

6 NOT WITH A BANG...

Moreover the profit of the earth is for all: the king himself is served by the field.

Ecclesiastes v, 9

It was predictable that the revolt in Ireland and the Hebrides should evoke some sort of answering movement in South Britain, particularly among the Celts of Wales. A remarkable agitation did indeed arise; but the Welsh land movement was very different in its objectives from that of Ireland and the Hebrides. There was some protest in England as well, but not very much. Neither in England nor in Wales was any substantial measure of unlawful activity directed against landlords.

As in the Hebrides and Ireland, both language and religion played a substantial part in the land movement of Wales. Rather more than a quarter of the people living in the Principality spoke only Welsh. The religion of the people was overwhelmingly Nonconformist — “over nine tenths of the rustic population”, in the view of *The Times*.¹ The conversion of Wales to Nonconformism had taken place within the nineteenth century. The Wesleyans had made no attempt to preach in Welsh before 1800.² In the view of one nineteenth century Welsh Nonconformist, the conversion occurred “not by force of abstract reasoning against the Establishments or in favour of the principles of Dissent, but simply because they were compelled to look beyond the pale of the Endowed Church for the means of spiritual instruction which were denied them within its pale”.³

The main upsurge of Welsh Nonconformism had thus taken place well within the memory of the older people. Welsh Nonconformists were divided into a bewildering variety of sects, but most of these had two features in common. Their services were conducted in the vernacular, which in many parts was Welsh; and their preachers were largely unpaid laymen. Thus there were many men, sprung from the Welsh peasantry, who had acquired experience both in speaking and in organising. The landowning classes of Wales, on the other hand, were predominantly Anglican in religion and English in speech. The Welsh countryman acquired

a large contempt for the Church of England, which had contributed little to the evangelisation of his country and which maintained an expensive establishment of salaried divines who addressed half-empty churches. By contrast, the little Bethels and Zions of the various Nonconformist denominations had been built through the people's faith, and were filled with large and enthusiastic congregations.

The land system in Wales was markedly different from that which prevailed in most of England. In 1887, only 10.2 per cent of the cultivated land in Wales was held by freeholders, against 15.5 per cent in England; furthermore, the proportion of Welsh land which belonged to large estates was also greater. In 1872, for example, 55 per cent of the modern Gwynedd was owned by thirty-seven families. Yet this feature was already changing rapidly in the late nineteenth century; the Royal Commission on Welsh land in 1896 reported that most freeholders had achieved that position in the preceding quarter of a century.⁴ The typical Welsh farm was worked by a family, with few or no hired labourers. About half of those labourers who were employed actually lived in the farm house,⁵ and Welsh farm labourers commonly had a few acres of their own to cultivate. Thus there was a much greater community of feeling between farmers and labourers than in England, and they were far more likely to make common cause against the landlords, or the Anglican Church. English farmers in most parts and at most times tended to be Conservative; Welsh farmers by the late nineteenth century were usually Liberals, and radical Liberals at that.

In the immediate aftermath of the General Election of 1868, there had been widespread evictions of farmers who voted against their landlords' wishes. These prompted a Royal Commission of enquiry, and played a large part in bringing about the Secret Ballot in 1872. The agricultural depression produced its own inevitable tensions. Wales, with a largely pastoral agriculture, was not at first hit so badly as the arable areas, but towards the end of 1883 the depression became much more serious, and persisted for most of the remainder of the century.⁶ The Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 was of very little value to the small Welsh tenants, who could afford few improvements, and were much less disposed to move from holding to holding than were the English farmers.⁷

In February 1884, contact was made between Michael Davitt

and a group of Welsh land reformers, including the Rev. Evan (Pan) Jones, editor of the monthly *Cwrs y Byd*, to discuss forming a Welsh land movement, parallel with those which had already appeared in Ireland and Scotland.⁸ There were no immediate and spectacular results; although at the 1885 General Election land seems to have been a major issue in Wales, especially in the north of the country.⁹ Chamberlain, however, may well have alarmed Liberals of the older type as much as he enthused the young radicals.¹⁰ Down to the end of 1885 the Welsh land movement seems to have been impeccably "constitutional", operating through the ordinary political channels, and there was no agitation remotely comparable with the disturbances which had been endemic for years in Ireland, and had recently occurred in the Hebrides.

