

"This is a war budget. It is a budget for waging implacable warfare against poverty."

LOUIS G. HOECK.

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, January 4, 1910.

The British Parliamentary Campaign.

The elections for the new Parliament will begin on the 14th and end on the 28th. In the short whirlwind campaign before Christmas the Liberals seemed to be carrying everything before them. T. P. O'Connor, writing from London on the 1st to the Chicago Tribune, finds this condition on his arrival from America (vol. xii, p. 1256):

The Liberals are fighting unitedly and enthusiastically everywhere, with all the leaders in the fighting line, except Haldane, who is temporarily ill. The Tories are dispirited. They are divided, with no leaders and no decisive leader. Chamberlain can only issue manifestoes from the sick room. Balfour has just emerged from the bed, and the death of Lord Percy removes a potent young genius. There is a similar weakness in the program. Little attempt is made to justify the rejection of the Budget by the peers, and the experiment of sending peers to the popular platforms to speak for themselves dissolved in a side splitting and universal roar of rough popular laughter. These lordly but unaccustomed orators were pursued by popular and telling questions, to which their inept answers added force. . . . Divided and discouraged on the questions of the lords and the tariff, the Tories fall back on the German navy scare and home rule. The navy scare has risen from the grave with more ghastly folly and panic than even during the Dreadnought agitation. George Wyndham, though an able Tory leader, ventures to ask, "What is the good of trade if the Germans are in possession of English soil?" . . . It is astonishing how home rule has rushed to the front since Asquith's speech.* Everybody, foe and friend, united in regarding Asquith's speech as bringing back the Liberals to Gladstone's policy of full home rule, and several Tory journals even say Asquith's position is more home-rule than Gladstone's. The Irish, on the other hand, interpreting Asquith in the same way, enter this election with more hope, enthusiasm and union than any since 1886. In England they are working everywhere in a cordial alliance with the Liberals, while the Liberals are everywhere speaking out on home rule with a clearness and courage unknown since Gladstone's retirement. In some cases Liberals who had opposed home rule for twen-

ty years and remained outside the Liberal ranks are returning and adopting home rule as the only settlement of the Irish question.

From the cable dispatches we learn that in an address to the Dundee electors Winston Churchill declared on the 28th that, "The forces of reaction are out for a double event. They are gambling with the rights and freedom of the nation, and they are running a tremendous risk to win a tremendous prize. That prize is no less than the complete tying up of the democracy, both through its politics and its industry." In an address in London on the 31st, Lloyd George argued against the protection policy of the Conservatives, asserting that unemployment was more prevalent in protectionist countries than in England, and citing as an example the United States which he described as "the protectionists' paradise, where customs officers line the shores like cherubim, with flaming swords, keeping every foreign made article out of this garden of Eden; but once inside, you find the serpent of hunger, want and unemployment hissing in every grade."

On the other hand, the enfeebled Joseph Chamberlain issued an address to the electors of West Birmingham, on the 29th, in which he advocated tariff reform and reciprocity with the colonies, and attacked the Budget as placing a heavy burden of taxation upon the people and increasing the number of the unemployed. The address further asserted that home rule for Ireland, as is promised by the Liberals, would not only injure the friends of England there, whose interests were safeguarded by the present control, but the danger to all would be greater, since Great Britain now was threatened by foreign nations as never before. After alleging that the Liberals desire a single chamber rule, the address concluded with a criticism of the government's lack of preparation for the national defense.

Mail advices are fuller and more picturesque. The Westminster Gazette of the 10th thus reports what it calls "Gems from the Peers":

Lord Willoughby de Broke, at Lincoln last night, mentioned his "qualifications" for appearing on the platform. He was, he said, a peer, a Tory, a landowner and an Englishman. The Budget, he declared, was saturated through and through with the poison of Socialism. Radical and Socialist ideas had been thrown into a common hotchpotch. The two parties were going to fight upon the same platform, and they hoped some day or other to share the same plunder.

At Stamford Hill Viscount Hill deprecated the suggestion that the Peers did not want to pay. It must not be supposed, he said, that the richer men in the country were shirking the payment of their share of taxation. Then he went on to argue that

*See The Public, vol. xii, pp. 1208, 1253.

the Budget would hit the workingman hardest, the inference being, of course, that the Peers were actuated by a desire to benefit the worker by rejecting the Budget!

Lord Dunmore had a warm time at Barking. "I want to tell you," he said to his audience, amongst whom were a good many Radicals, "why I supported Lord Lansdowne's amendment." "To further your own interests," came the prompt reply. His lordship was somewhat taken aback, but he proceeded: "We wished to have the Budget referred to the people—" "Because it touched your pockets," came the answer, and there was a roar of merriment. Later, his lordship asked what had this "so-called" Liberal government done. At least twenty members

of the audience supplied him with a list of the measures passed during the past four years. So he turned to unemployment. "What is the only way to give employment to the people?" he asked. "Clear the House of Lords out of the way," came the prompt reply.

