

these two kinds of treatment lead to emigration from Britain to Canada?

A deep prejudice has been shown by the landlords against human beings as inhabitants of Scotland. Men are made to feel that they are not wanted, and those Scotsmen who wish to remain in the country, or to see others remain, will require to change this state of affairs. If the landlords are left with the same powers and the same opinions, depopulation will go on. For a hundred years now the landlords and factors have held the view that men and women are expensive and unprofitable occupants of their land. They have argued quite seriously that it is bad business to keep men in their holdings.

The landlords have acted on the depopulation argument. They keep on throwing several farms into one and sending their tenants into the towns or away to the Colonies. This policy is mistaken and short-sighted as well as wicked. We assume that if men and women would live in old, tumble-down houses, if their horses and cattle would thrive without the shelter of stables and sheds or byres, the landlords would allow them to remain on the land. This is another way of saying that the landlord wants more rent, and that he reduces the population in order to get it. We have had more than enough of this in Scotland. The landlords have had far too long the opportunity of putting this stupid and wicked policy into practice. With some exceptions their practice has been to press Scottish farmers and laborers to reduce their living to something like the Chinese standard. An eternal grudge against the rebuilding or repairing of houses, against fair rents, is the cause of depopulation. The landlords' invitation to the Scottish people, backed by the power to enforce it, is: "Give us more rent, give us it now, give us it even if it costs the health and lives of men and women; if not, you can leave the land." The landlords expect farmers to fare like tramps, and yet to pay the rent of men well equipped with capital. But why should any people, especially the Scottish people, tolerate a system which finds fault with and opposes the reasonable desire, and even the absolute necessity, of men and women for decent houses and food and clothes?

There should be no mistake about the condition of Scotland. Good people who are worth keeping at home are being steadily rooted out of the country. If we take Argyllshire, the population is 12,216 less than it was in 1801, and 31,912 less than it was in 1831. The deer are coming further south, nearer to the heart of the Empire, while men are being pushed away to its remote borders.

Twenty years ago the Black Mount was the most southerly deer forest; now they have come down to Glen Lochy and even round the head of Loch Fyne on Ardkinglas. If we take such a beautiful glen as Glen Lonan lying between Loch Awe and Oban we see how the depopulation has proceeded. Not many years ago there were nine tenant farmers in the glen and two cottars. There were large families in each of the farms, and a full staff of ploughmen and shepherds. There is now one farmer and no cot-tar. The tenant left Cabrachan in 1904, Barguilean in 1906. Since then two have gone from Torinturk, two from Clachadow, one from Duntanachan and one from Glenamackrie. The hills have been given

up to grouse and some of the arable land to plantations.

It is not without reason that such men as Rev. Malcolm MacCallum of Muckairn have protested all their lives against the devotion of Highland land to large sheep farms. While men have been moving from the Highlands to the cities and Colonies, the land of the Highlands has undergone a change. It has moved rapidly back to a state of wildness. Land requires a certain number of men to work it. A mistake was made when so much of the land of Scotland was given over to sheep ranching on a large and burdensome scale. Although this is called sheep-farming, it is not farming at all. The few farmers and shepherds are neither masters of their land nor master of their stock. Land that was cultivated by small holders in former days went out of cultivation; pasture deteriorated, and now this system of ranching has broken down. The big farmers have grown tired under their heavy task, and, in spite of good prices are giving up their farms. If an inquiry were made into the history of the large sheep farms, how many of them would be found which have been occupied by the same family even for one generation?

The whole system is unnatural and unbusinesslike. The landlords and large farmers assumed that they could go on for an indefinite time taking much out of the land and putting little into it. They have discovered their mistake. The farms carry less stock every year. Bracken and moss spread over the best land. It goes down in condition, and instead of endeavoring to improve it again the landlords put it to a lower use, grouse, rabbits and deer taking place of sheep. This is the grave and tragic blunder. The landlords and the Government put a low value on good men and women, and let them go to the Colonies for land, while there is abundance of good land in this country. This is an evidence of madness or insanity which justifies the intervention of the supreme authority, the people themselves. It is a policy which has been pursued so long and with such disastrous results that this intervention should be immediate and thorough.