As in Ireland and the Hebrides, 1886 was a year of considerable turbulence in Wales. Right at the beginning of the year, the Welsh land question suddenly took a completely new twist — or rather, two new twists almost simultaneously. In the middle of January, *The Times* reported: "In Caernarynshire the farmers have met and formed a local land league. At Holywell in Flintshire the farmers are still more determined; not merely do they meet in increasing numbers every Friday, but they are establishing branches of their League in adjoining districts. In one Merionethshire district the farmers have refused to pay their 'high rents' and insist on abatement. In Carmarthenshire the farmers are preparing to form a League, and at Aberystwyth a 'Welsh political union' is to be established, and 'political union' and 'land league' are here convertible terms. Steps will, I am informed, be taken to extend the ramifications of this union into Cardiganshire and Merionethshire, and to come to an understanding with the other Leagues formed in other parts of the Principality. Last, but not least, comes the intelligence from the Rev. Michael Jones that Mr Michael Davitt is coming to Wales next month to gather up the scattered fragments of organisation and establish the Welsh Land League."¹¹ The association of Davitt with Michael Daniel Jones was important. Jones had been the leading figure in the establishment of Welsh settlements in Patagonia in the 1860s — a venture which was apparently achieved on a most democratic financial basis¹² and he was very much the hero of an older generation of land reformers. Davitt had acquired from his work in Ireland an immense reputation as a stormy petrel — a "dangerous man"

for all social and political establishments in the Kingdom.

Davitt addressed at least two meetings in Wales that February. The first was in Flint, where he spoke along with Dr G. B. Clark (who had recently been returned as "Crofters'" MP for Caithness); the second in Blaenau Festiniog, along with Michael Jones. This meeting is memorable as the first noted public appearance of a young Criccieth solicitor, David Lloyd George, who delivered himself of the opinion that: "Working men acting separately, were only as particles of sand to resist the power of the landlord; but let workmen combine, firmly express their opinion, and then no opposition, however powerful, would be able to stand before them. When a Land League was started for Wales he hoped they would all join it"¹³

Another young Welsh Liberal who was also in friendly contact with Davitt at this time was Tom Ellis, who was soon to become MP for Merioneth, and eventually Liberal Chief Whip.¹⁴

Some of the local "land leagues" refused to have anything to do with an organisation associated with Davitt;¹⁵ but in any case, before the proposed Welsh Land League could be formed, it had already been overtaken by events. What altered the situation was not so much any political upheaval associated with Irish Home Rule (for Wales and the Welsh MPs were overwhelmingly Gladstonian) — but the inception of the Welsh "Tithe War".

Tithes were compulsory payments to the established Anglican Church. They had long been a ground of general complaint in Wales, but they had hardly formed an acute problem. They were paid by the occupier in the form of a money rentcharge. The burden of tithes varied greatly from place to place; but one Welsh valuer contended that the incidence was usually between one fourth and one fortieth of the rent.¹⁶ Although this sum was relatively small, it was particularly resented, especially at a time when farmers were in real fear of bankruptcy.

The agitation began more or less by accident. Just before the audit of January 1886, a deputation of farmers waited upon the Rector of Llandrynog, Denbighshire (Clwyd), and asked for a reduction in tithes. The Rector referred them to his agents. Apparently the Rector had a quite honest lapse of memory, and when the farmers came to pay their tithes, the agent said that they had had no instructions on the subject. The farmers promptly refused to pay any tithes at all, and from that moment forth the movement spread rapidly.¹⁷ The only remedy available to the

clergy was to distrain the stock of the defaulting farmers — a procedure which began in August at Llanarmon. Auctioneers attempting to sell distrained stock were met with “howls of execration”; but the farmers’ losses were more than met by public subscriptions. Early in September, an Anti-Tithe League was established at Ruthin.¹⁸ The League was designed for the whole of North Wales, although for a considerable time the main activities took place in and near the Vale of Clwyd. The main inspiration of the movement appears to have come from Thomas Gee — Nonconformist minister, publisher, journalist and an avowed advocate of the “Three Fs”.¹⁹

In the following year, 1887, the situation became far worse. At Llangwm, in Flintshire, there were considerable disturbances in May; while at Mochdre, in the same county, there was a riot on 27 June which led to the reading of the Riot Act, and a conflict in which fifty civilians and thirty-four policemen were injured. In its Annual Report, the Anti-Tithe League’s successor disclosed that “about 300 farmers who were members have had their stock distrained upon, and many actual sales have taken place, but all the losses which have been suffered and all the costs which have been incurred have been paid in full, including the costs of our solicitors for attending sales etc. for the protection of our members”.

