

Land Values

JOURNAL OF THE MOVEMENT FOR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

Seventeenth Year—No. 199.

DECEMBER, 1910.

1d.; Post, 1/6 per annum.

Telephone Gerrard 8323, 8324. Telegrams: "Eulav, London."

CONTENTS.

NOTES OF THE MONTH :—	PAGE
Political Unrest	137
The Health of the Unionist Party	137
Tariff Reform for London	138
The Cant of Landlordism	138
A Sane and Fair Land System	139
Leo Tolstoy!	139
LEADING ARTICLE :—	
Change and Continuity of Policy	140
SPECIAL ARTICLES :—	
The Highland Campaign	141
Mr. Joseph Fels on Small Holdings	142
Slum Owners Encouraged and Rewarded	143
Port of London Authority	143
HERE AND THERE	144
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INTERESTS :—	
Miners' Wages Reduced	145
School Sites in Glamorgan	146
A Farm or a Building Estate	146
LORD WINCHELSEA AND THE LABOURER	147
QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENT—Price of Irish Land	147
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DISCUSSION :—	
Mr. Asquith on the Government's Policy	147
Mr. Balfour's Land Policy	149
Mr. Lloyd George on Liberalism	149
Land Values in London	150
Scottish League Manifesto	151
Ownership <i>versus</i> Tenancy	150-154
MR. LLOYD GEORGE IN EAST LONDON	154
NEWS OF THE MOVEMENT :—	
Highlands, Manchester, Yorkshire, Northern Land Values League, Liverpool, London, Scotland, and English Leagues	155-160
COLONIAL AND FOREIGN :—	
Western Australia, New South Wales, New Zealand, South Australia, United States	161-162
BOOK REVIEW :—	
LAND REFORM IN THEORY AND PRACTICE	162

NOTES OF THE MONTH.

Political Unrest.

The country is again the scene of a political struggle. The outbreak of strife was sudden and surprising, although every one knew that a deep ferment was going on beneath the surface. In this Election, which is the sequel or echo of the last, we feel more free than usual to take a general view of the issue. The last Election was so decisive and fruitful, and the educational work done in the interval has been so far-reaching, that it is possible to associate our own fortunes and experiences with those in other countries. Whether we look at our Colonies, at the United States, or at the Continental nations, we find in each of them a force at work breaking up existing systems. Conditions vary according to the number of the countries, but everywhere progress towards freedom is noticeable. The fierce heat of the struggle in Britain is warning receptive minds and spirits in every part of the world, and these are sending back encouragement to the people here. Within the last few months Australia as a Commonwealth, and as a number of States, has taken a long step towards our object. There is a spirit of challenge and rivalry in her adoption and extension of the Budget policy of the Mother Country. Western Canada is moving, and the United States have broken away from deadening bonds which have held them

in a monotonous and uninteresting imprisonment for years. This keen and sustained political exercise should produce a new race of strong and enlightened citizens in the world, whose civic spirit and strength will be the guarantee for the most beneficial results in the near future.

The Health of the Unionist Party.

Among the symptoms of ill-health in the Unionist Party is its failure to grapple with the land question. . . . The principle of freehold tenure cannot be accepted as a policy in itself, because tradition and modern circumstances have created a demand for agricultural tenancies which it would be absurd to ignore or endeavour to repress. But the multiplication of freeholds is politically desirable, and the arguments with which the suggestion is opposed are likewise political rather than economic. . . . The crying need for agricultural England to-day is a political party able and willing to show that the alternative to Radical-Socialism is not stagnation.

These are extracts from a long and serious leading article in the MORNING POST of November 7th. They indicate that the writer has a sound grasp of the political situation. It is not so long since the same statement about the health of the Liberal Party could have been made. There is only one way of grappling with the land question, and that is by the policy of valuation and taxation, and as soon as the Liberal Party begins to flag in this policy, the symptoms of ill-health will reappear. The second point in this statement from the MORNING POST reveals a vicious and fatal tendency. The multiplication of freeholds is to be advocated by the Conservatives, because, from their point of view, it is politically desirable. Tenancies are to be advocated by the Liberals, because, from their point of view, this is politically desirable. Small owners would vote Conservative, small tenants would vote Liberal. The less of this wicked game with the interests of the people we have the better. There is more need than ever for the intervention of business men who regard the industrial and social welfare of the country as a thousand times more important than any political game. Gambling in other departments of life is only the fruit and reflection of this most disastrous and unprincipled gambling in politics.

Unionist Despair.

I move about the country a good deal and I know the feeling that prevails. Even after discounting the confirmation I get of my views, it is unquestionable that the Unionists throughout the country to-day are really in a despondent condition. If apathy is to be seen everywhere, the reason is that things are wrong and the heads of our party are not putting them right. . . . I do not want to advocate repeal of the land taxes. If the question had been decided by an authoritative Council of the Party, or if Mr. Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain had laid down a definite policy on the subject, I would do my best to fall into line. As it is I am a wandering sheep.

This statement was made in a special article by a Unionist M.P. in the MORNING POST of November 11th. It resembles those we have noticed in these columns for many months.

The Unionists have been in the grip of some adverse fate. No matter what form of campaign they adopted, no matter how strenuously they carried it out, success never attended their efforts. Tariff Reform, Anti-Socialism, or Anti-Budget, whatever policy is advanced, it gets into difficulties. With the political atmosphere pervaded by the Taxation of Land Values, every one of these alternative schemes suffers a fatal blight. They cannot live. We hope that during the election, and after the storm blows over, this wholesome influence will assert itself, and cover the country more completely with the blessings of political earnestness and sincerity, and fill the minds of the people once more with the prospect of freedom.

Tariff Reform for London.

We have been asked how it could be done, how it was possible under a Liberal Government that a Bill should be passed imposing protective duties on goods entering the Port of London, how a Liberal Government could agree to the imposition of a tax on coal. We cannot give any satisfactory answer. We drew attention in our April issue to the Provisional Order being promoted by the Port of London Authority. In another column of this issue we deal with the measure which was passed by Parliament and with its reception by the different interests affected. Lord St. Aldwyn, in his Report to the President of the Board of Trade on the result of the enquiry held by him into the question of rates to be levied on goods, said: "The sole interest of the Port Authority is to maintain and increase the trade of the Port—they have no shareholders to satisfy." We can hardly imagine a statement of a principle or theory more at variance with the practical policy pursued by those who made the statement. It is a shallow and misleading statement to say that the Port of London Authority have no shareholders to satisfy. They have to pay interest to satisfy the mortgagees who advanced money to satisfy the shareholders in the old London Docks. The valuation of these Docks, like the valuation of London's water supplies, was far above any fair or business-like valuation, and now the people of London and districts are called upon to pay Port Dues and Water Rates to satisfy the unreasonable demand of the shareholders in these concerns. Taxes on trade and commerce have no other effect than to discourage them, and while it is true that the sole interest of the Port Authority is to maintain and increase the trade of the Port we ask why in the name of all that is business-like and reasonable they acted as if their sole and primary interest was to give the Dock shareholders an unbusiness-like price? We take this occasion of emphasising once more the fact that rates for carrying on any public service should be levied only on the basis of land value. It is on this basis alone that they can fall without discouraging and strangling the trade and production of a country.

Uncertain Ground.

Mr. Fell and Mr. Pretymann were responsible for a resolution in favour of a repeal of the land taxes so far as they affect "land" used for agricultural purposes, land dependent on the building trade, and property held by small owners. The member for Chelmsford explained that by repeal was meant repeal plus reconstruction. The form of valuation for site value laid down in the Act was unworkable and impossible. It was just that there should be a fair contribution towards local rates from the large increase in the value of urban property, but increment in value of other kinds of property should not escape taxation. A delegate wished to move an amendment, but the motion was being put before he was on his feet, and was carried with three dissentients.

In spite of the enthusiasm and determination displayed by the leaders of the Land Union, they are obliged to with-

draw their lines and beat a retreat. This is a report of what occurred at the Annual Conference of the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations held at Nottingham on November 17th. When we find the Land Union conceding the justice of the Taxation of Land Values for local purposes, we may carry on our work with renewed confidence in its early success, and when we find the strictest sect of the Conservatives accepting this modified policy of the Land Union, we can assure ourselves that the battle has been won on this side. The work that remains for us to do is that of removing apathy among those whose political duty it is to press forward with the policy of the Taxation of Land Values.

Another Blow to the Unionist Policy.

No part of their policy has received more attention from the Unionists recently than their schemes to promote land purchase and thus extend the influence of landlordism. The Farmers' Club secured Mr. W. Ankers Simmons, a well-known and experienced estate agent, to read a paper which we reprint in another part of this issue, on "The Comparative Advantages of Ownership or Tenancy of Agricultural Land." It was commonly expected that Mr. Simmons would favour ownership, but this paper turned out to be a strong condemnation of the system, and the same line was followed by most of the speakers who took part in the discussion. A writer in the *Times*, one of whose articles we reproduce, also supports tenancy against ownership. These things are encouraging as they indicate that there is a large amount of sensible opinion throughout the country in favour of a policy which will benefit the industrious man, rather than establish a vested right or interest.

The Cant of Landlordism.

The Australian land speculators who live in England are devoting much of their time to abuse of the Federal Land Tax. At the Annual General Meeting of the Scottish Australian Investment Company, Ltd., on November 18th, Mr. George Rait, the chairman, denounced the tax: "What was proposed was sheer confiscation. . . . He thought it would be a very good thing if it were nipped in the bud at once by the Royal assent being withheld. . . . There was an old company which was started in 1840, and until recently—until the Labour Party and the Socialists came into power—the company's relations with the different Governments in Australia were most friendly in every way, and so they would be again when the latter pursued a proper course. The company were only too delighted to sell their land, to get the proper people to go out to it."

