

NORTH-WEST NORFOLK BY-ELECTION.

A TRIUMPH FOR LAND VALUES TAXATION.



EDWARD G. HEMMERDE, K.P., M.P.

As a result of the by-election on May 31st, which it is safe to say has aroused throughout the country as much discussion and interest as any other Parliamentary by-election has ever done, Mr. E. G. Hemmerde, K.C., M.P., was returned as the member for the North-West Division of Norfolk. The figures were announced amidst a scene of great excitement at King's Lynn on June 1st as follows:—

E. G. Hemmerde, K.C. (L.)	..	5,613
N. P. Jodrell (C.)	..	4,965
Liberal majority	..	648

Addressing a meeting after the declaration of the poll, Mr. Hemmerde said:—

We fought this election on the lines of advanced Liberalism. We have answered their campaign on the Insurance Act, which in the long run will show very little credit to the Tory Party. We have answered that with a campaign of robust Liberalism, on the lines of land reform; and the policy for which we have stood in North-West Norfolk is going to find its mark in the course of the next few years in this chapter of Liberalism.

Mr. Jodrell said:—

I think I should have got more votes on the Insurance Act but for the fact that these land proposals came along.

Mr. Edward George Hemmerde, K.C., M.P., is the son of Mr. James Hemmerde, late manager of the Imperial Ottoman Bank, was born in 1871, was educated at Winchester and at University College, Oxford, where he had a successful career, and was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1897, joining the Northern Circuit. He had a great reputation as an athlete, and at Winchester was in the Diamond Sculls in 1890. In 1900 he was winner of the Diamond Sculls at Henley. He is also well known as a playwright. He collaborated last year with Mr. Francis Neilson in "A Butterfly on the Wheel," and a few weeks

since another production from his pen, "Proud Maisie," was given at the Aldwych Theatre. He was created a K.C. in 1908, and in March, 1909, was appointed Recorder of Liverpool. Mr. Hemmerde has had an exciting electoral career. He unsuccessfully contested Winchester at the General Election of 1900 and Shrewsbury at that of 1906, but at a by-election for East Denbighshire in August, 1906, caused by the appointment of Mr. Samuel Moss to a County Court Judgeship, he was returned for that constituency after a contest. He successfully defended the seat in 1909 on having to seek re-election after his appointment as Recorder of Liverpool, and was again returned at the General Election of January, 1910. In the following December he contested Portsmouth and was unsuccessful.

Mr. Hemmerde has devoted much of his time during the past five years to advocating the Taxation of Land Values. On scores of platforms throughout the country he has brilliantly explained the question and its relationship to bad trade, unemployment, housing and municipal progress. He was President of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values for the year 1908-9. Each of his election fights he has made Land Values battles and each time he has accomplished magnificent work for our policy. This last fight was perhaps the most successful of all from an educational point of view.

Mr. Hemmerde made his fight almost solely on Land Values Taxation, and it was admitted on all sides that this was the question that stood out far above any other during the contest. In every speech Mr. Hemmerde made he devoted almost his whole attention to showing how the problems of unemployment, low wages and bad housing depend for their solution on a bold policy of land reform; how the Taxation of Land Values will throw the land open to production, providing opportunities for employment, reduce the prices and rents of land, making it available for small holdings, allotments and housing.

In his fight Mr. Hemmerde had the assistance of many of our supporters from all parts of the country, who took the fullest advantage of the opportunities provided for making clear to the agricultural labourers the case for our policy. Among many others can be mentioned Mr. P. W. Raffan, M.P., Mr. F. Neilson, M.P., Mr. R. McGhee, M.P., and on behalf of the United Committee Messrs. R. L. Outhwaite, Harry de Pass, Fred Skirrow, and John Archer went into the constituency and worked strenuously, speaking at many meetings and distributing literature.

Mr. Hemmerde's Views on the Contest.

In a special article to the DAILY NEWS AND LEADER of June 3rd, Mr. Hemmerde gives his views of the contest. He says:—

The increase in the Tory poll was almost entirely due to gains upon the Insurance Act, an enormous poll of out-voters, and a supply of voters which was able to sweep in from any distance any voter who was either a Tory or not averse to a pleasant day's motoring. Under all these circumstances how did it come about that the Liberal forces polled stronger than ever? There is only one reason. The Liberal Party in North-West Norfolk carried the war straight into the enemy's country. Land reform became the burning question of the fight, and during the last few days almost silenced all others.