Another very serious disturbance occurred in May 1888 at Llanefydd, Denbighshire, where the police seem to have lost their heads and attacked a miscellaneous crowd. Before the year was out, the agitation had extended into Caernarvonshire, and again distraint sales were held — this time in Llannor parish, at the instance of the vicar of Pwllheli. The farmers were by no means lacking in humour; at one place the distraining party was confronted with an effigy of a drunken cleric, with the Welsh inscription “This is what we do with the tithes”; at another with the effigy of a surpliced clergyman wearing shooting boots. The farmers were also quite rough; the auctioneer was pushed into the water at one village and pelted with clods of earth at another.²⁰

In 1889 the agitation spread into South Wales, and there were disturbances in Pembrokeshire and Cardiganshire, some of which, at least, seem to have been exacerbated by police incompetence.²¹ They continued for a long time; the Welsh Land Commission, reporting in 1896, indicated that forced sales and conflicts with the police were still going on in parts of Cardiganshire,

notably at Pembryn.²²

At an early stage, the Anti-Tithe League was linked with the incipient "Land League" movement. In the autumn of 1887, the Anti-Tithe League was reconstituted as the "Welsh Land, Commercial and Labour League", which not only agitated against tithes, but also demanded "fair rents, fixity of tenure, full compensation for improvements, land courts (or a system of arbitration), limitation of mining royalties, abolition of state loans to landowners, but the grant of such loans for the purchase of land by occupying tenants and labourers, the abolition of all game laws and the throwing open of rivers to all fishermen".²³ This seems very much like the aims of the land movements in Ireland and the Hebrides, and suggests that land reformers of the familiar kind were gaining control of the Welsh anti-tithe movement.

The land reformers also promoted their campaign within the Liberal Party. In October 1887, the Liberal Federations which had recently been set up for North and South Wales were both committed to a programme which meant virtually the application of the "Three Fs" to Wales.²⁴

The leading figures in the tithe agitation, and in the general land movement, made determined attempts to capture the whole Liberal organisation in Wales. Liberals of the older kind felt they were caught in a cleft stick. Stuart Rendel, who had won Montgomeryshire from the Conservatives in 1880, received a letter from a like-minded friend, who wrote gloomily that: ". . . The movement will go on and if we drop it the control will pass into other hands. If they are successful we are eclipsed; if they fail they will do so by encouraging violence and personal bullying of individual parsons. That will be a disaster to the party of which we shall not escape the blame."²⁵

While the anti-tithe movement was developing in Wales, a movement against tithes also made its appearance in England. The objectives, however, were different. In the view of John Lloyd, member of the London County Council and Chairman of the Tithe Question Association: "The Welsh have their grievance, and the English corn-growing counties have theirs, the one religious and the other pecuniary, and, if just, both should be redeemed when the law is amended . . ."²⁶

The Welsh were very anxious to emphasise that they did not object to paying tithes, but to the use for which tithes were employed. Nonconformist farmers were quite happy that the

money should be collected, provided that it was used for "secular and national" purposes, and not for the support of the Anglican Church.²⁷

In spite of the fundamental difference of objective between the Welsh tithe agitation and the much weaker tithe agitation in England, the Government did not apply different treatment to the two countries. They sought to stop the tithe agitation without making any concessions of substance which would undermine either the revenues or the establishment of the Church in the Principality.