After a long and abusive speech the Report was adopted, and a resolution passed increasing the remuneration of the directors from £1,200 to £2,000 a year, to take effect from and after July 1st, 1909. If the words cant and stupidity are appropriate in any circumstances, they apply here with exceptional force. This man who talks about Socialists and confiscation declared in his opening remarks that the profit and loss account showed a balance of £116,199, "which I think is the largest balance that I have had the pleasure of bringing under your notice. . . . Last year you had only 2 per cent., this year you receive 5 per cent., and you have besides the knowledge that there is added to the value of your ordinary stock the substantial sum of £40,000 through the reserve fund." We commend these facts to our readers and ask them to use them for the purpose of meeting similar canting statements that are made with regard to the Taxation of Land Values in this country. These men, blinded by the view of their own interests only, have no eyes for the general interest of the country. Under the threat of the land tax they are

opening up the land which they have too long closed down, and yet they kick against this policy which is nothing less than the salvation of the country.

Consumption and the Land Question again.

A "Tuberculosis Exhibition" was held in York on Nov. 7th—12th. On the last day of the Exhibition a lantern lecture was given on the subject of "The Healthy Home," by Mr. E. R. Hardie, of Newcastle, in which town the housing problem is very serious. In answer to questions, Mr. Hardie said:—

When we came to deal with slum property, it was most remarkable how the value of it went up, when the public authority required it, and had to pay out of the nose. The land question was at the bottom of it, and in his opinion the real remedy was the Taxation of Land Values. When they heard of waste land, he almost thought that while there was a single square yard of land that could be described as waste, there should not be a single unemployed man. There were acres and acres of waste land, and there ought to be some way of bringing labour to it. The argument was brought forward that waste land was of no value, and not suitable for agricultural purposes. Could anyone say there were ten acres in England of no value, and anyone could have it by applying? There would be a good many applicants, and it would soon have a value.

We are glad that this statement was received with loud applause. The insane policy of permitting natural resources to lie waste while human powers and faculties are falling into atrophy and decay is fast becoming intolerable. For want of food, for want of fresh air, for want of warm clothes and suitable houses, millions of children never attain fulness of physical, mental or spiritual life. Even if they were born with full vitality they can never grow. They die, or are slowly killed, by the most cruel and tantalising death. Why should we be patient with the system which is responsible for this?

A Sane and Fair Land System Wanted.

Mr. Lloyd George in the course of an address to a large Liberal meeting at St. Pancras on Wednesday, 23rd November, said:—

But if they had taken the quack remedies of the Tariff Reformers, what would have happened? They could see what had happened in Germany. They had already got sick of it, and they had swallowed Socialism in order to get rid of the effects of Tariff Reform. If they judged the present position of trade by every test, our home and foreign trade had improved enormously. The building trade was better by 50 per cent. than it was when he introduced his Budget last year. They were steadily getting on, but things would never be right in the building trade until they had completely unlocked the resources of the land. How could they have good trade in building when they had a system which first of all gave the man who did nothing the first cut, and the best cut, and the juiciest cut, and a cut that very often left nothing but the bone for the rest? (Cheers.) They would never get the building trade what it ought to be in this country until they had got a sane and fair land system in this country.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer does well to keep the land question to the front in this issue with the Lords. It was the land clauses of his famous Budget that made the issue with the Lords, and it will be a bad day for the Liberal leaders when they forget this as some of them, as most of them, seem anxious to do. To ignore the land question in this fight is to throw open the ground again for the Tariff Reformer and his "quack remedies."

Leo Tolstoy.

Leo Tolstoy died on November 20th. His death was made the occasion for the paying of many tributes to his work. We are not here concerned to determine Tolstoy's place amongst the thinkers of the world. It was not as an original thinker so much that Tolstoy appealed to us, but as the staunch, courageous and eloquent apostle of righteousness and justice, of peace on earth and good-will to all men. It was enthusiasm for morality, for social justice, that inspired his life; it was this that lifted him almost above human weaknesses and human passions; and it was this that eventually made him the one voice in Europe to which men of all shades of opinion gave a respectful hearing.

We followers of Henry George owe Tolstoy a special debt of gratitude. For many years, during almost the whole of his career, he saw clearly enough that the Land Question was necessarily the root of social, political and moral questions, that, to use his own words, "the only indubitable means of improving the position of the workers consists in the liberation of the land from its usurpation by the landlords," and its administration in such a way as to distribute it and its fruits equitably amongst all. It was, however, only of comparatively recent years that Tolstoy came to realise that to both these ends "the most just and practicable scheme is that of Henry George, known as the single-tax system." But after he did come to realise this, he never lost an opportunity of using his world-wide influence to bring home the truth, justice and simplicity of this system to thousands to whom otherwise it might long have remained unknown. When writing, in September, 1908, to the Federation of the Single Tax Leagues of Australia Tolstoy expressed his regret that he had done so little for the cause which united him to them. He had done much, however, more than he himself realised. There is little to admire in the past history of Russia; there is little to admire in its present history; but we cannot despair of the future of the country which gave to Europe the wholesome influence wielded by Leo Tolstoy, whose life almost seems as if inspired by the lines:—

Because our race has no great memories,
I will so live it shall remember me
For deeds of such divine beneficence
As rivers have, that teach men what is good
By blessing them.

Passive Resisters against the Valuation.

At a meeting of Builders and Property-owners held recently in the Institute, Stirchley, Birmingham, to discuss the land taxes and valuation forms, it was suggested by several of those present that they should refuse to fill up the valuation forms. After Mr. Rhodes (Secretary to the Midland Counties Property Association) had discoursed on the difficulties of Form IV., and had answered several questions in the following discussion, a small property owner said he did not think the Act was going to affect them in the least. There might be some difficulty in reference to the forms, but there was none that could not be got over if the owners were conscientious and filled them up to the best of their ability.

The gentlemen who advocated passive resistance showed a deplorable lack of courage in offering to start resisting. The £50 penalty bogey they have been so busy making during the past few weeks was such a success that it frightened even themselves. One said that "the passive resistance movement only needed a light to be set to it," to which another replied that "the man who did that would be singled out. I propose we ask Mr. Austen Chamberlain." This is not at all fair to Mr. Chamberlain.

"OUR POLICY."

"We would simply take for the community what belongs to the community—the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community; leave sacred to the individual all that belongs to the individual."—*Henry George.*

CHANGE AND CONTINUITY OF POLICY.

The Conference on the relations of the two Houses of Parliament has failed. The question at issue, therefore, has passed from the leaders of the two parties to the nation at large, and the nation, hardly recovered from the last, is confronted by another General Election. Not a few of the electors are wondering whether all this trouble is necessary. The policy of overcrowding one year with two elections requires some justification, and it is only because the Government enjoy the confidence of the country in so marked a degree that such a policy can be undertaken with success.

The position is interesting both on account of the causes or movements from which it has grown, and of the results to which it is likely to lead. There has been a certain continuity of purpose underlying the Government's policy. The movement against the Lords' privileges has run in two distinct lines. To grasp and understand this fact it is necessary to go back a few years. On June 24, 1907, Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman introduced in the House of Commons resolutions directed towards the limitation of the Lords' power to reject measures promoted and passed by the House of Commons. These resolutions are the basis of the present Government Bill. They were framed with reference to the Lords' action in throwing out the Education and Plural Voting Bills of 1906, and they represented the Government's line of attack up till the rejection of the Licensing Bill on November 27th, 1908.

On December 11th, 1908, Mr. Asquith spoke at the National Liberal Club, and declared that the Government had decided to abandon this line. There was a deep significance in his statement that "finance is an instrument of great potency and also of great flexibility, and it may be found to be, in some directions, at any rate, a partial solvent of what under existing constitutional conditions would otherwise be insoluble problems." Significant also was his declaration that "the Budget of next year will stand at the very centre of our work, by which we shall stand or fall, by which certainly we shall be judged in the estimation both of the present and of posterity." The country now appreciates the meaning of this. From that time the Government's policy was directed to an attack on the economic privileges of the Lords by means of the Budget. The fruits of this policy are not yet exhausted. Politically it has given the Liberal Party renewed life and vigour and has bound the country to the Government in a remarkable way.

With the passing of the Land Clauses of the Budget to its

credit, and with their administration going on, the Government have decided that they can now afford to turn once more to their task of limiting the Lord's veto power. Once again, on November 19th, Mr. Asquith spoke at the National Liberal Club. This time his purpose was to announce the renewal of the conflict on the old ground.

"It is admitted tacitly," he said, "if not expressly, that it is only when the Liberal Party is in power that the House of Lords claims or exercises its supposed right to compel a dissolution. We have, you see, made some progress in the controversy after all. What I have to say to-day, in the plainest possible words, is that this state of things, that this unevenness, that this injustice, that this deliberate and mischievous distortion of the principles of democracy, this state of things we are determined to bring to an end once and for all. When, then, I am asked what we are fighting for, I answer, for two things—for fair play for progressive legislation and the establishment in all its fulness of representative government."

Here we have the language used three or four years ago by Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, the resolution to deprive the Lords by direct legislation of the undue political power which they have exercised. The General Election will be fought mainly on this issue. But happily this is not the end. In the same speech Mr. Asquith made another significant statement. "To us as a party," he said, "constitutional changes are but the means to further and greater ends. We have before us great ideals in the social and economic sphere, ideals towards the realisation of which we have made some progress during the last five years, mainly because of the financial omnipotence of the Lower House. We find ourselves hampered at every stage on the road by the overriding powers of a Chamber overwhelmingly Tory in its composition and the natural champion of threatened interests and privileges. Those great causes of which we are the trustees cannot afford to go on waiting."

This declaration bears the promise that we shall only be asked to engage for a little while in this political struggle, and that its fruits shall be used for the further object of freeing ourselves from the tyranny of vested interests. The statement is less definite than we might wish, but this is a fault which often marks those pre-election speeches. When Ministers talk about "social reform" and "ideals in the social and economic sphere," we generally associate these phrases with charitable schemes of Invalidity Insurance, Labour Exchanges and Poor Law Reform, for which they want money.

At this time, however, we believe we are justified in assuming that the Government intend to pass at an early date from reform of the Constitution, and to resume as soon as possible the work of extending freedom in the economic sphere which they began in the Budget. But it is worth while discussing, even as a matter of tactics and politics, whether the movement against the Lords' position should

follow one line or two lines. Experience has already proved that the direct attack on the political power of the Lords does not appeal to the country. To make this attack even possible it was necessary to associate it with the attack on their economic power, their irresponsible domination of the people's means of livelihood through the land. The political or constitutional attack is entirely abstract. It has neither evoked the enthusiasm of the people, nor the strenuous opposition of the Lords. In itself it is empty and uninteresting, and requires to have something close behind it, or better still, right inside of it, as the Budget was last year.

