

tions increasing fares and nullifying the ostensible purposes of the ordinance. So much he felt bound to advise the people. If they were tired of fighting, he felt that they ought to know nevertheless the possible cost of their yielding to their weariness. But he made no fight. His condition of health would not have permitted that, even if he had cared himself to push the fight on to a better settlement. The people were tired of the fight and they sanctioned the Taylor ordinance, which has now gone into effect. If the traction interests of the United States (for this is not a local Cleveland question) are wise enough to work under the Taylor ordinance according to its spirit, the low fare regime now in operation will continue; but if they are as fatuous as such interests usually are, Cleveland will soon be in their grip once more.

Regarding his condition of health, ex-Mayor Johnson appears to be happily convalescent and wholly confident of an early restoration of his physical powers. The fight is not yet over and better work than ever confronts him, in which he busies himself daily and to the fruition of which he looks eagerly forward. Within a few days the completion of his first struggle for public rights is to be celebrated by the presentation of a fine medallion upon which Richard F. George, the sculptor, is now engaged in his studio in New York.

The British Situation.

At Home, Feb. 27.

Looking over the meager, mixed and misleading cable reports of British politics, and American editorials on the subject, I am interested, with a peculiar interest, in the prevailing notion that radical Liberalism suffered a defeat at the recent elections. It did not. The defeat, in so far as it was a defeat, was a defeat of whig Liberalism. Radicalism is in a far better position in Great Britain today than it has ever been in before.

What will occur no one can prophesy with definiteness—whether an early dissolution and new elections, or a long lease of power for the present Government. But if there are no new elections soon (and this is the better guess), there will be an advance in progressive legislation in Great Britain which the American newspapers will be less than ever disposed to report fully or intelligently. Should the present Government stay in power, land value taxation will be established. Moreover, the Lords' veto will be completely cut off as to financial legislation and curbed as to all other kinds; Ireland will be given home rule in home affairs (under a local or State legislature), and so in quick sequence will Scotland and Wales; and with the rest, the abominably Tory-sided electoral system will be reformed so as to secure fair representation upon the basis of adult suffrage. All this is in the air in British politics.

And whether the present Parliament dissolves early or not, those progressive results will at worst be only postponed. They may not be even postponed, for the joinder of issue would be much more definite and clear at new elections, though they were to occur next month, than they were at the recent elections. Protection "red herrings" would not again cross the trail with false scents.

As one final word I should like to pay a tribute to some more of the men whose past work has made the land value taxation movement so strong in Great Britain. It is well known that the Glasgow men, among whom Henry George sowed the seed in the early 80's, have fostered its growth until at the recent elections Scotland secured more Liberal Parliamentary seats than in the landslide election of 1906, and did it intelligently along the lines of land values taxation. It is well known also that the London, the Yorkshire, the Lancashire and other Henry George men, as well as those of Scotland, all concentrated in their efforts now in the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, have done splendid work. But it is not very generally known that three men—J. W. S. Callie of Liverpool, Edward McHugh of Birkenhead, and Richard McGhee (formerly a member of Parliament)—did shrewd and influential work in the Liberal party in the western divisions of Great Britain in the 90's, and that the funds for this work were supplied by Arthur J. Moxham of Wilmington, Delaware. The Tories in those divisions made no gains over the phenomenal Liberal victory of 1906. To know the history of radical work in Great Britain is to realize that Mr. Moxham is entitled to credit for much of the work of the earlier days out of which this result has come, even as Joseph Fels is for so much of the same kind of work and in the same places at the present time.

L. F. P.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for obtaining continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before; continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, March 1, 1910.

The British Parliament.

Advices by mail confirm our inferences (p. 130) regarding the political complexion of the New House of Commons (p. 177), with the single difference that the progressive Irish under Redmond hold one seat more and the tory Irish one seat less than from the cable reports we had gathered the fact to be. The official result, to be found in the Pall Mall Gazette's handbook for 1910, shows the following:

Liberal (including labor members not in the Labor party, single taxers, and other radical Liberals, being the elements of which the Liberal party is now almost wholly composed) . . .	274
Labor (composed of Labor party and Independent Labor party)	41
Irish (under Redmond's leadership)	71
Progressive membership	386