JOHN ORR.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### AMERICAN ORIGIN OF THE RECALL.

Oakland, Cal.

Representative government is fine in theory, but the experience of a century has shown that the men who are chosen by the people to represent them are not always true to their trust. They forget that they are only agents, and assume magisterial functions; so the people, who are the source of power, are adopting Direct Legislation. It is a radical change, a grand progressive movement, a virtual political revolution.

Representative forms of government have developed a class of unpatriotic persons who fatten by systematically corrupting the people's representatives. These men do not desire a change. They particularly condemn the "Recall" and call it a new

fangled idea, forgetting or ignoring the fact that it is older than the Constitution.

The Articles of Confederation, the organic law of this country previous to the present Constitution, were adopted on the 15th of November, 1777. Article 5 of that time-honored document contains the Recall. It may be well for such of our reactionary fellow-citizens who have never read it, or having read it have forgotten it, to read it again. It is as follows:

"Art. V. For the convenient management of the general interests of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the Legislature of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its delegates, or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year."

This is where we get the Recall. It is not new.

J. W. DUTTON.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

---

Week ending Tuesday, August 8, 1911.

---

### Arbitration Treaties.

At a dinner of the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes on December 18 last, President Taft declared that he saw no reason why the ancient tradition should be preserved that questions affecting the vital interest and honor of nations could not be arbitrated; that in his opinion these questions were as susceptible of dispassionate arbitration as any other international issues. The French Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Jusserand, immediately offered on behalf of his government to enter into such treaty relations. Sir Edward Grey, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, called out approval of such forms of treaty in the House of Commons. And as a final result nearly identical arbitration treaties have been worked out between each of these countries and the United States. These treaties are regarded as the greatest single step yet taken toward the preservation of universal peace. As summed up in the *Chicago Record-Herald*, the general features of the treaties are as follows:

The contracting parties agree to submit all questions which diplomacy has failed to settle to a commission composed of an equal number of citizens of each country.

The commission does not decide, but recommends a settlement which, if adopted by the governments, disposes of the dispute.

If the dispute is regarded by one as justiciable, and by the other as not justiciable, the dispute is submitted to the commission, and if the commission decides that the dispute is justiciable then the dispute is to be referred to arbitration; that is to say, machinery is created in the form of a commission between the failure of diplomacy and arbitration at The Hague, or by some special tribunal, in the expectation that a careful and thoughtful discussion of the difficulty will result in a recommendation acceptable by both countries.

In case of a decision to arbitrate either party may ask for a delay of a year in which to settle the difficulty without the need of resorting to the arbitration agreed upon.

+

Both treaties were signed on the 3rd, that with France receiving signature in Paris, where the French Ambassador to the United States happened to be, and in Washington by the Secretary of State, Mr. Knox; and the treaty with Great Britain being signed in Washington by the British Ambassador, Mr. Bryce, and by Mr. Knox, in the presence of President Taft. The President immediately transmitted the treaties to the Senate, ratification from which body they await. At the request of the President the Senate has adopted the unusual but not unprecedented course of making the treaties public in advance of its consideration of them. They received publicity in the press of the country on the 6th. [See vol. xiii, page 1202; current volume, pages 250, 277.]

+ +

### European Deals in Morocco.

The war scare in European capitals over rights in Morocco, reported last week, has been subsiding. The German government has given no indications of resentment over the English warnings to Germany to keep out of Morocco: and various German papers, indignant in behalf of national honor, have used unusual freedom in applying to the Kaiser such epithets as "William the Timid," "The Valorous Poltroon"—these especial terms being used by the *Pan-Germanic Post*. In the meantime Germany and France are bargaining with spheres of influence—Morocco against French Congo territory. [See current volume, page 805.]

+ +

### The Lords' Veto.

In expectation of an attack by the Tory leader, A. J. Balfour, upon the Liberal-Irish-Labor-coalition on the 7th, the galleries of the House of Commons were filled with lords, diplomats and distinguished strangers. Mr. Balfour had given notice of his motion five days before. The motion was in this form:

That the advice given His Majesty by His Majesty's Ministers, whereby they obtained from His Majesty a pledge that a sufficient number of Peers would be created to pass the Parliament Bill in the