We are sometimes asked how we shall get a Bill for the local Taxation of Land Values through the House of Lords, unless we curtail their powers. We have no fear. It will go through as the Budget went through, by the irresistible force of public opinion in its favour. The weakness of the Liberal or democratic forces at any time is not due to the overshadowing power of the Lords, but to the fact that the burning desires and aspirations of practically the whole people never find expression or outlet in a political measure. The first business of any Government in this country is to remove at once the barriers which prevent the land of this country from supplying to millions of men, women, and children the pleasant bread of life, for lack of which they are dying, and which the land holds in such abundance, to remove those obstructions to production which dry up the streams of trade and commerce, which make men industrial outlaws on the face of the earth, tying up their hands and numbing their brains in idleness.

Let the Government put its hand to this sacred work in earnest, let it open to a thirsty people the water of life, let these people feel the sap and vigour of life which Nature has provided coming into their beings, and we should like to see the House of Lords stand in their way. There is, after all, only one method of destroying a privilege, and that is by removing its roots or foundations. The Lords have built themselves their privileges, slowly and patiently, on the ownership and increasing ownership of land. They will only disappear with the dissolution of this ownership, and with the gradual reinstatement of the people in their free and natural rights to the use of land. Democracy will only be established step by step as this is accomplished, and efforts to clothe democracy in proper forms, when the substance of democracy does not exist, are irrelevant, and apt to be mischievous. Democracy will grow from the heart or centre outwards, and will shape new and appropriate forms for itself as it grows. To a people free from the despotic necessity of struggling beyond their strength to gain and hold the material basis of life political achievement would be easy. With such a people the task of statesmen would be simple. Poverty and the injustice from which it springs are the facts which baffle the most brilliant efforts to build a permanent and stable Constitution.

THE HIGHLAND CAMPAIGN.

AN INTERVIEW WITH MR. J. DUNDAS WHITE, M.P.

In reply to a few questions Mr. White has given us the following short account of the impressions he formed during his speaking tour in the Highland counties.

"You opened your campaign in Oban?"

"Yes, we began at Oban, thence to Fort William, thence across the country by Loch Laggan to Speyside, spoke at various places along Speyside, then at Elgin, Nairn and various places along the south side of the Moray Firth. The next departure was then made for Thurso, the most northerly port on the mainland of Scotland, from which we passed to Wick, working our way down the centres along the coast, and concluding at Dingwall. Then across to the Isle of Skye, where meetings were held at Portree and Dunvegan, thence to Stornoway further north, and south again to close the series at the Inverness Conference."

"What kind of meetings did you have?"

"On the whole we had good meetings. The numbers who came varied according to the place and hour, but the whole campaign was marked by the greatest interest on the part of those who were present at every meeting, and some of the meetings were large and enthusiastic."

"In what did you find the people most interested?"

"I had known before starting that they held strong views in favour of the Small Landholders' Bill, but the experience of the meetings showed that the subject of the Taxation of Land Values also evoked very great interest. The key-note of course was that the people have certain rights to the natural resources of the country, and that those who made buildings and improvements were entitled to the full benefit of them. This went home, particularly in those districts where the clearances had not been forgotten, where the memory was still green of the way in which the people had been driven without compensation from their homes in order to make room for sheep and deer. Since the Crofters' Act, these conditions have of course been ameliorated, but their effect is being increasingly felt by the small towns which have naturally been crippled by the depopulation of the agricultural districts which they should naturally serve. These little towns are also being crippled in yet another way. I had of course, been familiar with the idea of accommodation around our large towns, but was not prepared to find the same conditions there."

"How do our land and rating systems affect these small towns?"

"In various cases the people are huddled together in houses in low-lying positions which should have been condemned long ago, but there is excellent building land a little higher up, and it has been the experience time and again that while it is rated at about 12s. or 15s. per acre, the feuing price is £10 or £12 per acre, which is practically prohibitive. This combined with the rating of houses—and in some cases the rates are very substantial—not only prevents the building of houses for the people themselves but also militates against the building of houses for the better accommodation of summer visitors, and checks any possible development. A good deal has been spent in various places on harbours, but there again there was the same difficulty, that if the expenditure leads to development, there is a greater demand for land, and the feuing price can be raised correspondingly. Indeed it is increasingly recognised that if the decline of the population is to be arrested and the Highland districts to be developed, the land question must be faced boldly and at once. The present evils are increasingly recognised and public opinion is ripe for a solution."

"Did the people appreciate the fact that the valuation of land would help them to gain the object of the Small Landholders' Bill?"

"Throughout the campaign the close relation was shown between the question and the reform of rating and the Small Landholders' Bill, and special attention was laid on the new valuations under the Budget as providing the basis for the joint reforms. It is found almost everywhere that there is a great demand for Small Holdings. Indeed, only recently applications for Small Holdings were received by one important County Council to the extent of nearly 1,400. The best answer to the suggestion that there is no land suitable is the Report of the Highlands and Islands Commission of about 16 years ago which reported giving details for each of the Crofting Councils of Scotland, that in the six crofting counties of Scotland there were about 1½ million acres of practically unused land suitable for the creation of Small Holdings or the extension of the existing ones, or for the establishment of small farms. It is high time that the recommendations of that Commission were given effect to."

MR. JOSEPH FELS ON SMALL HOLDINGS.

AN INTERVIEW.

"I understand, Mr. Fels, that you have lately changed the method of managing the Mayland Farms?"

"I have not exactly changed my method, but I have corrected my way of dealing with most of the small holdings. The reasons for this are that the small holders originally put in were more or less inexperienced, and had very little capital, and further, because of the poor quality of the land."

"From what sources were your small holders drawn?"

"The small holders were drawn principally from London, from the industrial classes instead of from the people we should have drawn them from, men with agricultural experience."

"Then your experience would lead you to conclude that it was not a successful policy, that of taking men in middle life from the towns?"

"No, I found it was a poor policy, because the middle aged industrial worker took quite as long to learn anything about farming as he would to learn any other trade, and, on the principle that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks, it is best to take experienced agriculturists of whom there are plenty and to spare in Great Britain looking for land."

"Would your experience lead you to say that it was better to attempt the solution of the unemployed problem by different means than those which you employed in this case?"

"I did not start this small holding scheme in Mayland for this reason at all. To the outsider it appeared a benevolent or philanthropic enterprise; to some as the fad of a well-to-do man; to others as a fool thing generally. My object in starting it was to demonstrate that the presence of an industrious population gives value to the land on which they work and to adjacent land."

"Were there other causes of the failure than the unsuitability of the men?"

"Well, among other reasons was the distance from the railway station, nearly four miles. The soil is about the heaviest clay land in Essex, in fact practically in all England, and being so near the sea-level difficult and expensive to drain."

"What satisfactory features were evolved from your experiment with Mayland farms?"

"Among these are the gradual improvement in the condition of the small holders who are left; the proper development of intensified agriculture; the starting of a co-operative shop; an open-air and closed school, etc., etc."

"You have done something in the way of advancing education at Mayland, giving the children special opportunities?"

"Yes, when we bought the land at Mayland the nearest school to the farm was a little under two miles. The school was of the old type, the principal object being apparently to make the children sit up and keep silent. The Essex Educational Council agreed to staff the school at Mayland if we provided the building, but in a very short time it was found necessary to give notice to the Council to vacate. Since then I have been running the school myself, based on lines that give the children more freedom. Within a year we have "re-made," for want of a better term, the sixty or seventy children in constant attendance, physically and mentally."

"You attempted to organize a co-operative system of dealing with the produce of each consumer. I understand that system broke down. To what do you attribute this?"

"To the fact that the small holders themselves were not trained or educated to co-operation, and though most of them called themselves Socialists, they were Individualists almost to a man, and being strangers to each other, distrusted each other. To have changed this would have meant to have changed the nature of the small holders. Given access to land of the right quality by a sufficient number of men of the right quality and with agricultural knowledge, and with a sufficient amount of capital, these men would naturally co-operate as most men are willing to do when they are on an equality. I should certainly say co-operation is entirely feasible where men have equal opportunities, and it would be to their profit in every case to co-operate with each other, as is pretty conclusively proved by the widespread co-operation that has actually come about, and also in Denmark by conditions of land tenure which promoted the better development of land and human relationship."

"What is your opinion of the Hollesley Bay Farm Labour Colony experiment on which there is said to have been a loss of £79,000?"

"In the first place, I do not believe there was any such loss, as opponents of a thing can usually cook up any account or statement they want; figures are easily played with, but it was never expected that a Labour Colony for the Unemployed would or could under present conditions be made self-supporting, just as in my experience of Mayland with men brought from the city and unused to land cultivation. The Hollesley Bay labour was equally inexperienced, and, as we cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, naturally men who are used to sawing timber, driving nails, loading machinery and sweeping streets would not make very good farm labourers for a three months' stay as a limit. It takes a man three months to get his muscles in shape for farm work. All these small holdings and Farm Colony cultivation schemes under such conditions as we find must necessarily be mere palliatives and of no constructive importance, but given free access to land, exemption from taxes and rates on industry, and buildings, men would find their own level and small holdings would spring up almost automatically in great numbers wherever the land was suitable for them."

"What are your future plans for Mayland?"

"My idea is that the occupants of the small holdings would be paid a fair wage of £1 per week, which is to be charged to them along with the expenses of the particular holding, and give credit for the produce of their Small Holding, the balance belonging to the occupant so that he may be made more or less independent by what he makes."

"How has the presence of the Mayland enterprise affected land values within say a radius of 2½ miles?"

"It has put them up 70 to 100 per cent. My next-door neighbour wants 100 per cent. more for the 141 acres he has than he asked the day after I purchased the farm."

HOW SLUM-OWNERS ARE ENCOURAGED AND REWARDED.

THE TABARD STREET CLEARANCE SCHEME.