Conservatives	229
Liberal-Unionists (the Chamberlaintes, who are now in complete co-operation with the Conservatives and whose party they dominate)....	43
Irish (under O'Brien's leadership)	11
The Speaker (a Tory, but whose re-election to a seat is always unopposed, the position of Speaker taking its incumbent out of politics, and who has no vote except to break a tie)..	1
<hr/>	
Tory membership	284
<hr/>	
Total membership	670
Progressive membership	386
Tory membership (without the Speaker).....	283
Tory membership (without the Speaker and the O'Brien Irish)	272
Liberal plurality (without the Speaker and the Irish)	2
Liberal and Labor plurality (without the Speaker and the Irish)	43
Progressive majority over all	102

+

Since the assembling of the new Parliament (p. 177), American newspapers have reported a probable collapse of the Progressive elements. These reports, however, have consisted chiefly in gossip deeply colored with the prejudices of correspondents or of public men whom the correspondents have consulted. The actual facts that have come over by cable do not indicate any substantial change of policy or situation. Taking the specials of the New York World, and the regular dispatches of the Associated Press, the Parliamentary situation up to the present time appears to be such as the Progressives, considered as a whole, would wish to have it.

+

The vacancies in the Ministry were filled on the 20th, which was fairly regarded as an indication that the Prime Minister expected to carry through the Progressive programme he had announced in his keynote speech of December 10th (vol. xii, pp. 1208, 1258) at Albert Hall, London. After the King's speech (p. 178), prefaced by the Ministry and accepted by the King, an amendment in favor of "tariff reform" (protection), offered by the Tories to the formal address in reply to the speech, was defeated by a vote of 285 to 254. This was on the 24th. The Irish (for tactical reasons) and some of the radical Liberals (for similar reasons) abstained from voting; but the coalition of Unionists and Conservatives polled within 18 of their full Parliamentary strength. The Labor party cast its vote with the Liberals. At this day's session, the Prime Minister announced that on the 28th he would move that Government business take precedence until March 24th.

+

The proceedings of February 28 were therefore

looked forward to with special interest, and meanwhile the sensational gossip regarding a collapse of the Progressive elements was reported. That the Irish and the Labor parties and a large Liberal contingent were opposed to repassing the Budget ahead of measures for abolishing the Lords' veto is true. It is evident, also, that they threatened much, if this were not done. But it is by no means clear that their hostile attitude was not entirely welcome to the Progressives in the Ministry. For the abolition of the Lords' veto necessitates the co-operation of the King, and the more threatening the demands of members of the Commons the stronger would be the position of the Ministry when the King's co-operation came to be solicited.

+

It was at the session of the 28th that the affair came to a head, to the apparent satisfaction of all the Progressive elements. Through Mr. Asquith and Lloyd George, the Ministry on that day laid the following programme before the House of Commons:

1. Resolutions to limit the Lords' veto power shall be taken up first.
2. When they have passed the House of Commons they shall be sent to the House of Lords.
3. If the House of Lords rejects or delays the resolutions, the Prime Minister will ask King Edward to create enough Liberal peers to carry the resolutions.
4. If the King refuses to do this Mr. Asquith will resign as Prime Minister.
5. The Budget is not to be proceeded with until the veto resolutions are sent to House of Lords.

This programme was accepted by the House without "a division"—the British device for what with us is "roll call." As soon as the Ministerial programme had been adopted, the Prime Minister's motion giving precedence to Government business until March 24 was adopted, also without "a division." The Irish remained out of the chamber and did not vote on either question.

+

Lloyd George is reported to have made a telling speech in support of the Ministerial programme. It is poorly reported by cable, but some idea of its significance and the significance of the programme itself, may be had from this morsel furnished by the Associated Press report:

Chancellor Lloyd George delivered a telling speech. He said that the Government could not ask for the exercise of the royal prerogative upon proposals which had not yet received the sanction of the House of Commons or the opposition of the House of Lords. "The Government will stake its existence," said the Chancellor, "upon the advice it will give the Sovereign if it becomes necessary to do so. This is a matter of the greatest moment to the democracy of Great Britain and Ireland. We are fighting a power-

ful combination, which cannot be overthrown without courage and comradeship, loyalty and sacrifice."