Starting from the undoubted fact that large numbers of agricultural labourers have been driven to leave the agricultural districts during the last few years and seek service upon the railways, in the factories, and in the mines it was easy to show that the railway strike and the miners' strike were largely influenced by the low standard of wages introduced by these new comers. We therefore proceeded to examine the reasons why the wage of the agricultural labourer is so low, and found two main reasons—firstly, that he has very little chance of getting a decent cottage from which he is safe from eviction if he makes a stand for better wages; secondly, that he has little or no chance of getting land of his own. The Small Holdings Act has secured 137,000 acres, but little of this has come the way of the agricultural labourer.

Having found these reasons the next step was to show the farmers and labourers that both these reasons could be removed. The real nature of the proposals for the Taxation of Land Values was explained in every village. We showed the farmer that the Taxation of Land Values means the untaxing of cottages and all improvements made by capital and labour, a system of local rating which will encourage and not discourage the producer and the improver. Such a policy is the reverse of the existing system, which taxes industry and allows monopoly to escape. Just before the election land rated at fifteen shillings an acre had been offered to the Norfolk County Council at £1,000 an acre. It is not difficult to persuade a farmer that a rating system which permits such abuses is against his interest. One considerable farmer who had determined not to vote because of the Insurance Act heard this policy expounded by one of my friends, and came enthusiastically into line, and there were others, too, some of them Conservatives, who were so interested that they came in large numbers to hear the brilliant speeches of the Lord Advocate upon the subject. The Tories were so seriously alarmed that they began to issue leaflets in thousands to try to undo the mischief that the Land Values speakers were doing.

And if the farmers were interested and shaken in their political prejudices what about the labourers? It was not difficult to make them understand that no real advance would be made with the housing question while famine prices could be asked for land in and near the villages, which for rating purposes were valued at a few pounds only, and that their chance of getting cottages with an acre of land attached (as is possible in Ireland under the provisions of the Irish Labourers' Act) depended upon the securing of a proper valuation, and a proper use of it when it was secured. We pointed out what the system we advocated had done in New Zealand and elsewhere, and how the Tory Party had opposed every effort we made to get a valuation. We also pointed out to them that the Prime Minister had said that the rural aspect of the question of the Taxation of Land Values is more urgent at the present time than the urban aspect.

Recent statements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to show that the Government was giving earnest consideration to the question, and encouraged the labourers, who readily understood that the Taxation of Land Values might strike at the root of the difficulties of housing, small holdings, and low wages in agricultural districts, to come in and fight for a policy which not only seemed likely to be a cure for many of their troubles, but also in the near future the most important plank in the Liberal programme.

I do not think that anyone can deny that the splendid Liberal poll is due to the great popularity of our land proposals. On no previous occasion has there been greater Liberal enthusiasm. Upon this point all were agreed. It remains to be seen whether this fact will cause certain Liberals who have never even taken the trouble to understand our proposals to cease talking of proposals for the Rating and Taxation of Land Values as though they only concerned urban areas.

I am firmly convinced that bold and far-reaching proposals for the rating and taxation of rural as well as urban and values will rally to the Liberal Party at the next election such a following in the rural districts as will surprise even those who witnessed the great Tory rout in 1906.

MR. FRANCIS NEILSON, M.P.'S IMPRESSIONS.

In REYNOLDS' NEWSPAPER of 9th June an interview is reported with Francis Neilson, M.P., one of the foremost advocates of Land Values Taxation, who assisted Mr. Hemmerde in his campaign, in which he gives his impressions of the effect the discussion of that policy had upon the electorate in North-West Norfolk. He said:—

The first thing to be gathered from the result of the by-election is this—that it effectually silences those Liberals who have said that you cannot talk of the Taxation of Land Values to agricultural labourers.

The agricultural labourer wants to know how he is to get land and a cottage. He seeks independence, and is only too eager to support a Government that will free him from a "tied" cottage, and the servitude of a bare weekly wage, which, in the majority of counties, is only at subsistence level. Mr. Hemmerde, in advocating the Taxation of Land Values for rural areas, explained clearly to the labourers

how this object could be attained, and, extraordinary as it may seem to many people, in two weeks the labourers grasped the question sufficiently well to give Mr. Hemmerde the largest Liberal poll recorded in the division.