The London County Council have now before them a scheme for the clearance of slum properties, covering a total area of 16 acres, situated in Tabard Street and Grotto Place, Southwark, and in Crosby Row, Bermondsey, involving a capital expenditure of £473,000, and a net loss to the London ratepayers of £387,700. In other words, in order to get possession of some 16 acres of land to-day, a purely slum property, of the estimated value of £85,600, or, without provision of 5 acres for an open space, of £93,350, the London County Council proposes to pay no less a sum than £473,300.

The average yearly death rate per 1,000 from all causes was, period 1904-8, in London 14.9, in Southwark 18.2, in the Tabard Street area 36.8; from 1905-9 it was in London 14.5, in Southwark 17.5, in the Grotto Place area 39.1, in Bermondsey 18.9, and in the Crosby Row area 30.9. Hence no public-minded man can question the necessity for some "drastic action" being taken with reference to the areas under consideration. But they may well question the necessity for such action involving a loss to the ratepayers of London of a cash sum of £387,700, involving, such is the magic of compound interest, a total payment during the next fifty-nine years of over £785,000!

Under an order of reference, the Council must arrange that all outgoings, in respect of their dwellings, inclusive of capital charges, shall be met out of the rents received. Even after saddling a huge sum on the rates, by means of writing down the value of the land, the rents the Council is compelled to charge are more than the poor people who are displaced can pay. In this Tabard Street case, the value of the land has been written down from £473,300, the gross cost, to £85,600, the estimated value after the clearance. In the Clare Market scheme the value of the land was written down from £80,000 to £10,000. In 1902, Sir John Dickson-Poynder, M.P., L.C.C., said that "the last 25 years' operations in improvements and clearances had involved a net irrecoverable loss to the ratepayers of London of no less a sum than £1,206,000, arrived at by this artificial operation of writing down the values." The futility of these schemes for rehousing the displaced people is borne out by past experience. In the case of the Blackwall Tunnel, the works displaced 1,210 persons, accommodation was provided for 1,104, but only 9 of the original occupants availed themselves of the new dwellings. In the Boundary Street area, out of 5,719 persons, only 11 were original tenants. In the Falcon Court scheme only 40 of the 500 provided for were original occupants.

As reported in the Agenda Paper of the London County Council of Tuesday, November 1st, the Medical Officer of Health represented to the effect that—"The houses, courts, and alleys within the respective areas are *unfit for human habitation*: that the narrowness, closeness and bad arrangement of the streets and houses, the want of air, light, and ventilation, and other sanitary defects, are dangerous or injurious to health." Nor is this surprising; for the Tabard Street area is represented as about 13½ acres in extent, as containing 649 houses, inhabited by a population of 3,552 persons—that is, *over 40 people to each house*!—"nearly all of whom are persons of the working class." The characteristic feature of the area is the narrowness of the streets and the bad arrangements of both streets and houses. George Court is, in parts, only 3 feet wide; Little Britain, 5 feet. . . . Out of 32 streets in the area no less than 13 are *culs de sac*. The houses in Tabard Street are three storeys in height, but nearly all the other houses on the area consist of two storeys, and contain either two or four rooms. Many of the houses have backyards, which are small, and in which are situated the waterclosets and dustbins. . . . The houses generally are worn out; the walls of many of the ground-floor rooms present evidence of dampness, or have been match-boarded in such a way as to conceal the dampness; and the staircases are, in a number of instances, narrow, dark, and dangerous." The Grotto Place area comprises some 1½ acres, and contains 138 houses, mostly of one or two storeys in height. "The houses, with few exceptions, are quite worn out, and the inhabitants, who number 567, are of the poorer class." The Crosby Row area is about one acre in extent, and contains 88 houses occupied by 474 persons. "The houses generally are worn out, are surrounded by high buildings, and have insufficient space about them."

Such is the evidence of their own officials. But it is for these 875 houses, worth, according to this evidence, nothing or less than nothing, that the London County Council proposes to call upon the ratepayers of London to pay the sum of £387,700, or over £443 per house! The poor purveyor of diseased meat is held up to public execration, is hauled before our Courts as a criminal, fined, and his property seized, condemned, and destroyed. But the rich purveyor of such hotbeds of disease as those described above is not denounced as a criminal, is not hauled before our Courts, nor is his property seized, condemned, and destroyed. Quite the contrary, his nefarious enterprise is encouraged and rewarded, in this case, by a gift of £387,700, even though he has probably been the direct cause of more deaths than all the detected and undetected purveyors of diseased meat throughout the kingdom.

We are well aware that when undertaking any such scheme the London County Council is bound to act in accordance with Acts of Parliament; and that most Acts relating to "real estate" are framed with more regard to the interests, legitimate or illegitimate, of "property," than to the interests of the community or the health and well-being of the people. In this case they are acting under Part I. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, as amended by The Housing and Town Planning Act, 1909, which provides, we believe, that "compensation for disturbance" has to be paid, not in proportion to the intrinsic value of the property taken over, but in proportion to its yield, in this case in proportion to the tribute it enabled them to extort from the unfortunate 4,588 of the poorest and most dependent of the landless classes crowded on these disease breeding spots. But we have a shrewd suspicion that the Council has other powers, powers entrusted to them to rid the district they govern from public nuisances, dangerous to the health of the people, to which they might have had recourse had they desired to do so. Over twenty years ago, according to their own report, their attention was directed to these dangerous areas. The worn-out houses were admittedly unfit for human habitation. Have the Council no power to have them closed on these grounds? Or, even if not, have they not Parliamentary influence sufficient to secure them such powers? The present House of Commons would have lent a willing ear to their petition, and just now the House of Lords would have been very reluctant openly to oppose it. But no! The Council prefer to act on the line of least resistance and greatest cost to the inarticulate and easily deluded ratepayers. But it is by such actions on the part of our governing bodies that the surplus wealth of the community is stealthily drained from those who have little, still further to swell the unearned incomes of those who have much, and that men are richly rewarded for creating such plague-breeding spots in the very heart of our Empire.

L.H.B.

PORT OF LONDON AUTHORITY.

PROTESTS AGAINST PORT RATES.

A WORKING MODEL OF PROTECTION.

On October 31st, a copy of a letter from a number of prominent London manufacturers to the Port of London Authority appeared in the Press. The letter contained a strong protest against the action of the Authority in fixing the Port rates on goods entering and leaving the Port of London at such high figures as those appearing in the Schedule of Port Rates. Apparently the rates payable in respect of goods imported are, almost without exception, over 65 per cent. of the maximum rates scheduled to the Port of London Act (1908), while the export rates are about 25 per cent. of the same maximum schedule. It appears that in fixing the rates at these high figures the Authority are attempting to levy the full limit of their revenue powers from this source. When the Bill was before the House of Commons, the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Churchill, in fixing the limit of an annual revenue from port rates at £330,000, said that he wanted to give an adequate security that the interest on the port stock will be properly defrayed, and he had to choose some point which would leave a considerable margin, far more than needed, or likely to be needed." As the same time Mr. Churchill told the House of Commons that he wanted to give a general assurance to the traders of London and the metropolis of the very minute, not to say microscopic, character of the dues which would be levied, and he assured Parliament that nothing like £330,000 would be

required, indicating that about £180,000 at the outside would be sufficient.

On November 4th, at a General Meeting of the Mincing Lane Section of the London Chamber of Commerce, a resolution was passed protesting against the action of the Port of London Authority in imposing on the entrepôt trade of the Port the double burden of both import and export rates. The section has repeatedly pointed out to the Port Authority that to impose both import and export rates on this traffic will tend to divert trade from the Port of London. During the discussion attention was drawn to the matter with which the manufacturers' protest was concerned.

On November 14th there appeared in the Press a copy of a letter from the Indian Tea Association (London) protesting against the heavy rates and against the burden on the entrepôt trade. They stated their belief that as a consequence a large proportion of the distributing trade would be lost to London.

On November 11th the Chairman of the London Waterside Manufacturers' Association, Mr. L. A. Martin, had a letter in the TIMES. In this he stated that the Association were quite prepared to pay towards the upkeep of the Port by rates on goods, but protested that they were excessive. He stated that ordinary merchandise could be diverted to other ports, and that shipping companies could take their vessels elsewhere, but London manufacturers would be unable to move their works to escape the dues.

In the same issue of the TIMES there was a letter from Charles Charleton, Chairman of the Railway and Dock Rates and Charges Committee of the London Chamber of Commerce, and representing the Conference of London Trading Mercantile Associations and Exchanges. He also stated that the bodies he represented favoured the principle of levying rates on goods for the upkeep of the Port, but protested strongly against the Authority using the full extent of their revenue powers granted by Parliament. He said in conclusion: "I may add that I am personally of opinion that the collection of a more moderate revenue would not have aroused the antagonism of the traders, and would have sufficed for the needs of the Port."

An examination of the Schedule of Port Rates issued by the Port of London Authority reveals the fact that Protection has been instituted on a municipal scale. Goods are scheduled under no less than 904 headings, for each of which special rates are quoted, two rates for foreign trade, inward and outward; and two for coastwise trade, inward and outward. We find that leather from abroad, rough tanned, but not curried is rated at 1s. 4d. per ton, but curried and finished the rate is 3s. 4d. per ton, while hides are rated at dry 8d. per ton, wet 4d. per ton. For all goods the foreign export rates are less than half the import rates, while coastwise trade is rated at half the foreign rates.

This principle of Protection runs right through the schedule. Thus we find iron ore and pig iron from abroad at 23d. per ton, while iron and steel are rated under seven classes, the rates increasing as the articles are more highly finished; for example, rough iron castings are rated at 4d. per ton, finished at 7d. per ton, tubes, pipes and fittings, iron tyres, wire goods, at 7d. per ton, and bedsteads, screws, safes, saws, spades, tools, winches, type and lifting jacks at 1s. 4d. per ton. Ironmongery not otherwise rated is at 1s. 4d. per ton. Copper is rated at 1s. 4d. per ton, copper manufactures at 2s. 0d.

Even if it were granted that a tax on trade is necessary, which we do not grant, one would think that the rates should have been levied according to some general and impartial principle.

