

United States shall have a separate bureau for the distribution of the unemployed and ascertain and distribute information concerning business and professional opportunities; shall license and regulate employment agencies doing an interstate business; shall favor the establishment of free employment agencies in each State, with which the Federal bureau of distribution shall co-operate in such matters as bring employer and employe together; investigate conditions of unemployment and transportation and co-ordinate the work of State free employment agencies in various parts of the country, and also co-operate with organized labor and employers' associations.

John R. Commons of Wisconsin was re-elected president and Frances Kellor of New York secretary. [See current volume, page 1094.]



Singletax Conference at Boston.

The third public advisory but unofficial Singletax Conference of the United States which is to be held upon invitation of the Joseph Fels Fund Commission, will meet at 10 a. m., November 29th, at the Twentieth Century Club, 3 Joy street, Boston, Massachusetts. Open meetings will be held at the same place in the afternoon and in the evening of the same day. On the following day, November 30th, meetings will be held at Hotel Bellevue, the headquarters of the Conference, which is at 21 Beacon street. At 6 o'clock on the 30th there will be a 75-cent dinner at Hotel Bellevue, at which William Marion Reedy of St. Louis, editor of *The Mirror*, is to preside as toastmaster. The local managers of the Conference meetings ask all persons intending to be at the dinner to notify James R. Carret, 79 Milk street, Boston, in time for him to receive the notice before November 28th. An executive session of the Joseph Fels Fund Commission will be held at Hotel Bellevue on the 1st of December, and a public evening meeting for that day is under consideration. [See current volume, page 1085.]



Disorder in the British House of Commons.

To correct the nominal defeat of the Ministry, reported in these columns last week, the Prime Minister moved in the full House on the 13th to rescind the amendment to the home rule bill which the Unionists had carried in committee of the whole during a slack attendance of Liberal members. [See current volume, page 1092.]



Thereupon the Unionists started a riot on the floor of the Commons. Almost unanimously they threatened to make business in the House impossible unless the Ministry would acquiesce in the amendment or abandon the bill for home rule in Ireland; and they so far succeeded, through the

weakness of the Speaker, a Unionist member, as to force an adjournment of the session by riotous disorder. When the session began, say the Associated Press dispatches—

there were packed benches. The Premier's followers gave him a great cheer on his entrance and demonstrated that they were present in force by defeating a motion to adjourn early in the proceedings by a vote of 327 to 218. The substance of Mr. Asquith's motion was that the Banbury amendment be rescinded, "notwithstanding anything in any standing order of this House," and that the order of the House in respect to the home rule bill take effect as if Monday's proceedings had not taken place. The effect of this would be practically to begin again the consideration of the bill at the clause where the Banbury amendment was offered. Andrew Bonar Law, leader of the Opposition, had the floor quickly and inquired whether there was any precedent for the Government's course and whether it would not destroy all safeguards for regularity in the House of Commons proceedings. Amid loud opposition cheering the Speaker replied that he could find no precedent for rescinding a decision of the House arrived at during the passage of a bill. Whether it would destroy the safeguards was a matter on which every member must form his own judgment. There was a long discussion on the Parliamentary points, and then Mr. Asquith rose and said that no notice had been given of the amendment offered by Sir Frederick Banbury and that its discussion was brief. He doubted if the members on either side had appreciated its importance. It would reduce the \$30,000,000 which it was proposed to transfer to the Irish government to \$12,500,000. "If the decision come to Monday remains unreversed," said the Premier gravely, "or, on reconsideration, is found to be the deliberate judgment of the House, it would be impossible for the Government to proceed with the bill. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, a mortal blow would have been struck—"

Mr. Law—"Has been—"

Mr. Asquith—"At the financial arrangements of the bill. Next, I strongly hold that a bill passing this House should receive upon all substantial and vital points the assent of the majority of the House." Mr. Asquith proceeded to point out that last week the Government had a majority of 121 on a question similar to that raised by Sir Frederick Banbury. He argued that there were precedents for the course proposed.

Bonar Law replied that the established rule of the House was a decision once on a resolution. The Government's proposal, he declared, was an affront to the House.

Capt. Craig, Unionist for East Down, . . . moved adjournment, which was defeated, 327 to 218.

Then the storm broke. Sir Frederick Banbury moved that a decision reached could not be reversed at the same session. "The only honorable alternatives before the Government," he said, "are resignation or dissolution." . . .

Lewis Harcourt, Secretary of State for the colonies, attempted to speak. He was on his feet for several minutes. Every sentence was drowned by Unionist shouts and derisive cries. . . .