I was in the division for ten days, and spoke at many meetings. This gave me ample opportunity of testing the audiences, and I can assure you the question that roused enthusiasm was an almost analytical examination of the land proposals of the Liberal candidate.

One fruit farmer told me that years ago he took a derelict farm which was down in the rate book at a ridiculously low sum. After he had worked on it for three years, had improved it and put buildings on it, and was hoping to see a return for his labour and expenditure, the authorities raised the assessment a hundred per cent. Well, to such a man Mr. Hemmerde's proposals to exempt improvements from rating and base rates upon the capital value of the land, naturally, was most attractive.

As for the labourers they quickly saw that when rates were based on the capital value of land, whether used, not used, or ill-used, the pressure of the rates would force land not used, and not properly used, into use, and would enable them to get some of the land which would go into the market. As one old man who had been through Joseph Arch's campaigns with him said to me, "That is the way to raise wages, master; you want to make labour scarce." He saw that by putting more land to use there would be a greater demand for labour.

When I reached the constituency I must admit I heard of a great many Liberals who, because they did not thoroughly understand the Insurance Act, intended to abstain, but when they got hold of Mr. Hemmerde's land proposals they did not hesitate to poll, and the result shows they polled as they never did before. The issue of this election convinced me that if the Liberal party will only come out strong on the Taxation of Land Values in rural areas, they will, at the next election, have as great support from the shires as they did in 1906."

A SPECIAL SKETCH OF THE CAMPAIGN.

North-West Norfolk is unthinkable, says the Tory; it is staggering, exclaims the Whig; it is epoch-making, the Radical joyously proclaims. As one having taken some part in the campaign, these expressions of opinion which fall from the lips of friend and foe alike wherever men foregather for the discussion of national politics, have been profoundly interesting and full of significance. In Press and from platform, in clubdom, in railway carriage, in hotels, in factory, in workshop and round the village pump, or wherever two or three gather together, men's thoughts have found expression relative to this epoch-making fight. And truly the wonderful achievement of Mr. Hemmerde gives pause to think! Your orthodox Liberal has ever been taught to believe that whilst the proposals to tax Land Values were ethically sound, they were nevertheless inexpedient, for they were far too intricate for the man in the street to grasp, and it was bad electioneering to make them a prominent feature of election propaganda, when to do so was to court avoidable risks. To make them the one dominating topic, the one issue by which you were prepared to stand or fall in a purely agricultural constituency, of all places, was a sign of madness to your ordinary party man, which clearly pointed out the fact that Liberalism needed saving from you, if indeed you did not stand in need of being saved from yourself.

If your good party man on the Liberal side was filled with misgiving and filled the air with his lamentations, not so the Tories. How they chortled and chuckled! Surely the Lord had delivered the enemy into their hands; for was not Hemmerde simply making a present of the seat to Jodrell by his insistence to make the Taxation of Land Values the one issue upon which he sought the suffrages of the constituency? How splendidly landlord and squire, farmer and labourer alike, would unite in resistance to such unheard and unthinkable spoilation, and Heaven be thanked what a magnificent cover it supplied for covering up their own policy of negation and emptiness. All they used to do was to misrepresent the Insurance Act and spread alarm amongst the labourers by distortion of fact and figure.

Alas, for the calculations of tacticians in both parties. Here was a man with a gospel of deliverance which knows

no expediency save the expediency of principle, the power of truth and the might of right. He believed that his policy would be heard gladly, and he set himself to the task of appealing to man's reason and to their sense of justice. Dismissing all other subjects with a passing word, he at once focussed and concentrated the attention of the entire constituency to the unrest and discontent amongst all workers in town and country, and showed conclusively that the evils which lie at the root of this unrest and discontent are—1st, Bad Housing; 2nd, Bad Conditions of Labour; 3rd, Unemployment; 4th, Low Wages, and that these are largely if not entirely due to Land Monopoly. With unerring skill and unanswerable logic did he build up his indictment against landlordism, following upon which he showed how the emancipation of life and labour could be secured by the simple process of taxing Land Values. And how "John Hodge" drank in the message of deliverance! Liberty, equality, fraternity, the watchwords of democracy, were at once filled with a new and a nobler meaning for him.