The disadvantages of the protective nature of the rates are becoming apparent. In the first place during the enquiry held by Lord St. Aldwyn in respect of the schedule, in February and March, this year, the report of which was published on April 18th, no less than 210 different commercial, manufacturing, trading and carrying associations and chambers of commerce protested against the rates levied on the goods with which they were respectively concerned. These included, the Aberdeen, Bradford, Cardiff, Glasgow, Goole, Gravesend, Hull, Kirkealdy, Leeds, London (16 sections), Newcastle and Gateshead, Sunderland, and West Ham Chambers of Commerce and the big London Railways and Shipping Companies. This is exactly what would happen if Protection were re-established in this country: every interest would fight for rates to suit its own particular purposes, the most powerful would win, and it would be a case of the devil take the hindmost.

Lord St. Aldwyn states in his report that "the sole interest of the Port of London Authority is to maintain and increase the trade of the Port." The best comment on this statement is a reference to the schedule of rates and to the protests of the manufacturing and trading interests.

In the first annual report just published the total capital expenditure is shown at £23,028,165 6s. 4d., and the interest paid on stocks at £839,643. That is, a yearly payment of over £800,000 is to be made for the upkeep of the Port apart from the ordinary working expenses. The consumers and traders in London will have to pay this, through increased rates, but those who have reaped and will continue to reap the benefit are the landowners in London and district. The more the docks are improved and the better they are worked, the higher will be the value of land. This interest on capital expenditure cannot justly be levied on the consumers and traders; for it represents interest on the amount which has been added to the land value of the area affected. The fair method of raising this amount would be a rate on land values. S.J.P.

HERE AND THERE.

According to an official report 92,000 acres have been obtained by the English and Welsh County Councils for Small Holdings.

"The United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values is scattering a lot of rascally leaflets broadcast over the country."—Mr. Pretyman, at Aberdeen, November 11th.

Speaking in the House of Commons on November 21st, Mr. J. A. Pease said that the Government proposed in the Finance Bill in next Parliament to afford discussion over the whole range of our taxation system.

The constituencies are being flooded with mendacious literature by the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, whose funds are mainly derived from foreign sources, and it is of the first importance that this mischievous propaganda should be effectively answered.—Mr. Pretyman, in the TIMES, November 23rd.

Westminster City Council has had to take action with reference to what is believed to be the smallest shop in its district. The tenant has been obstructing the public way of St. Martin's Court by placing goods on wooden trays on trestles outside his fruit shop. The tenant said he took the shop—which is only 18in. deep at one end and 24 in. deep at the other—at a heavy rental, and he is compelled to use the wooden trays to pay his way.

"If landlords were compelled to suffer much longer owing to the inquisition on them by the Radical Government of extra taxes, the time might arise when they would have to fight for their rights, and he would not hesitate, whenever the time came, to use once more the sword presented to Sir John Owen, an ancestor of his, for risking his life for principles."—Mr. Ormsby-Gore, M.P., at Portmadoc, October 26th.

THE PEOPLE'S BUDGET.—I don't believe the above, for it has robbed us of £200 and more subscriptions by which we were able to minister to our 8,000 poor people's needs. Please do help me in this riverside struggling parish, and enable us to help them. For our funds are bankrupt and we have the winter before us.—The Rev. Herbert Williams, The Clergy House, Tower Bridge, S.E.—MORNING POST, November 2nd.

By instructions of the Countess of Warwick, several portions of the Easton Estate at Dunmow were sold by auction on November 8th for building purposes. In all, twenty-eight lots, varying in size from eight acres to a quarter of an acre, were offered, and every one was sold, the total amount realised for twenty acres being £3,132. The competition for several of the best sites was very keen. One plot of two acres was purchased for £1,080.

In Belgium 72 per cent. of the total holdings are cultivated by tenants and only 28 per cent. by owners (598,306 and 231,319 respectively). Or if instead of taking the number of holdings we take the area of land, then we find that two-thirds of the cultivatable land is cultivated by tenants and one-third by owners (3,261,287 and 1,730,722 acres respectively).—NOTES OF ALLOTMENTS AND SMALL HOLDINGS ASSOCIATION November 21st.

We see from the Liberal Song Sheet issued by the Liberal Publication Department that they still exclude the Land Song from their list used at election meetings. East London people present at Mr. Lloyd George's Mile End Meeting did not approve of this omission. They called for the Land Song, and shouted the chorus with splendid enthusiasm and effect. We hope the Land Song will play a greater part in this campaign than it did a year ago.

* * *

The Australian Mortgage Land and Finance Co. Ltd., held its annual meeting in London on November 10th. The Chairman, Mr. F. A. White in submitting the report, entered into a long criticism of the Australian Land Tax. When he was not abusing the Labour Government, he was dwelling on the prosperity of the Company. "We are to-day—or shall be, we hope in a few days—in a position to invest our capital not only in Australia, but in any other part of the world."

* * *

"For a long time there has been a consistent effort on the part of the Unionists to keep the Navy outside the range of party politics."—MORNING POST, November 23rd. Yes, can there possibly be a living inhabitant of the British Isles who remembers the Dreadnought agitation during the far-off spring of 1909, or who can cast his or her memory back to the still more remote age when Blatchford, DAILY MAIL, Lord Charles Beresford and other good "Radicals" got up such a frightful Navy scare, in that far distant time—December, 1909, and January, 1910?

* * *

Mr. E. G. Pretymann, M.P., was the principal speaker at a public meeting held on November 18th, in the Dome, Brighton, under the auspices of the Land Union. Mr. Pretymann said that it was a compliment to the Land Union that at Nottingham on the previous day its policy had been practically adopted. It was the object of the Government to put the biggest burden of taxation on the land. (A Voice: "Quite right.") Mr. Pretymann was frequently interrupted and, according to the TIMES report, one member of the audience had to be ejected. This is satisfactory for Brighton.

* * *

A remarkable case concerning a home employment advertisement was reported in the Press on November 20th. A man and his wife were charged at Bow Street with being concerned together in stealing 83 postal orders, for 2s. 6d. each, by means of a trick. According to the police evidence the man, on arrest, made a statement to the effect that on November 18th he inserted an advertisement (offering home employment) to which he received roughly 10,000 replies. After receiving the replies he forwarded a memorandum to the senders inviting them to send him 2s. 6d. He said he inserted the advertisement because he was out of work. It meant either that or the workhouse. He had no employment to give, the whole thing being a swindle.

* * *

Messrs. Osborn and Mercer ask us to announce that the Isle of Lewis, the principal island of the Outer Hebrides, is to be sold, by order of Major Matheson. In extent about 500,000 acres, the island provides sport with deer, grouse, woodcock, and snipe, and it has three salmon rivers. The principal mansion, known as "Lewis Castle," standing in 600 acres of grounds, overlooks Stornoway. It was visited by King Edward and Queen Alexandra in 1902, when their Majesties planted trees in the grounds. It has also been visited by King George, and the late Duke of Edinburgh on one occasion spent a week there. The population of the island is about 28,000, of which Stornoway has 4,000, the majority of the remainder being crofters.—TIMES, November 18th.

* * *

Catherine of Braganza, wife of Charles II., was not a very happy Queen. Nevertheless we owe her a debt of gratitude in that it was practically owing to her that England first obtained a foothold in British India. The marriage was fostered by the Portuguese in every way, one way being the very handsome marriage portion assigned to the future Queen of England. Part of that dowry was the "Island of Bombay in the East Indies." As early as 1532 the Portuguese had captured that island, and in 1661, on the marriage of Charles II. and Catharine, it was ceded to England. The Portuguese did not realise the value of the gift, nor did Charles, who in 1668 granted the newly acquired territory to the East India Company for an annual payment of £10.—PROPERTY MARKET REVIEW, November 12th.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INTERESTS.

Glasgow University Recreation Ground: £500 an Acre.

Owing to increased laboratory accommodation encroaching on the present recreation ground, the University of Glasgow has acquired 15 acres of land at Anniesland from the trustees of the Kelvinside Estate, at £500 an acre. This land would be rated at about £2 per acre.

High Price for Small Holdings.

The Small Holdings Committee of the Holland (Lincs.) County Council have decided to purchase a farm near Cowbit in the occupation of Mr. Cook, and comprising 152 acres, at £53 per acre. The committee have, in addition, purchased a farm in the Moulton district, occupied by Mr. John Manby, of an area of about 92 acres.—MARK LANE EXPRESS, November 14th.

A Valuable Site.

According to the PROPERTY MARKET REVIEW for October 29th, a new opera house in Kingsway will be erected by Mr. O. Hammerstein, who has offered a rent of £4,875 a year for a lease for 99 years of a site in Kingsway between Sardinia Street and Portugal Street. The site in question has an area of about 24,350 square feet with frontages to Kingsway, Sardinia Street, Sheffield Street, and Portugal Street respectively. This ground rent is at the rate of £8,723 per acre.

A Public Valuation and a Withdrawal.

The TIMES of November 5th said that despite a very large attendance at their auction of Essex land, Messrs. Kemsley were unable to do business with the more important lots. These were situated at East Tilbury, near Low Street Station, with good frontages to the Thames and public roads, and had a total area of 885 acres. For St. Clerc's, a freehold farm of 473 acres, the final offer was £11,600, and for Gobions, a farm of 398 acres, £9,800. These offers were at the rate of £24 10s. per acre.

Lord Manvers's Estates.

Two of Lord Manvers's Lincolnshire estates were offered by auction at Lincoln yesterday. The Newball estate, including the manor house and other farms, of a total acreage of 1,088, passed in one lot at £17,000. Six of the ten lots into which it was then divided realized £15,020, the Manor Farm and 352 acres making £7,450, and Grange Farm, 257 acres, £4,075. The Newball Wood Farm, 132 acres, made £2,050; and the Langton Estate Farm, 893 acres, was sold in one lot at £15,900. The Woodlands failed to sell.—TIMES, Nov. 5th.

Miners' Wages Reduced.

The Northumberland Coalowners met at Newcastle on Saturday under the presidency of Mr. R. O. Lamb. Representatives of the colliery mechanics', deputies', enginemen's and firemen's associations attended. The question of wages was discussed, and it was proposed by the owners that there should be a reduction equal to 1½d. per day in all classes, excepting the firemen, who were to suffer a reduction of 2 per cent. The men's delegates agreed, though, so far as the enginemen were concerned, the decision will be submitted to the association for confirmation.—MORNING POST, October 31st.

L.C.C. and the Government.