The first attempt to deal with the situation by legislation was a miserable failure. Lord Salisbury himself confessed to the Queen "that . . . the Bill has come to an end by no means creditable to Your Majesty's advisers. It was a complication of blunders".²⁸

Another Bill, however, was brought forward in 1890, and carried in the next year. The Bill provided that tithes should be payable not by the occupier but by the owner of land. This made it very difficult for the Welsh Nonconformists to continue their campaign. Direct payment of tithe, served as a constant reminder to the tenant-farmer that he was contributing to the upkeep of a Church which he certainly considered alien, and perhaps heretical. Perceiving that the Bill's passage would vitiate their object, the Welsh MPs resisted it strenuously—but unsuccessfully. East Anglian farmers, who were often far more heavily tithed than the Welshmen, sought to limit the incidence of tithes to half the annual value of the land instead of two-thirds, as proposed in the Bill; but they also were defeated. The Bill passed into law substantially in the form which the Government had proposed. The great majority of farmers thenceforth paid their tithes as if they were part of the rent—no doubt with grumbles, but without effective resistance; and the trouble largely subsided.

The Welsh land agitation died down, but was not forgotten. Opposition to the Anglican Church remained strong, and even bitter, right down to its final disestablishment in the Principality in 1920. Welsh opinion could easily be roused on political questions which seemed connected with land, and in the various "land campaigns" which were launched during the twentieth century, Wales evinced special enthusiasm. In one vital respect, however, the effect of the Welsh land movement extended far beyond the Principality, for it gave immense impetus to the career of David Lloyd George, whose first recorded office was as Secretary of the

South Caernarvonshire Anti-Tithe League in 1887.²⁹ Lloyd George has been accused — sometimes justly — of the most incredible political gyrations; but the antipathy to landlordism which he acquired as a very young man in Wales remained constant throughout his career, and was to exert a most massive effect on the whole course of politics.

The various Celtic land movements of the late 1880s produced only a faint echo in England and the South of Scotland. Although there was a short period of heavy unemployment, real wages rose steadily and rapidly from 1884 to 1890.³⁰ This affected not only the industrial workers but the farm workers as well, for it meant that there was alternative employment available in the towns, and therefore wages in the countryside were bound to rise as well. People were not under extreme pressures, and there is little or nothing comparable with the semi-revolutionary activities of the Celtic peasants. Unlike some of the measures applied to the "Celtic fringe", the English land legislation of the period was not extracted from a reluctant Government by external pressure, but represented a free application by the Government of policies which its own members desired to set into operation.

In the first half of the decade, the peasant-proprietorship movement had inevitably attracted interest among farm labourers and over-rented tenant farmers. We have already seen how this influenced Chamberlain's *Radical Programme*, and the election results of 1885. In the latter part of the decade the same idea persisted in the form of a movement in favour of allotments and smallholdings. Balfour, with his remarkably acute mind, recognised that the questions of allotments and smallholdings were in fact "entirely unrelated. A Smallholdings Bill aims at creating a Peasant Proprietary; an Allotments Bill aims at improving the position of the agricultural labourer *while leaving him in the position of an agricultural labourer.*"³¹ This distinction, however, was not generally appreciated for a long time, and the movements for allotments and smallholdings were in practice very closely associated.

Allotments for agricultural labourers were no new thing.³² In the brief Conservative administration of 1885-6, Balfour suggested further allotment provisions, although some of his recommendations were firmly vetoed by his uncle.³³ When the Conservatives returned to office in the middle of 1886, they were under

great and effective pressure from the Liberal Unionists, who were much influenced by the ideas of Chamberlain and Jesse Collings.

Collings was more than the close associate of Joseph Chamberlain; he symbolised the type of man whom the Conservatives would need to attract and hold if they were to remain in office. The son of farm workers, he had achieved a successful career in business before turning to politics. He was the author of the "three acres" doctrine in the *Radical Programme*, and it was on his resolution that Salisbury's first government had been defeated at the beginning of 1886. Collings was the founder of the Rural Labourers' League, which he took over with him into the Liberal Unionist camp at the time of the Liberal schism. It was he, and the League which he founded, who were the most active proponents of the idea that allotments and smallholdings should be made available for agricultural labourers.