But what of your party man, whose lamentations had filled the air at the beginning? What is this which the eye beholdeth? What is this new message which hath wrought such anticipation in the mind of the electorate? Reveal to us the secret of its power; blind are we, and we would lead the blind! Teach us this new gospel, for we have eyes but we see not, and ears but we hear not. Thus were the disciples of George who had come down with Hemmerde interrogated within the hotel where the candidates' friends were staying, and Skirrow, Outhwaite, de Pass and others were coaching, teaching, preaching, and elucidating the philosophy upon which Hemmerde's whole campaign was based over the breakfast cups, at lunch, at tea, at supper, aye, and onwards till 2 a.m. every day of the contest. Fred Skirrow had the time of his life; every time he put in an appearance men were waiting for him armed with a new series of queries or old ones dressed up in new form, and it was a sight to see the genial Yorkshireman revelling in the opportunity given of bringing light and guidance to burdened souls: a book here to this man to whom glimmerings of hope had come; another there to one who, filled with astonishment at the zeal, enthusiasm, and self sacrifice which are the characteristics of all true single taxers, desired to know more and to feel the same pulsating enthusiasm for the cause of Justice which was so transparently the possession of his Single Tax friend.

Thus went by the days. In the hotels Land Values for breakfast, for lunch, for tea, and for supper, outside an ever-growing enthusiasm engendered by a fuller knowledge of our principles. Hemmerde hammering away with a fuller and nobler passion, and a loftier eloquence than even he has ever before exhibited; Neilson doing wonderful work wherever he went; Raffan, Outhwaite, de Pass, Skirrow, Mitchell, going through the division like a live wire; and John Hodge drinking it all in, demanding more and more, refusing to bother with Home Rule, Disestablishment, aye, even Insurance; talk Land, cried he; we are God's children, from Land we came, on Land we live and labour; show us the way of winning back our natural rights, our God-given inheritance.

Yes, it was an epoch-making fight, and as I returned to the factory life of Yorkshire, the message of Henry George to Ireland adapted to the workers of town and country was in my thought: "For yourselves, O brothers, as well as for us. Ask not for sympathy or charity, but justice. Let the call of rural England to the town and cities be the call of fraternity, the sympathy which links together, that lives and lets live, that would help as well as be helped, that in seeking the good of all finds the highest good of each." Hemmerde by his Norfolk campaign has sounded this call of fraternity in fighting a common cause. No longer shall it be said that town and country cannot unite in a common policy of Land Reform; henceforward urban and rural England will march shoulder to shoulder in fighting the devastating power of landlordism to the death, and labour shall be free. The Holmfirth by-election now proceeding reveals how ready the country is for such a lead. For seven nights I have been working in the contest, and have seen miners and iron workers vieing with the textile workers of the division in demanding full and free discussion of the Land Values proposals. Mr. Arnold, the Liberal candidate, nobly assisted by Hemmerde, Neilson, and others, are delivering this message of hope, whilst the Socialists are beating the air with futile talk of Nationalisa-

tion schemes and fatuous Rights to Work Bills, and the eagerness of the electorate to hear the former is seen by the large and growing audiences which gather to hear Hemmerde and Neilson in comparison to the small and dwindling crowds which gather at the feet of their Socialist rivals; whilst as for Toryism, it is a thing of no account in the fight. Yea, verily, wonderful things are happening in the world of politics just now!

JOHN ARCHER.

THE LORD ADVOCATE'S SPEECH IN SUPPORT OF MR. HEMMERDE'S CANDIDATURE.

LAND MONOPOLY AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

TAXATION ACCORDING TO BENEFIT RECEIVED.

The Lord Advocate, the Rt. Hon. Alexander Ure, K.C., M.P., was the chief speaker at a meeting held in support of Mr. Hemmerde's candidature in the Corn Hall, Fakenham, on May 29th. He said; according to the EASTERN DAILY PRESS:—