The Improvements Committee of the London County Council reported that they have been in communication with his Majesty's Commissioners of Works as to a site in Kingsway which the Government desire to acquire for the purpose of erecting offices for the Public Trustee. It is stated that the site suggested has an area of about 10,750 square feet and frontages to Kingsway, Sardinia Street, and Lincoln's Inn Fields respectively, but the site available for the erection of buildings will have an area of about 8,000 square feet. The Government ask that the land be conveyed subject to a perpetual rent charge of £2,000 a year.—PROPERTY MARKET REVIEW, October 29th.

The Risks of Small Holders.

An experienced farmer and owner of agricultural land, speaking to me about the prospects of small holders who are taking land up as fast as it is obtained for them by public authority in the North, says he sympathises with the tenants who are taking upon their shoulders responsibilities which may easily become irksome to them after a while. Rents of 32s. 6d. an acre and

"all that comes against the holding" will be a heavy drain upon their resources, unless they are men with capital. A bad season or a few losses would bring the men to bankruptcy. Since the first flutterings and scramble for allotments subsided, the eagerness to take up land has subsided.—MARK LANE EXPRESS, November 14th.

Landowner on Land Values.

He happened to be among those who were selling land at present. He always thought it very much better if possible for a landowner who had land which he was unable to look after himself, or unable to visit as much as he would like, to sell it, and that was one reason why he thought it better to part with outlying estates. He did not agree with Lord Carrington when he said that the Government's land policy had made the value of agricultural land jump up. The value of such land had been growing gradually in years past because prices were better and farmers had adapted themselves more to the new requirements. It was owing to these things that land had increased in value, and not owing to the policy of the Government.—Lord Manvers at Collingham Show.

Another Valuable Site.

London's next new theatre is to be built by Mr. H. B. Irving and it will be called the Irving Theatre. Appropriately enough, it will stand within about a hundred yards of the statue of Sir Henry Irving, which is to be placed at the side of the National Portrait Gallery. The new playhouse will have its main entrance in Charing Cross Road, and will face Wyndham's Theatre, while on either side are the Alhambra and the Hippodrome. We understand the site will change hands for £100,000, but all the land will not be occupied by the Irving. It is proposed to provide seats for two thousand people, and special attention is to be paid to the stage. We believe the house will be completed in about fourteen months, when Mr. Irving will open it with a Shakespearian play on his return from Australia.—PROPERTY MARKET REVIEW, October 29th.

High Prices for School Sites in Glamorgan.

According to the SOUTH WALES DAILY NEWS, at a meeting of the Glamorgan Education Committee, held in Cardiff on October 25th, several members protested against the recommendation of the Buildings Sub-Committee that a site at Tonna be purchased for £300, conditionally upon a stipulation that the Council pay half the cost of an approach road being withdrawn. Alderman Hughes pointed out that this was at the rate of £600 an acre. Further, the recommendation to offer £350 for the freehold of a site at Duffryn, Rhondda, was at the rate of £500 an acre, and to offer £500 to Lord Jersey for a half-acre site at Briton Ferry meant £1,000 an acre. He thought these prices were very exceptional, and he would like some explanation.

Mr. W. Howell observed that they had been paying anything from £1,000 an acre at Port Talbot, and other districts saw they could do the same.

It was agreed by five votes to four that the matter be referred back, in order to see if other sites could be obtained, or, in the alternative, to apply for compulsory powers.

The Need for Valuation and Taxation.

On the question of "Derelict Allotments," alluded to in last week's "Seasonable Topics" on page 509, I am reminded of an instance, an extraordinary case of wilful neglect, that came under my observation a few weeks back. A man—said to be a very poor man—was summoned before a bench of county magistrates for non-payment of rates. Strange as it may seem, he had been exempted from paying any rates for a long time. He owned, actually owned, an acre of land, and this he was too lazy to cultivate. Instead of being put to good use, it lay derelict, a weed producer and disseminator. The magistrates made an order, but I have not heard whether the defendant paid up, or whether a distress warrant was issued. There was certainly nothing to be seized upon his land, neither crops or stocks.—"Northern Notes" in MARK LANE EXPRESS, November 14th.

A Farm or a Building Estate.

An extensive area of ground, which, although known as a farm, forms in reality an estate suitable for the conduct of building operations on a large scale, is shortly to be sold by auction by Messrs. Edwin Fox, Bousfield and Co. It is situate within a short distance of the Hammersmith Broadway, and has a frontage

of more than 1,000 feet to Fulham Palace Road, and another of nearly 400 feet to the River Thames in the rear, and in its entirety it contains an area of about 21 acres. It is seldom that such an extensive plot of ground in a London suburb comes into the market, so that the present offers an exceptional opportunity for securing a site which is capable of immediate development for building purposes, and which, the auctioneers intimate, will be sold at a price enabling a purchaser to realise a large profit from his operations. Having regard to the situation of the land, it appears to be well adapted for the erection of numerous shops and houses in the Fulham Palace Road, whilst the frontage to the Thames might be made available for the purposes of wharves and factories, and the central portions of the estate would be suitable for the erection of medium-sized villas. The property is of freehold tenure, and it is estimated that by a judicious scheme of development a building frontage of between 8,000 and 9,000 feet might be made available.—STATIST, November 12th.

"After Criminal Business."

The YORKSHIRE POST of October 31st told the following story:—

On the conclusion of the criminal business, at the Hull Quarter Sessions, on Saturday, the Recorder, Mr. Harold Thomas, heard an appeal by Mr. T. R. Ferens, M.P., against the poor rate for the parish of Sculcoates, made in April last, against his house on Holderness Road, which had been assessed at £300 gross, and £265 rateable.

Mr. Ferens had objected to these figures before the Assessment Committee, but the Committee refused to make any reduction.

Mr. Konstam, for the appellant, said that Mr. T. R. Ferens, M.P., had recently purchased Holderness House, in respect of which, under the occupation of Mrs. Jalland, the gross value was fixed at £125, and the rateable value £110. The house was a portion of the Jalland Hall estate, purchased for the Hull Garden Village Company.

Mr. Walter Stickney, land agent, agreed that the assessment for the Holderness House had not been altered for 35 years. The land was worth £13,000, the price Mr. Ferens paid for it, or £1,200 per acre.

Mr. Percy Runton said that over £2,700 had been spent by Mr. Ferens on alterations. Before they were made he did not think a tenant would be found to pay £100 a year.

Sir W. Alfred Gelder, M.P., put the value of Holderness House at £200 gross and £160 net.

Mr. Jeeves, for the respondents, submitted that the house was thoroughly modernised, and admirably adapted for the purpose of a residence for Mr. Ferens. It could be let for £300.

Mr. Douglas Boyd, superintendent assistant overseer, said he could give the name of a substantial Hull gentleman who would give more than £300 a year for the property.

Colonel W. H. Wellsted thought the house would let at £300. In his opinion, about £2,500 had been spent on permanent improvements.

After hearing Mr. F. S. Brodrick, architect, and Mr. L. Hebblewaith, land agent, the Recorder allowed the appeal with costs, fixing the gross value at £250, and the net value at £200.

"Progress & Poverty" for 4d.

UNABRIDGED.

By Post 5½d. From the Publishers,
JOHN BAGOT, Limited, Middleton, Manchester,
or Booksellers.

Also in Red Cloth, 8d., by Post, 10d.

Very handy for the Pocket,

A SUITABLE CHRISTMAS PRESENT IS THIS
HANDSOMELY BOUND BOOK.

From LAND VALUES PUBLICATION DEPT.,
376 & 377, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

LORD WINCHILSEA AND THE LABOURER.

The following verses appeared, unsigned, in the *CARLISLE JOURNAL* in the early 'nineties. They are quite in the manner of the late Sir Wilfrid Lawson:—

"Will you walk into my Union?"
Said the Nobleman to Hodge.
"It's the grandest kind of Union
Where anyone can lodge.
Will you, will you, will you, will you,
Won't you, dearest Hodge?"

"Will you walk into my Union?—
You'll find good comrades there:
There's Chaplin and Jim Lowther
And Lord Herries in the chair.
Then you'll walk into our Union,"
Said the noble-looking fly,
"It's the choicest kind of Union
That ever you did spy.
Will you, will you, will you, will you,
Won't you have a try?"

"We landlords and we starving peers
Are very much afraid,
That if things continue as they are
Our rents will not be paid.
And so the British peasant
We are taking by the hand,
Each honest hind and labourer
Will rally round the land.

"You know that things are far too cheap,
As wise men oft have said;
I don't mean only beasts and sheep,
But I also speak of bread.
I'm sure, to make it dearer
You must be all intent,
If you'll pay higher price for bread
Then we'll get higher rent.

"The landlord and the farmer
And the tenant, all the three
United in a threefold cord,
How happy we shall be!
To raise the price of everything
Shall be our steadfast bent—
To raise the price of everything—
But specially of rent.

"We'll circumvent swine fever,
And we'll ticket foreign meat,
With which the swindling butchers
So often try to cheat;
Then by lowering rates and taxes,
But by always raising rent:
So you'll walk into our Union—
Now you see what's our intent.

"We nobles and we landlords,
O how we love you all!
United we shall firmly stand,
Divided we shall fall.
Our feelings have for many a year
Within our breasts been pent,
But now you know them, brothers dear,
So help us with our rent.

"Old England in the future
Shall stand against each foe,
If only bread shall still be high
And wages still be low.
Let every farmer's purse be drained
And labourer's strength be spent—
The object of our Union's gain'd
If we only keep up rent.

"Then you'll walk into our Union
Now you understand what's meant:
For none can make the least mistake—
It's nothing else than rent."

QUESTIONS IN PARLIAMENT.

LAND VALUERS' METHODS.

On November 21st:—

The Marquis of TULLIBARDINE asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether valuers under the Finance Act on receiving an appointment as such undertook not only to keep secret from the public the result of their valuations, but also not to divulge the terms of their engagement or methods of valuation.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: On appointment by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, valuers undertake not to disclose information obtained by them, except to the Inland Revenue or for the purposes of the Finance Act.

The Marquis of TULLIBARDINE: Would a valuer get into trouble if he told the public the terms of his engagement and the methods by which he has to value?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: These valuers are treated exactly in the same way as other officers of Inland Revenue, and they are subject to the same regulations as other officials of the department.