In 1887, the new Government gave practical evidence of support for Collings's doctrines by passing an Allotments Act. This empowered local authorities to purchase land for allotments, principally for farm labourers, and proved a major landmark in the development of the allotments system. Balfour — a good deal less tender towards recalcitrant landowners than the Prime Minister — even secured provisions for compulsory acquisition of land; but in fact this power was very seldom used. An amending Act was carried three years later, which allowed an appeal to the County Court when sanitary authorities had failed to exercise their compulsory powers.

The smallholdings question also attracted the attention of the Government, and there, too, the hand of the Liberal Unionists may be seen. In 1888, Jesse Collings introduced a Private Member's Bill which sought to empower local authorities to acquire land for smallholdings between one and forty acres in extent. Collings proposed that a quarter of the value should be paid by the smallholder on entry, while the remainder should constitute a permanent mortgage. The avowed object was to assist men who had already proved themselves sufficiently successful to amass a substantial sum of money, or, alternatively, to be regarded by others as creditworthy — and deliberately to exclude men who sought smallholdings as an escape from a career of failure. Collings's Bill proceeded to its Second Reading, but the debate was adjourned and not resumed.

Yet this did not indicate disinterest or opposition on the part of the Government. In fact, some profound change seems to have entered Conservative thinking on smallholdings in the short period since they were last in office. At the beginning of 1886, Henry Chaplin, one of the most authoritative Conservative spokesmen on agricultural matters, had argued forcefully against peasant proprietorship — which, in his contention, had signally failed in other European countries where it had been tried.³⁴ Perhaps under the persuasion of an altered Parliamentary situation, the Conservatives were no longer intransigent, and after Collings's Bill they showed sufficient interest to set up a Select Committee to examine the question, with Chamberlain as Chairman. When this Committee reported in 1890, it proposed that County Councils should receive powers to purchase land for smallholdings, and to borrow money from public funds up to £5 millions in the first instance. The land should be let in smallholdings not exceeding ten acres in extent, the purchasers providing at least one-fifth of the money as a lump sum.³⁵ Collings introduced another Smallholdings Bill to implement the Select Committee's recommendations. It received a Second Reading in March 1891, but was not proceeded with further.

A Government Bill on the subject was produced later in the same year. As on the allotments question, the Government was much vexed whether or not to introduce compulsion; but here they gave a different answer. The argument for compulsion was a good deal weaker in the case of smallholdings than that of allotments. An allotment must be near a man's existing home; while a man who is proposing to become a smallholder will usually need to move house in any case. A single landowner could effectively block allotments for a whole village, while he could scarcely exert much effect on the progress of the smallholdings movement. Chamberlain tried nevertheless to force the Government to apply compulsion;³⁶ but on this occasion his pressure was resisted.

When the Government brought forward its Bill in 1891, Chaplin, now President of the Board of Agriculture, had undergone a complete change of opinion. The object which he now avowed was "to recreate the class of yeomen". In its new form, the Bill proposed to empower the County Councils to purchase land and to dispose of it in smallholdings of up to fifty acres in extent. One quarter of the money would be paid at once by the incoming

smallholder, a quarter would remain as a perpetual rentcharge, while the remainder would be paid in instalments or by terminable annuities. This Bill became law; but it was a great deal less effective than the Allotments Act of 1887 had been. Other smallholding legislation was introduced by the Liberals in the twentieth century; but none of these measures produced an effect comparable with the Irish Land Purchase Acts in establishing a widespread peasant-proprietorship. One is left with the persistent feeling that the idea of smallholdings, although strongly held by some intellectual thinkers and politicians, and initially popular among the more ambitious farm workers, had not struck very deep roots among the proposed beneficiaries.

Thus politicians of various kinds were willing to pass legislation which, to a degree, might benefit the farm labourers. There was very little sign, however, that the rural workers in England would take effective collective action to advance their own interests, as their Celtic brethren had done. Even their Trade Union activities were not conspicuously successful. The more enterprising among them were inclined to "vote with their feet", and betake themselves and their families to the towns or the colonies.

