

from Roosevelt in *The Outlook* to those lazy editorial writers, especially in the South, who work over for their own papers editorials from New York papers—we should like to know if some classes do get indulgences for crime. Whom do we mean? Well, at this moment we especially mean bankers, and our allusion is to the following statement which we quote from the *Chicago Tribune* of December 14, 1911, page 6, first column, first paragraph:

George M. Reynolds, president of the Continental and Commercial National bank, told the national business congress last night in an after dinner speech that bankers have to violate the law in times of stress.

Is that confession true? If it is true, why are not bankers punished? Do they escape because they violate the law only "in times of stress"? But every other criminal who confesses would make that plea. The McNamaras make it. What, then, is the difference between the McNamaras on one side, and the president of this great bank and his banker brethren on the other? Is it that the criminal McNamaras kill people by their kind of crime, whereas criminal bankers protect people by theirs? There may be such a difference, to be sure, but isn't it a dangerous difference to base any other appeal upon than an appeal for mercy and lighter punishment? Any community which allows some classes to "violate the law" for the public good, must expect to suffer from violations of the law from baser motives. And who shall decide what is for the public good—law makers or law breakers? While you are thinking over the McNamara case with its sinister significance—and sinister indeed it is—would it not be well to consider whether it is true that our laws punish McNamaras but exempt Reynolds. If it be true, then is it not high time for a housecleaning, and not in trade unions alone as dilettante moralists urge but throughout society?

* *

The Assault Upon Lloyd George.

It may be that the cable reports which attribute last week's assault upon Lloyd George to the violence wing of British woman suffragists, are in that respect untrue; but the act itself, the hurling of a box into his face with evident intent to do him physical injury, is so manifestly in line with the tory policy of that group as to make their responsibility for it fairly probable.

*

Whether this inference against them and their leaders be valid or not, there is no obvious escape from the conclusion that the assault could not

have been inspired by any democratic purpose. When attacked, Lloyd George was coming away from a Liberal meeting at which he had been speaking for woman suffrage. His speech was made in a campaign for equal suffrage for adults regardless of sex, which he is leading and which has every reasonable prospect of immediate success if the House of Lords do not use their limited veto—of success during the life of the present Parliament if they do. Tories are opposed to that policy, for tories stand for the classes and against the masses always. Those that oppose woman suffrage, want property suffrage for men alone; those that favor woman suffrage, want property suffrage for men and women alike; and both are opposed to adult suffrage. The special ire of both kinds of tory is excited against Lloyd George at this juncture because he is campaigning for adult suffrage on a democratic basis and is likely to succeed.

*

Lloyd George demands the abolition of "plural" voting, and in this the whole Ministry are with him, while the tories of both sexes are against him. He demands manhood suffrage, and in this also the whole Ministry are with him, while the tories of both sexes are against him. He at the same time and through the same Parliamentary bill demands woman suffrage along with manhood suffrage. On this the Ministry is divided, but the tories of both sexes are a unit against him. The difference between the two is that the Ministry have agreed to acquiesce if he gets the support of a majority of the House of Commons (which he has undertaken to do and doubtless will succeed in doing if violence by woman suffragists doesn't have the effect of driving away his weaker supporters), whereas the tories of both sexes are determined to thwart him if they can, to the end that the highly prized privilege of government by property instead of people may continue. This is the otherwise inexplicable meaning of the revival of systematic violence by a certain group of woman suffragists in Great Britain. It is the meaning, too, of the assault upon Lloyd George last week at the close of his London speech for adult suffrage regardless of sex.

* *

Death of John R. Waters and Herman V. Hetzel.

These are names that have been known in the American Singletax movement since long before it took that name—Mr. Waters especially in New York and Mr. Hetzel especially in Philadelphia. For ten years they were associated in the business of fire insurance through individual and recipro-