SUMS PAID TO IRISH LANDLORDS.

Mr. KENNEDY asked the Chief Secretary if he would state the amounts paid to vendors of Irish land under the Irish Land Purchase Acts to the most recent available date.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that up to the 12th instant £62,043,177 has been advanced to vendors under the Irish Land Purchase Acts, 1870 to 1909. The amounts of advances in the financial years ending March 31st, 1907, 1908, 1909, and 1910 were respectively £5,747,644, £4,954,281, £6,430,469, and £6,920,005. In accordance with the regulations issued under the Irish Land Act, 1909, vendors were allowed up to April 1, 1910, to choose whether they would accept payment partly or wholly in stock. No advances in stock, therefore, were made during the year ending March 31st, 1910. Since that date the Commissioners have advanced £1,433,184 in cash, £403,369 partly in cash and partly in 2½ per cent. stock, £105,884 in 2½ per cent. stock, and £70,363 in 3 per cent. stock.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DISCUSSION.

MR. ASQUITH ON THE GOVERNMENT'S POLICY.

Speaking at the National Liberal Club on November 19th, Mr. Asquith said:—

I thank you with all my heart for the more than cordial greeting which you have given to the toast so kindly proposed by my friend Captain Hemphill. We meet here on the eve of a General Election (cheers), and my first question is, Why is Parliament about to be dissolved? The conduct of the Government in advising a Dissolution was denounced yesterday in the House of Commons by Mr. Balfour as a breach of all Constitutional precedent. (Laughter.) I agree that it is not easy to find a case in which a British Government, enjoying the confidence on all questions of general policy of a large majority of the House of Commons, that House having not yet completed the first year of its Parliamentary existence, has felt itself obliged to advise a Dissolution.

JUSTIFICATION FOR NEW PRECEDENTS.

But new circumstances demand new precedents (cheers), and the circumstances here are without example in our Constitutional history. What are the circumstances? No House of Commons ever more clearly represented the emphatically declared will of the people than that which was returned in January, 1906. Yet in almost every attempt which it made to give effect to the wishes of those who elected it, it was systematically thwarted, baffled, defeated by the House of Lords—the body which, then, at any rate—I am not sure it is the case now (cheers)—claimed a gift of divining the people's will, and the right of compulsory reference over the heads of the people's representatives. The climax was reached when for the first time the whole finance of the year, on which the Commons had spent six months of care and toil, was summarily rejected. In the new House of Commons which was elected in January of this year there was from the first an assured majority of over 100 in favour of limiting the Veto of the Lords. It was by such a majority that the Government resolutions were carried last April. The lamented death of the King on the eve of battle

was the signal for a temporary truce, and from June to November the best efforts of the Conference, of which I was a member, were directed to arriving if possible at an agreed settlement. Those efforts were unavailing, and we are back where we were in April—with this difference—that we must now put aside the method of compromise (loud cheers and a voice, "No compromise," followed by further cheers) as a thing which has been tried and has failed. Negotiations are over and war is declared. (Cheers.)

THE LIBERAL GRIEVANCES.

I come now to my second question. What are we fighting for? Whatever may have been the case a year ago, the grievances of the party of progress are no longer denied. (Cheers.) It is now admitted that under existing conditions Liberal legislation does not get a fair chance. It is admitted that the popular will, though clearly and decisively expressed at the polls, may be frustrated or delayed by a body which has no representative authority. It is admitted tacitly (cheers), if not expressly, that it is only when the Liberal Party is in power that the House of Lords claims or exercises its supposed right to compel a Dissolution. We have, you see, made some progress in this controversy after all. (Cheers.) This state of things, with its unevenness, its injustice, its deliberate and mischievous distortion of the first principles of democracy—this state of things we are determined to bring to an end—once and for all. (Loud cheers.)

When then I am asked what we are fighting for, I answer, for two things; fair play for progressive legislation, and the establishment in all its fulness of representative government. We are told, I know, that the plans which we have put forward and the present House of Commons has approved would substitute for the evils of the present system a greater evil still—the unchecked domination of a Single-Chamber. (Laughter.) It is this prospect which fills Lord Rosebery with repugnance and even with terror. (Laughter.) To his imagination it would mark the transition from freedom to slavery. (Laughter.) But surely Lord Rosebery, and those who share his apprehensions, must be aware that during a large part of their political existence—probably the larger part—they have been living under this very yoke of the Single-Chamber tyranny. (Cheers.) They have only to go back to the years between 1900 and 1905 to witness the spectacle of a House of Commons passing measures which had never been submitted to the electorate and which at the first opportunity that same electorate repudiated with unexampled emphasis (cheers), and passing these measures into law without check, delay, or even remonstrance from the Second Chamber—whose supreme duty is by some persons supposed to be to safeguard the people from the domination of their elected representatives. (Laughter.)

NOT A SINGLE-CHAMBER SYSTEM.

But we are not proposing to set up a Single-Chamber system. We are proposing such a change in the relations between the two Chambers as will confine the Second Chamber to those subordinate functions (cheers) which are admittedly appropriate to such a body (laughter), and will secure the fair and even working of the two Chambers whichever party is for the time being in power. (Cheers.) The principle upon which we take our stand is simply this—that in a democratic country the chosen representatives of the people ought to have the controlling voice, not only in policy, but in the shaping of the laws. (Cheers.) We have carefully guarded against possible abuses. (Hear, hear.) By shortening the duration of Parliament we bring automatically to an end any House of Commons as to which there is any presumption that it may have outstayed or outlived its representative authority. Where the two Houses differ we provide for such opportunities of conference and such an interposition of delay as would effectually frustrate any attempt by a scratch majority to rush unpopular legislation out of touch with public opinion. We except from the new arrangement legislation which is introduced in the later years of a Parliament until the electorate have had an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. It is subject to all these safeguards, which prevent any House of Commons that might be so minded from stealing a march on the people, and secure to the Second Chamber large powers of delay and opportunities for amendment and revision—it is subject to these safeguards that we ask that in future the will of the people as expressed by their representatives in the House of Commons shall within the lifetime of a single Parliament be effectively supreme. (Cheers.) There is nothing revolutionary in these proposals. On the contrary, they proceed strictly on the lines which our constitutional development has hitherto

followed, and secure to the people through and in the House of Commons the same supreme authority over the making of the laws which they have already, step by step and stage by stage, acquired in the appointment of the Executive and the control of finance. (Cheers.)

WHAT THE FIGHT IS AGAINST.

I proceed now to my third and last question—What are we fighting against? This is a much more difficult question to answer. (Cheers.) A year ago the House of Lords was depicted on Tory platforms as the Ark of the Constitutional Covenant, the cheap defence, nay, the last refuge, of our popular liberties. (Laughter.) It had just, by a supreme display of patriotic courage, rejected, root and branch, the most iniquitous and unpopular Budget of modern times; and with these blushing honours thick upon it (laughter) it made a confident appeal to the gratitude and admiration of the country. Ah, gentlemen, what a change eleven months, eleven short months, have wrought! (Cheers.) This ancient and picturesque structure (laughter) has been condemned by its own inmates as unsafe. (Cheers.) The parricidal pickaxes are already at work (laughter and cheers), and Constitutional jerry-builders (laughter) are hurrying from every quarter with new plans. (Laughter.) Dr. Johnson once said of a celebrated criminal (laughter), who after his condemnation showed literary activity (laughter), "Depend upon it, Sir, when a man is going to be hanged in a fortnight it concentrates his mind wonderfully." (Cheers.) The activity recently displayed by the House of Lords in providing itself with a successor (laughter) is surely a miracle of this kind of concentration. In a single sitting, not, I believe, unduly prolonged (laughter); the venerable institution which has withstood the storm and stress of ages was transformed—in principle, of course; some of the details are still withheld (laughter)—into a brand-new modern Senate. There has been nothing like it since the memorable night of August 4th, 1789. The motive for this feverish exhibition of destructive and constructive ardour is not far to seek. The Tory Party were determined at all hazards not to face another General Election with the incubus of the House of Lords on their back. There must be something to put in its place—something, it did not matter for the moment very much what (laughter and cheers)—but something that could be called a Second Chamber with a coat, however thin, of democratic varnish.

LORD ROSEBERY'S RESOLUTIONS.

And this is how it comes about that the country is suddenly faced with an alternative policy to ours in Lord Rosebery's Resolutions. This, remember, is the scheme, and the only scheme, which has been approved with practical unanimity by the House of Lords itself. And what is this new Second Chamber which is presented to the country as the real solution of our Constitutional difficulties? It is a nebulous body, of uncertain size, composed in undefined proportions of hereditary peers, of official and qualified peers, and of peers "chosen"—not necessarily elected (laughter)—but "chosen"—chosen by somebody, somewhere, somehow. I said a moment ago that some of the details are lacking, and the authors of this ingenuous proposal seem to think it unreasonable that at this stage they should be called on for fuller particulars. They apparently expect the country to vote for what is to all intents and purposes a ghost. (Laughter.) But it is on these very particulars that the merits or demerits of the scheme depend. According as they are filled in one way or the other, your new Second Chamber may be better than, or as bad as, or even worse than the existing House of Lords. (Cheers.) In the meantime, it is no answer to our demand for an immediate and effectual removal of the obstacle that blocks the road of progress to say that, in course of time, it may be found possible to evolve a Second Chamber better fitted than the present House of Lords to exercise the true functions of such a body. I have always hoped and thought that it would. But I have got to deal—you have got to deal—the country has got to deal—with things here and now. We need an instrument that can be set to work at once, which will get rid of deadlocks and give us the fair and even chance in legislation to which we are entitled, and which is all that we demand. The plan of the Government will do so, and it is the only plan before the country which even pretends to meet the urgent necessities of the case.

A MEANS TO GREATER ENDS.