An interesting attempt was made by outside enthusiasts to stir up the English farm workers. In the course of 1890-1, the English Land Restoration League tried to convert agricultural labourers to the doctrines of Henry George, through the operation of its "red vans". A series of village meetings was held in Suffolk, and later in many other parts of the country. The League's report for 1891 describes the procedure: "The van arrives at each village early in the forenoon and is stationed in some prominent position. A notice of the meeting is exhibited — the meeting being also advertised by placards in advance — and some large pictures representing the workings of landlordism are shown. A thorough distribution of suitable leaflets is made in the village. The meetings are held in the open air at 7.30 and are attended by from 100 to 300 labourers. . . . The lecturers report that the labourers everywhere welcome the van with enthusiasm and so far there has been an almost complete absence of opposition."³⁷

The Land Nationalisation Society began a very similar line of activity on a smaller scale, using "yellow vans", which began to tour in March 1891.³⁸ The two movements had noticeably different ideas, but seem to have avoided conflict — save in the

pages of their respective publications — and to a considerable extent they even co-operated actively.³⁹

After a time, the coloured vans encountered a measure of opposition. Often difficulties were placed in the way of people who tried to hold meetings, and once or twice there was some trouble with roughs. The landlord interest was galvanised to engage in counter-propaganda through a body sonorously entitled the Liberty and Property Defence League. It is doubtful, however, whether any of these kinds of opposition really contributed substantially to the eventual decline of the rural campaign. The "red van" accounts of the Land Restoration League balanced at about £900 a year in the middle 1890s, but this was the zenith. It appears that the venture was dependent on a few substantial contributions, and when the Treasurer, William Saunders, MP, died in 1895, the "red van" work declined rapidly. In the course of 1901-2, the remaining "red vans" were disposed of,⁴⁰ and these activities ceased. The "yellow vans" appear to have been discontinued at about the same time.

The dismal results secured by the coloured vans may be attributed to two main causes. In the first place, the campaign turned on a few enthusiasts, and never received the active support of major politicians. The Liberal leaders, in particular, were far too busily employed in the congenial task of obstructing each other's work to do anything so useful. Branches of local Land and Labour Leagues were indeed established;⁴¹ yet it is difficult to see how they could hope to be effective without either a high-powered central organisation, or else some immediate and tangible objective. No doubt, many farm labourers were impressed by the arguments they had heard; but what were they to do about it? If a limited number of constituencies had been worked, and strong Parliamentary candidates had been advanced (as the crofters had done in the 1880s), there was at least the possibility of establishing a substantial pressure group in the House of Commons; but, as it was, the effort was largely wasted.

Although the rural land movements in different parts of the United Kingdom showed immense variations during the period 1886-1892, certain common features may be seen in all of them. In the middle 1880s, illegal and violent activities were widespread in the Celtic areas, and could easily have become general throughout the country as a whole. Gradually, these disturbances were

contained: partly by ameliorative legislation; partly by force; occasionally through wise concessions by the landowning classes; but to a much greater extent through the gradual adjustments which all classes made to the changed conditions of world markets. By 1892, violence was the exception rather than the rule. There was no fear of a revolutionary situation, or of public disorder on a scale too large for the organs of government to contain with ease.

By common consent of serious politicians in all Parties, much remained to be done, both through legislation and through administration. It was generally agreed that tenants of agricultural land should have substantial security of occupation, at least so long as they did their job properly; and many people were prepared to go further, and urge that the tenant should be enabled to acquire the fee simple of his holding if he so desired. It was also universally held that farm labourers and other landless men should have a real opportunity to acquire some land as a small-holding, or at least as an allotment. The special problem which was presented by those areas where the land was inadequate for the people's needs had been raised and understood. There was every reason for believing that future governments of whatever composition would try various expedients to reduce the remaining grounds of complaint among the rural populations; although it was unlikely that they would pursue any of the really drastic remedies which the various enthusiasts continued to propose.

Thus the rural land problem was no longer likely to produce acute and violent crises — at least so long as relative prosperity persisted. Land reformers were beginning to take the advice of Shaw Maxwell, and to see the land problem as one whose principal implications were for the urban areas.

