond went over to America and appealed to these exiles to help the old country. He said, "You are wasting your money. Help us to get liberty for Ireland, and then the dominion of these landlords will be at an end." And they subscribed—not 80 millions—but a very considerable sum, it is true, to carry on the campaign. Let me say this: Was it all American dollars? A large proportion of it came from Canada. Since when has Canada become a foreign country? When Canada and Canadian statesmen are to be used as an excuse for taxing the bread of the people, these Canadians at our kith and kin beyond the seas. But when Canadians subscribe money for the purpose of enabling Ireland to win the same measure of self-government as they themselves enjoy, these Canadians are "aliens," tearing down the Constitution. . . . We stand absolutely by the position we have taken up in the matter of self-government for Ireland—the position taken up by the Prime Minister in the Albert Hall speech. But the House of Lords is just as much a barrier to relieving Ireland of its wrongs and its oppressions as it is to the democracy of England, Scotland and Wales.

Schemes for reform we can consider at our leisure, say the Lords, and they have taken over thirty years to do it; but they are hurrying up just now. They are calling out excitedly, "Don't shoot, and we'll come halfway down," and we'll say, "Clear out, please."

There is but one thing we must insist upon, and that is that when the people of this country, after reflection, have decided that certain measures shall become part of the law of the land, no man, be he great or small, shall have the right to stop them. The Liberal party is not a junta of party leaders, it is the executive Government of the country—if it is chosen by the people. A Liberal House of Commons is not a party convention. They are not delegates at a great party conclave. They are the chosen representatives of the people in the House that is to shape its laws; and if you defy them, reject their measures, mutilate them, tear them, trample upon them, you are not defying the Liberal party—you are making a mockery of free institutions. So we go to the country to put an end to that forever.

+ + +

A legislator is the only man who can tell whether or not a law ought to be passed.

An executive is the only man who can tell whether or not it ought to be enforced.

A judge is the only man who can tell whether or not it has been violated.

A lawyer is the only man who can tell how it may be violated with impunity.

A layman is one who cannot possibly know anything about a law without seeing a lawyer.

A criminal is one who would rather take chances than see a lawyer.—Life.