He had long sailed in the same boat with the Liberal candidate on the land question. The cause which Mr. Hemmerde championed he championed. Mr. Hemmerde asked them to return him as their member—and they would do it—in order to attack the land monopoly, for he saw very clearly, as they all did, that neither the wages of the miner nor the wages of any working man of this country, would rise so long as the agricultural labourers' wages remained at a low figure. He saw that until the land monopoly was broken up it would be a difficult thing for the agricultural labourer to have his position in life bettered. The land question lay at the root of every social and industrial question in this country. All wealth ultimately came from land, from labour bestowed upon the land, and until the land was free, general prosperity amongst the people was an impossibility. That was Mr. Hemmerde's creed and that was his. . . . On the land question there was a great gulf fixed between the Liberals and the Tories—a gulf wide and deep and apparently impassable. It was a difficult question and one that lent itself much to misrepresentation, both innocent and intentional, and also to misconception. Under our present system of distributing the burden of rates the value of buildings was mixed up with that of the land on which the buildings stood. We did not seek to disengage the one from the other. We jumbled up two things which were absolutely different in every way. Buildings were the work of men's hands, the fruit of his labours and expenditure; on the other hand, land came from the hand of the Creator. A man who erected a substantial commodious, and up-to-date house on his land was made to contribute handsomely to the rates; another man who did not make good use of his land was not asked to pay a very big contribution to the rates; while another man who did nothing with his land was allowed to go free. Our present land system was expressly designed to discourage the making of good use of land and to encourage the making of a bad use or no use at all of it. Value was given to land not by anything the owners did for it, but its value came from the exertions of the community. Where there was a busy, progressive community the value of land was high; where a community was sleepy and backward the land in its midst was low. There was land in London which changed hands at the rate of no less than three millions an acre, land without a single brick upon it. It was as he said, busy, enterprising communities which so increased the value of land near populous centres. What did the owners do to increase its value? They might be living in the Antipodes, or be sound asleep like the characters in some fairy tales. Therefore as the community created the value of the land the community ought to have a contribution therefrom. The land question was a town question as well as a country question. If land could be obtained for building cottage dwellings at as cheap a rate as it could be obtained for farming purposes houses would be able to be erected in a much better and more commodious way and let at cheaper rents. Builders would be encouraged to build. The small farmer or market gardener needed far more buildings in proportion to the land he held than did the big farmer or the squire. Therefore by taxing buildings the small farmers and people of that sort were compelled to pay far more than their fair share of the rates. Moreover, building improvements were followed by an increase in the burden of the rates upon those buildings. Free from taxation altogether buildings, erections, and improvements, the work

of man's hand, the fruit of man's toil, and rate only the value of land, and then every man would be asked to pay his contribution to the needs of the community in proportion to the material advantage he derived from the community. If the land were taxed in this way the owners could not shift the burden on to other peoples' shoulders, and, moreover, they would be compelled to make the best possible use of the land. If they could not do this themselves, they would have to put their land in the market, and this would bring down the price of land. That was the one method by which the land monopoly could be smashed. It was the method to which the Liberal candidate and the Liberal Government were pledged. The valuation of the land now being made when completed would enable us to place our taxes and rates on a fair and reasonable and equitable basis, so that no man should be asked to pay a larger contribution than he ought to pay, and so that the burden of rates and taxes would be distributed over the shoulders of the people according to the value they derived from the community.

SOME PRESS OPINIONS ON THE CONTEST.

There were some misgivings when Mr. Hemmerde was chosen to succeed Sir George White. He was a total stranger, and he had to fight a popular local squire, who had been before the electors twice, and who was supported by all the forces of squiredom, which count for so much in rural society.

Yet in a brilliant campaign of three weeks Mr. Hemmerde has won a notable victory. He has done this by outlining a bold scheme of land reform, which carries within it the possibility of the removal of the agricultural labourer from the position of being the only rural worker in the world who is completely divorced from the soil. The land policy of the new Member caught on like wildfire.—DAILY CHRONICLE, 3rd June.

The most important aspect of the election is the triumph of Mr. Hemmerde's land campaign. Just as the Tories staked all on the Insurance Act, so he staked all on his plea for the Taxation of Land Values. His success is an event of capital importance. It is often suggested that the rural mind cannot be reached by an argument of some intricacy. "If you advocate the taxation of agricultural land," so runs the view of the timid, "the tenant farmer will fear that his rent will rise and the labourer that his wages will, in consequence, fall." It is a libel on the rural intelligence. Mr. Hemmerde has shown that a bold handling of the land question is as popular in the country as in the towns. He has gone through the villages showing that taxation is the key that will unlock the land to the peasant and free the countryside from the heavy hand of landlordism, that it is the hope of the tenant as well as of the labourer, and that through it, incidentally, the burden of the rates will be lightened. And the benefit is not to the country only. It reacts on the town. The slum of the town is the counterpart of the solitude of the country and the policy with which Mr. Hemmerde has won N.-W. Norfolk will provide a cure for the twin diseases. We do not think the Government will be insensible to the real lesson of this memorable victory.—DAILY NEWS AND LEADER, 3rd June.