Notes-6

- 1 *The Times*, 16 January 1886.
- 2 Thomas Rees, *History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales* (see bibliog.), p. 448.
- 3 Henry Richard, *Letters on the social and political condition in the principality of Wales* (see bibliog.), p. 2.
- 4 John Davies, "The end of the great estates and the rise of free-

- hold farming in Wales", *Welsh History Review*, 7 (1974), at pp. 187-88.
- 5 For a general description of conditions in Wales, see *Land in Wales and Monmouthshire*, Reports Commissioners 1896 (20) vol. xxiv ("Welsh Land Commission"), *passim*.
 - 6 *Ibid.*, p. 173.
 - 7 Compare J. W. Willis Bund, *Law of compensation for unexhausted agricultural improvements*. . . . (2nd edition) (see bibliog.), p. 15.
 - 8 T. W. Moody, "Michael Davitt and the British Labour Movement 1882-1906", *Trans. Royal Historical Society*, 5s (1952), 3, pp. 53-76, at p. 62.
 - 9 Welsh Land Commission, p. 173.
 - 10 S. Rendel to A. C. Humphreys-Owen, 4 February 1885. Rendel 19,461 C, fo. 248.
 - 11 *The Times*, 16 January 1886.
 - 12 Jones to Thomas Gee, 21 April 1866. Gee 8303D, fo. 129.
 - 13 At Blaenau, 12 February 1886; report in *Cambrian News*. LG (B) A/6/2/1. The meetings are reported (but not Lloyd George's speech) in *The Times*, 12, 13 February 1886.
 - 14 Davitt to Ellis, 1 March 1886. D. R. Daniel, fo. 63.
 - 15 Notably in the Vale of Conway and Montgomeryshire. *The Times*, 13, 16 February 1886.
 - 16 D. P. Davies to T. E. Ellis, 28 April 1888. Ellis, fo. 227.
 - 17 *The Times*, 16 September 1886.
 - 18 *The Times*, 23, 27 August, 1, 7, 8 September 1886.
 - 19 Humphreys-Owen to Rendel, 28 November 1886. Rendel 19,461C, fo. 312.
 - 20 *Glasgow Herald*, 17 December 1888; *The Times*, 17 December 1888.
 - 21 G. A. Godfrey to Rendel, 7, 14 May, 2 June 1889. Rendel 19,450C, fos. 198-200.
 - 22 Welsh Land Commission, p. 175.
 - 23 *Ibid.*, p. 174.
 - 24 *Ibid.*
 - 25 A. C. Humphreys-Owen to Rendel, 24 November 1889. Rendel 19,463C, fo. 511.
 - 26 Lloyd to Rendel, 5 April 1891. Rendel 19,453C, fo. 411.
 - 27 See, for example, *Annual Register*, 1890, p. 253.
 - 28 Salisbury to Queen Victoria, 15 August 1889 (copy). S. D/87, p. 703. An amendment to the Bill was accepted by the Government. The Opposition then contended that this fundamentally altered the character of the Bill. The Speaker upheld their contention and the Bill was withdrawn.
 - 29 Lloyd George to T. E. Ellis, 19 May 1887. Ellis, fo. 679.

- 30 Mitchell & Deane, *op. cit.*, p. 344, give the average UK real wages, allowing for unemployment (1850=100) as: 1884:138; 1885:140; 1886:142; 1887:149; 1888:155; 1889:161; 1890:169.
- 31 Memorandum, 29 December 1891. AJB 49,689, fos. 170-87.
- 32 See discussion on history of allotments, Balfour memorandum, 12 January 1886. Balfour 49,688, fos. 82-7. Chaplin memorandum to Cabinet, 14 January 1886. CAB 37/17/11.
- 33 Balfour Memorandum, 12 January 1886, *supra*.
- 34 *Annual Register* 1886, p. 27.
- 35 See Chaplin's memorandum, 28 November 1890. CAB 37/28/58.
- 36 Memorandum entitled "Smallholdings", January 1891. JC 5/5, fo. 47.
- 37 English Land Restoration League, Eighth Annual Report, 1891, p. 12.
- 38 Land Nationalisation Society Report for year ending 31 March 1891.
- 39 See, for example, *Single Tax*, July 1894. Later, however, the two movements were much less inclined to co-operate. *Ibid*, April 1899.
- 40 English Land Restoration League report, 1902 (Nineteenth Annual Report).
- 41 *Single Tax*, August 1894.