

made with a degree of enthusiasm that one would hardly expect from a campaign audience in our country to a purely argumentative address. My impression is that if the speaker had made a similar address to a similar audience with us he would have emptied the hall in about fifteen minutes. The speech would have been dull. I do not mean that the speech was dull in fact, for it was the very reverse. It was one of the most interesting speeches I have ever listened to. The point I am trying to make is that our audiences are not as a rule patient with an extended argumentative address, unrelieved by any of the usual devices of popular orators.

Not only have I observed that your audiences over here are thoughtful, are interested in reasoned-out exposition, and are quick to catch the climaxes of pure argument, but their intelligence is not of the stolid kind. I had expected to find English audiences stolid. I think it is the general impression in our country that they are so. One of our constant flips at the English is that they are slow to appreciate a joke; that the point comes to them by "slow freight," as we sometimes express it. This is not true according to my experience. The English audiences I find to be good humoured and quick and heartily responsive to whatever pleases them, whether it be funny or serious.

### 3.—IS THE LAND QUESTION AS PROMINENT AN ISSUE IN THE ELECTION AS YOU EXPECTED?

It is, and it is not. Before I had been twelve hours ashore I was at a meeting of perhaps five or six hundred people, packing the Town Hall of a village in Cheshire, and the air was alive with the song "The Land for the People," to the tune of our old familiar "Marching thro' Georgia." At this meeting the speeches were keyed up to that sentiment, and the audience was thoroughly enthusiastic about it. The same thing was true of the meetings which I attended in Wedgwood's constituency (Newcastle-under-Lyme.) I found the same thing in other constituencies and at other meetings; as in Halifax for instance; and I have heard of it as prevailing among the common people all over England. In these respects, the prominence of the land question exceeded my expectations. But I found that the Protectionists had in a great degree diverted attention from the land question by injecting the Protection proposition. I say Protection, for that is what we call it although over here you call it Tariff Reform. Our Tariff Reform is not toward Protection but away from it. I feel very strongly that if the Liberals had met the Tariff Reform attack that was injected into your campaign by conceding that commercial Free Trade, while infinitely better than Protection for the working man and business man will not give to those classes what they earn but that the abolition of land monopoly will—if the Liberals had taken this course—it is my judgment that they might have secured better results at the elections than they have secured. It seems to me to have been a weakness on their part to allow themselves to be turned upon the defensive by the injection of the Tariff issue. They could have fought Protection much more effectively, I think, by fighting for the abolition of land monopoly as a better and indeed the only way of giving to the working classes what Protection proposes to offer. Do not understand me as criticising. I realise how difficult it has been—for I have experienced the difficulty myself—to avoid placing the emphasis on the negative when and where the air was full of Protection promises, but I believe that the serious afterthought will strengthen such feeling as there may be that the tactics of fighting against Protection and for the land in one breath would have brought better results. A defensive fight is always a weak one, and the Liberals had the strength that goes with an aggressive fight until they yielded to the temptation to go upon the defensive which was thrown across their path by the Protectionists.

### HENRY GEORGE, Jr.'s IMPRESSIONS.

Mr. George who has spoken for Liberal candidates in England and Scotland has also kindly made the following brief statement of his views on British and American politics:—

I came over here to write for a syndicate of American newspapers a series of signed articles on what appeared to me to be the most significant phases of the great struggle between privilege and the people. On our side of the water the public had not been fully aroused to the full significance of the Budget fight, and they regarded the rejection of the Budget more as a political struggle

than a social one. The underlying economic questions did not appear to be very important; but as the election contests opened, more attention was given to the tariff question and the land question was seen to be of primary importance. I am confident that these extraordinary contests will have remarkable effects on the United States. Our people will have the same issues to face sooner or later. The tariff question is pushing its way to the front in American politics. The Democratic party is committed to a lower tariff and the Republican party is rent over the subject. What is known as the "insurgent" movement is arising among the farmers in the trans-Mississippi States, who demand with increasing vehemence the reduction of the tariff wall. So that the tariff and land monopoly questions will soon be in the forefront of the nation's politics.

The manner in which candidates present their case here is most interesting to one accustomed to American political methods. Your short campaign makes the issues very sharp and direct, and gives the speaking a freshness that a long campaign would deprive it of.

But to an American, the first peculiarity here with a Parliamentary election is that it is like a Presidential election by Congressional districts—as if a President was to be elected, not by a general vote, but by the majority of Congressional seats a party could capture. This draws attention to each Parliamentary division, so that there is personal interest in each candidate, and in his chances of winning. With us, except for the chief figures in Congress, a Congressional contestant is unknown outside his locality, or at any rate, outside his State.

The issues in our Congressional fights therefore may in many respects essentially differ with different localities even among the candidates of the same general party. It gives to our Congressional fights a separateness unknown in the United Kingdom. Speakers flock here into a division from without to strengthen a candidate's canvass. With us that is done much less, and indeed is often hurtful rather than helpful to a candidate, the incomer being regarded as an invader.

From this it will be seen that the circumstances of a national election here have marked differences from ours. The issues here are more clearly marked as between the two parties, and the candidates not only keep more nearly within party lines, but devote themselves more generally to certain issues. To all intents and purposes a constituency in Scotland fights over the same matter as a constituency in the South of England or in the hills of Wales, so that there is here a singular directness in the manner in which candidates present their arguments, and, on the whole a strength of, and matter-of-factness of style which I should ascribe largely to the brevity of the campaign, since that makes it necessary to get down to business at once without frills.

This, however, is not to say that there is not a great deal of finished and really artistic campaign speaking in the Parliamentary contests. I have not heard Mr. Churchill, whose speeches read so remarkably well; but I have listened to others, and among them, three times to Mr. Lloyd George. Certainly, Mr. George must be ranked as among the very first political speakers in the English tongue. He has the power and skill of a studied orator, combined with an easy almost conversational style, and a grace, a humour, and a poetical imagination that are the more captivating since they appear to be, and doubtless are, entirely natural with him. He has, moreover, in high degree, the first necessity for political speaking—sincerity; without which all his capabilities would go for nothing in the advocacy of a great democratic cause.

Mr. Balfour, on the contrary, on the one occasion on which I heard him speak—at Bradford—impressed me as a scholarly man who was struggling to make out a case that he did not believe in; and so was full of hesitations, poverty of illustrations, and physical discomfort.

The audiences here are, generally speaking, very fine. They follow close reasoning and yet instantly respond to points. And their quick appreciation of humour has a most exhilarating effect upon the speaker.

What has delighted me most in all these contests is the prominent part the land question has played. Candidates whom it might have been supposed had given little or no thought to the subject have on the hustings put it with great strength and cogency, and pointed it with the local illustrations that carry the argument home. It is this fact that must make the land question the real question in British politics, for years to come. Raised as a general issue in Parliament, it has been given local application by each candidate, some for, some against; and no matter what the other issues may become, this one touching the taxation of land values can never again be put aside or ignored.