Only those who took part in the fight can fully appreciate its significance. The attitude of the Liberal Party to the land question was the determining factor. Its introduction and vigorous discussion by Mr. Hemmerde and his friends won over and fired with enthusiasm the labourers everywhere. The land hunger is a very real thing in Norfolk. Even a sympathetic county council cannot satisfy it, and delay only whets the appetite of the worker on the land whose earnings average 14s. per week. What affected the electors generally was that at long last land reform was becoming practical politics. The Norfolk labourer hopes and believes legislation will be forthcoming, and he voted accordingly. It is for Mr. Lloyd George and the Liberal Party to justify his confidence and his vote. Will the Liberal Party fail the labourer?—A correspondent of the WESTMINSTER GAZETTE, 7th June.

The interest of the electors continues to be concentrated upon two main topics—the Insurance Act and Mr. Hemmerde's policy of taxing the land in the supposed interests of the labourers. If the Unionist candidate is successful, his

return will be proof of popular discontent with the Insurance Act. If Mr. Hemmerde is returned by a fairly large majority, he will be able to claim that his victory is an expression of approval of the Act and something more—a mandate also in favour of the policy of land reform which he has advocated with so much pertinacity and with undoubted skill. TIMES (Special Correspondent), 30th May.

It is possible that the growing opposition to the Act (the Insurance Act) will prove to have been countered to some extent by the Liberal candidate's bold advocacy of a policy of land reform, which he sums up in the cry of "The land for the people." I have been impressed in moving about the division with the avidity with which the labourers have endorsed this programme of taxing site values in order to increase rural wages and improve rural housing conditions. They do not understand perhaps how these happy results will be achieved, but they would like to experience them, and they believe that Mr. Hemmerde's proposals, endorsed as they have been in the letter from Mr. Lloyd George which was published to-day, will work a revolution in the conditions under which they live. They are enthusiastic, therefore, for Mr. Hemmerde and land reform, and inclined to overlook the drawbacks and inconveniences of the Insurance Act in the hope of witnessing the "complete and thorough reorganisation of the land system," of which Mr. Lloyd George writes. If the issue could have been confined to the Insurance Act Mr. Hemmerde's position would not have been at all secure. If the seat is retained by the Liberals Mr. Hemmerde's land programme will have saved the situation.—TIMES (Special Correspondent), 31st May.

I should say that Mr. Hemmerde owes his success mainly to the ingrained attachment of the Norfolk labourers to Liberalism, their dread of Tariff Reform as the harbinger of "dear food," and their enthusiasm for the policy of land taxation which he has placed before them in such an attractive form. We shall probably hear more of this programme of taxation of land in the interests of the labourers in other agricultural constituencies. In North-West Norfolk it has neutralised to a considerable extent the undoubted feeling of dissatisfaction with the Insurance Act which prevailed in many places.

I believe that the reduction in the Liberal majority is due almost entirely to the Insurance Act. That reduction would have been greater—indeed, the seat might possibly have been lost—if it had not been for Mr. Hemmerde's insistence upon the importance to the labourers of land reform and for their fears of Tariff Reform.—TIMES (Special Correspondent), 3rd June.

Mr. Hemmerde's electioneering plans have justified themselves. What he had to do was to put forward something so attractive to the labourers as to distract their attention from the inequalities and glaring blemishes of the Insurance Act. In his own words it was necessary to fight on ground of his own choosing. His recitals of all the blessings that would come to the rural labourer, if only land were, as he put it, "justly" taxed, appealed not only to the cupidity of a comparatively ignorant electorate, but to their hereditary dislike and jealousy of the farming and landowning classes. An alluring prospect presented with a persuasive eloquence which disdained particulars was just the thing to capture the voters during a short campaign such as this has been. "Higher wages, cheaper living, free access to the land"—and at the end of it the question, "Who gave you old age pensions?" And the labourer knowing the answer to the question naturally imagined that the party which had given him pensions would have no difficulty in adding other things unto them.—MORNING POST, June 3rd.

There is no doubt that land reform is the winning card for the next election. Tariff Reform offers less than nothing to the farmer and the labourer, and therefore we must fight Tariff Reform with Land Reform. It is high time that the conditions of life in the village were raised. An improvement in the status of the agricultural labourer would at once reduce the supply of low-paid labour in the towns, in the mines, and on the railways. It is by the Taxation of Land Values that the land will be made available for the people, and that the rates which break the farmer's back will be lightened.—STAR, June 3rd.