The same report gives this condensation of the Prime Minister's speech:

The Premier explained his programme at some length and the intense interest with which those in the crowded chamber listened, testified to the importance attached to the plans of the Government. The exigencies of the financial situation were such, the Premier declared, that the vote on the army and navy bills, covering the borrowings and other urgent demands, must occupy the whole time of the House of Commons up to March 24, when adjournment would be taken to March 29. Immediately when Parliament was reassembled, he said, the Government would introduce resolutions excluding the House of Lords altogether from the domain of finance, and declaring that in other legislation the power of veto, as at present possessed by the House of Lords should be limited so as to secure a predominance for the House of Commons during the lifetime of a single Parliament. Continuing, the Prime Minister said it would be made plain that these changes were without prejudice, and that the Government contemplated in the subsequent year the substitution in the second chamber of a democratic for a hereditary basis. A bill giving in effect the operative part of the resolutions would then be introduced, Mr. Asquith said, but in order to avoid waste of time and labor and to bring the matter to an issue at the earliest possible moment, the resolutions would be submitted to the House of Lords. "If the House of Lords agrees to them, well and good," the Prime Minister concluded, "but, whether it does or does not, the Government will regard the placing with all possible promptitude upon the statute books of a provision which will set free this House from the veto of the House of Lords not only as the first condition of the legislative dignity and utility of the House of Commons, but as our own primary and paramount duty. In the prosecution of that task we shall adopt all such measures within the limit of the Constitution which seem to us proper and adequate, and upon its successful accomplishment are at stake not only our fortunes but our existence as a Government."

+

To sum up our own inferences from the scrappy and tory-colored cable reports at hand, and in the light of the whole previous situation, we should say: (1) That the sessions of Parliament until the 24th of March will be devoted to adjustments of those fiscal conditions which have grown out of the use of "I-O-U's" and the collection of unauthorized taxes during the year ending with March 31st in consequence of the refusal of the House of Lords to adopt the financial bill for that year which is commonly known as "the Lloyd George Budget"; (2) that immediately after the 29th of March resolutions limiting the Lords' veto—(a) absolutely as to finance, and, (b) so as to give the Commons predominance as to all other legislation—will be presented by the Ministry and upon adoption sent to the House

of Lords for acceptance; (3) that if the Lords reject them, the King will be asked to appoint enough Peers to be nominated by the Ministry, to "swamp" the present Tory majority in that House, and thereupon adopt radical democratic legislation regarding the Lords; (4) that if the King refuses to do this, the Liberal Ministry will resign, leaving him without any general finance legislation for the fiscal years ending March 31, 1910, and March 31, 1911, unless he can create a Tory majority in the Commons; (5) that if the Lords accept the resolutions, or the King "swamps" their Tory majority, a statute in accordance with the resolutions will be passed in both Houses, and thereupon the Ministry will proceed to formulate legislation for a land values taxation budget (as radical at least, and probably more so than the one now pending), for home rule for Ireland in home affairs, and for electoral reform on the basis of fair apportionments of seats and of "one man, one vote,"—and if a majority of the Commons advise it, also of "one woman, one vote." The implication that the "land values taxation" budget has been abandoned has no foundation in fact in the sense in which it is made. Every kind of budget has been abandoned until the Lords' veto shall have been abolished. That accomplished, "land values taxation" is likely to fall more heavily than before upon the landlord class.

+

Should the Progressives be beaten on the Lords' veto question, through the King's refusal to co-operate, the King would have no other recourse for revenues than to change his mind and accede to Mr. Asquith's demands, to depend upon a Tory Ministry to take the Asquith ministry's place, or to turn to the electorate immediately. That the Tories could not get a financial bill from the Commons is evident enough. The radical Liberals, the Irish and the Labor parties, would defeat any financial measure the Tories might propose. If they would not allow Mr. Asquith to put a radical financial bill ahead of the Lords' veto, is it likely that they would allow Mr. Balfour to put a Conservative one ahead of it? Only by a home-rule bargain with the Irish party could he do anything, and a home-rule bargain of the Irish with Balfour and Chamberlain is the most improbable thing in British politics. There is apparently good reason now to believe that the Lords' veto will soon be abolished, and that the present Parliament will be a long one, and historical for its progressive legislation.

+

The Prussian Suffrage Bill.

Popular protests against the inadequacy of the proposed Prussian electoral reform bill (p. 179) continue. Early demonstrations were made by the