+

In his great Lancashire campaign Winston Churchill, speaking at Southport on December 4, thus arraigned the House of Lords, as reported in the Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury of the 6th:

I say the House of Lords had no right to reject the Budget. Custom, precedent and authority are



Mr. Winston Spencer Churchill Speaking at Southport, Lancashire, December 4, on the Case Against the Lords, From the Liverpool Daily Post and Mercury of December 6.

against them, and all the great men of the past, all the moderate and impartial men of the present. . . . The whole movement of the world is against the gradual intrusion of the House of Lords upon legislation. As democracy becomes more numerous and educated, more varied, more complex and more powerful, it is necessary that the House of Lords should recede and retire. It is necessary that it should count less and less. Most men expected that gradually, as things happen in the history of our country, the House of Lords would pass peacefully and painlessly away. That would have been a natural evolution (laughter). Much better for us, and much better for them (renewed laughter). But what do you see? On the contrary, the House of Lords put their claims higher every year. They now claim to reject every bill, no matter by what majority it is supported, in the House of Commons, or how newly elected that house is (hear, hear). They claim to tinker, tamper and meddle with every kind of subject, many of which they very imperfectly understand. They have mutilated the principal legislation of this Parliament until at last a climax has been reached, and by a violent act the executive government has been brought to a standstill; and so we come to a dissolution, in which the House of Lords comes face to face with the electors in a fierce collision which must involve a constitutional change (cheers). The control of finance is the root of all civilized government. The whole plan of the executive and the administration depends upon finances. The power of finance cannot be exercised by two chambers, unless those two chambers act together in general unity. And you are brought to this clear alternative. Finance must be given wholly to one chamber, as it has been in the past, or else both chambers must be elected simultaneously (cheers). The alternative brought about is the absolute breakdown of the constitution and the administrative machinery. I must say it with composure and deliberation, that is why we as a government will not be willing to discharge the responsibilities of government, whatever our majority, under the state of things which the action of the House of Lords has created (loud cheers). Is it not of real advantage to the country that there should be two great parties, each capable in turn of providing responsible government administration for services to the crown? Does not that fact, that men of both parties and millions of working men have a chance from time to time to help to choose the government—does not that associate the whole body of the nation in one way or another in the high duties and with the glorious inheritance of the British Empire (cheers)? How much better our system of government has worked upon this balance than in those countries where there is a permanent governing class, with all the interest of wealth and privilege massed around them keeping the rest of their fellow countrymen in sullen subjection by force of arms. That is the position of more than one European country today. A powerful Imperialist and militarist combination, holding all the power and confronting the vast Socialist party, utterly estranged from the fundamental institutions of the state—that is a condition which everyone who cares about the future of our country and who understands the story of these famous islands would labor and would struggle to save us from (hear,

hear). But that is an inevitable result of the change in the constitution which the House of Lords has now attempted. If no Liberal government were able to pass any measures except those which commend themselves to a permanent majority of their political opponents; if every Liberal government could only hold office from year to year by the favor and upon the sufferance of their bitter foes in the House of Lords; if at any moment, upon some pretext or other, a Liberal government was liable to have the whole structure of the nation's finance brought clattering about their ears, it is certain that the reign of two great parties, differing widely, no doubt, in conviction, in sentiment, in character and motive, but united in a common loyalty to the crown and empire, would be closed for ever, and we would be face to face with a period when parties should necessarily be grouped upon violent lines, and when brute force and class hatred, instead of forbearance and public spirit, would become the characteristics of British political life (cheers). It is from these perils that we rely upon the genius and sagacity of the British electors to preserve at this juncture the foundations of the state (loud cheers).

* *

The Nicaraguan Revolution.

José Santos Zelaya, the deposed and fleeing President of Nicaragua (vol. xii, p. 1255), arrived at the City of Mexico on the 29th. He declares himself to be still the titular President of Nicaragua. Dr. Zelaya is reported to have sent messages to the recently inaugurated President, Dr. Madriz, urging the liberation of Zelaya's son-in-law, Joaquin Passos, arrested in connection with the looting of the Nicaraguan treasury (vol. xii, p. 1255). General Estrada, leader of the revolutionists in the east, remains firm in his determination not to recognize the election of Madriz. This refusal receives endorsement from Cardenas, a former president of Nicaragua, who was overthrown and exiled by Zelaya twelve years ago. Cardenas is now in Costa Rica. Estrada is reported to have entered upon a westward campaign, with Managua, the capital city, as his objective point. He has published a proclamation outlining his policy for a provisional government. He states that it will abolish all monopolies; restore individual rights; encourage mining, agricultural and commercial industries; guarantee the freedom of the press; initiate free elections; and establish schools on the highest ideals. Immigration will be favored and foreigners will be guaranteed rights and privileges equal to those enjoyed by the native born.

* *

"Conservation and Equal Rights."

Speaking before the University Club in New York on the 27th, Gifford Pinchot made an address on the above subject which he had been scheduled to deliver before the People's Forum at New Rochelle on the previous day, and which had been sidetracked by a blizzard. Though de-