To us as a party, Constitutional changes are but the means to further and greater ends. We have before us great ideals in the social and economic sphere—ideals toward the realisation of which we have made some progress during the last five years,

mainly because of the financial omnipotence of the Lower House (cheers); but we find ourselves hampered at every stage on the road by the over-riding powers of a Chamber overwhelmingly Tory in composition and the natural champion of threatened interests and privileges. (Cheers.) These great causes of which we are trustees cannot afford to go on waiting. It is for their sake that we are bringing the matter to an issue. We ask gentlemen for your confidence (cheers), and for that of the party outside. We have passed through a troubled year, in which we have had to encounter difficulties and perils, exceptional in number and degree and some of them not only wholly unforeseen but unforeseeable. We believe that, nevertheless, the party is stronger now both inside the House of Commons and in the country than it was eleven months ago. Give us your confidence once more, and with united forces and disciplined energy we shall make the longest step that has been taken in the lifetime of any of us for the real enfranchisement of the people. (Loud cheers.)

MR. BALFOUR'S LAND POLICY.

Speaking at the annual meeting of the National Union of Conservatives and Constitutional Associations at Nottingham on November 17th, Mr. Balfour said:—

Now the difficulty of a speaker on this annual occasion is that he is expected to survey the whole field of party politics, and it is absolutely impossible to do that in any detail. I must ask this large audience, representative as they are of every part of England, to take what I say to-night in connection with other speeches which I have made quite recently, developing what, at all events my friends and I conceive to be the true policy of the Unionist Party. I must, therefore, be forgiven, and I know you will forgive me, if I pass with only a reference on such immense questions as the Osborne judgment and land policy. I have dealt with these questions in recent utterances at considerable length, and I will not repeat what I have already said, except, perhaps, to emphasise that, so far as our land policy is concerned, we, as a party, desire to see the number of freehold owners largely, as it is now, in spite of what our opponents say, increased. (Cheers.) We desire to see small occupations, where small occupations are economically possible, and when there are small occupations we desire to see them not occupations at the will of a county council or of a Government Department, or of what is better for the tenant than either county council or Government Department—namely, the landlord—we desire to see them freehold ownerships. (Cheers.) We desire further in the case of those occupiers of land who already have ability, experience, and knowledge of what small occupations mean, we desire to see whether suitable arrangements can be made for the sitting tenant to become the owner when, as may well often be the case, that is in accordance with his interests, his desires, and the general equity and justice of the situation. (Cheers.)

Well, there are two questions which I must mention—otherwise I know that I shall be reproached for having left them alone—but which, with all I have got to say to you, it is quite impossible I should dwell on. I mean the way the party should deal, if and in so far as they have power to deal, with the provisions of the Budget. There are two questions which, I believe, have been thoroughly threshed out at the Conference—I could not be present myself, but that, I understand, is the case. I would only say this, that in our opinion it is absolutely necessary that we should do what we can to remedy the gross injustice which has been done to the licence-holders, who have been treated, as we have often pointed out before, as no legitimate interest has ever been treated before. So far as the other controversial branch, or one of the other controversial trades, I ought to say, is concerned, we think that the avowed policy of the Government should be exclusively embodied in legislation; that agricultural land should be wholly free—agricultural land already overburdened, already unduly taxed, should be wholly free, as they admit that it ought to be, from the oppressive action of the new taxes; that the serious effects which, as I am told, are being produced on the business of the building trade and on all that is connected with the building trade should be as far as possible relieved; but above all that, if you are going to raise taxes from urban land, those taxes should go to the city communities in which the lands are situated, and that they should be used, as they ought to be used, for the locality in which the lands are situated and not be dissipated broadcast over the whole area of the country with which they have no direct connection whatever. (Cheers.)

MR. LLOYD GEORGE ON LIBERALISM.

In an interview on "The Humanity of Liberalism," which appeared in the DAILY CHRONICLE, on November 24th, Mr. Lloyd George said, among other things:—

Believe me, no community is safe where Liberalism is a dead thing, where the unhappy multitudes have to choose between a temporising Conservatism and a heaven-promising Socialism. Unless Liberalism is definitely improving the lot of those who feel themselves unhappy and hindered, unless Liberalism gives them the sense of actual movement towards betterment, unless in Liberalism they feel that they have something to which, without the fear of being fooled and dragged nowhither, they can hitch the wagon of their hopes—in other words, unless Liberalism is an active and real force in the national life, you can look for nothing in the people but impatient disgust and a most dangerous inclination to rebellion.

There are foolish people who truly and verily believe that this modern, earnest, and triumphant Liberalism is a crusade against wealth. How can they come to such an opinion when they know that our reforms depend upon the prosperity of British wealth, and when they reflect that Liberalism is the faith of some of the very richest men in the kingdom? Into the small hours of the morning employers of labour and men of vast capital waited in the House of Commons during the passing of the Budget and followed me into the lobby to vote for the super-tax. I do not think that there are more devoted Liberals in the House of Commons than its very richest Members. No; Liberalism is not a crusade against wealth. Personally I regard with admiration and gratitude the man who, by the exercise of his ability, sets up a great industry, gives worthy employment to his fellow-countrymen, and uses his just profits to the advantage of the whole community. Active and beneficent wealth is a blessing to society. Who can doubt it? But there is a wealth got by grinding the faces of the poor, a cruel and most devilish wealth which is wrung from the blood and tears of those in the community least able to defend themselves—the wealth of the sweater! Against that wealth, with all the angels of God on our side, Liberalism makes war, and will continue to make war till the loathsome stain of it is washed away from the records of humanity.

Consider the case of the landlord. In many cases you will find excellent men in possession of estates, men who may be said to earn their incomes, and certainly to spend them honourably and well. But can any man say that the landlords of this country, as a whole, have really done their duty?—that they earn their incomes?—that they are working for the good of the English race?—that their occupation of land is a success? Many of them keep agents to do their business, they cannot be troubled with the matter, land is so little to them that they find it a bore even to study its balance-sheet. Now Liberalism warns this type of man. Liberalism regards land as it regards industry—it is something to be worked, developed, and made contributory to the social welfare. Liberalism will not let men use land as a toy. Liberalism demands an account of such stewardship. You see, land is so tremendously precious to a great and numerous nation inhabiting a small island. There is no room for waste. Political economy, eugenics, commonsense, the simple instinct of any man who really thinks about the matter at all, tells us that we must do everything in our power to increase our rural population. Instead of this ceaseless tide of emigration to the towns, we want an ever-increasing yeomanry, a vast rural population of homesteaders. And we hold that if a landlord regarded his estate as a manufacturer regards his business, if he laboured with all his might to develop his land to the very utmost, the countryside would not be deserted. Liberalism stands for access to the land for those who will work it. Call it if you will a crusade against wealth, stigmatise it if you like as a mere hatred of landlordism—but is there a single dispassionate man who will not say that a till d England is better than a preserved England, and that peasants are not of greater value to the State than pheasants? I call it patriotism—this crusade of Liberalism for a peopled England. Real patriotism. Sound business.

THE RESULT OF TOWN PLANNING.

There is in Copenhagen a society corresponding to our Housing and Town Planning Council called The Association for Beautifying Copenhagen. Mr. P. H. Elbaek has addressed the following argument to that Association:—

You work for the beautifying of our city, making it brighter, healthier, and better for us all to live in. You employ artistic ability, and devotion, and spend money and labour for this object. Have you considered what happens every time you

carry out a new scheme? The more beautiful, the more healthy and the more pleasant you make the city, the more valuable becomes—not the houses, but the land on which the houses are built. If an ugly square, or a mean street is made attractive and pretty, people live there much more readily than before, houses and apartments find tenants more easily—rent advances!

You expend energy and money upon ideal objects, but the ground landlords in the end put the substantial result thereof in their own pockets. This preposterous arrangement can only be remedied in one way—by society taxing this ground value, which society as a whole has created. This is the only just tax which leaves to everybody what rightfully belongs to them. Support your own policy by advancing the Taxation of Land Values.

LAND VALUES IN LONDON.

The President of the Surveyors' Institution, Mr. Leslie R. Vigers delivered the Presidential address at the Surveyors' Institution on November 14th.

Cost of Station Sites.

In the course of his address Mr. Vigers said that the Central London Railway and the tubes since built were now carrying 148½ millions of passengers yearly. The cost of station sites for the Central London and the other three tubes had been large, amounting to close upon £2,600,000, including the Whitechapel and Bow Railway, and the widening of the District Railway. The cost of sites had varied from 7s. 11d. to £35 per foot super., and adjoining property had not been injuriously affected to any great extent. He estimated that damage according to the gross assessments at .108 per cent. of the value in the case of the Central London Railway, .039 per cent. in that of the Baker Street and Waterloo Railway, and .127 per cent. in the case of the Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton Railway. In nearly every instance the injury was at station sites where the shafts had to pass through the upper layers of the soil before entering the London clay, and the estimate included damage to adjoining houses by the removal of those on the station sites.

Increase of Rents.

Rental values along the routes had not diminished judging from the fact that along that of the Baker Street and Waterloo line gross assessments for rating purposes had increased between 1906 and 1909 by 8.73 per cent., along the Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton line by 17.3 per cent., and along the Central London line 32 per cent. from 1900 to 1906, and since by 8.7 per cent. The cost of the land and the compensation had amounted to, per mile, £75,287 for the Central London tube; £93,656 for the Bakerloo; £49,875 for the Charing Cross and Hampstead tube; and £43,199 for the Great Northern, Piccadilly, and Brompton tube. Motor omnibuses paid no rates for the use of the roads, while the tube railways, which did not use the roads, had to contribute towards their upkeep. The four tubes just mentioned paid £66,954 in rates in 1909. Reform of rating procedure was urgently needed, and he favoured the idea of having a special tribunal of experts, a lawyer, a rating surveyor, and a man of business, to hear appeals respecting special properties.

Form IV.

The faults of "the famous Form IV.," which had curtailed professional holidays, lay rather with the Act than with the Form. The complicated and different "values" set up by the Act made it difficult to draw up a set of questions which any property owner might answer without professional advice. It had, he knew, been stated that owners need not answer those questions the replies to which they did not know and could not ascertain without expense. It seemed to be an example of "Hobson's choice," as few owners would care to risk a provisional valuation being made on an entirely wrong basis owing to full information not having been placed before the official valuers. The task before those valuers was one beside which the labours of Hercules paled into insignificance. Not only had they, in the words of the Act, to value "all land in the United Kingdom, showing separately the total value and site value respectively of the land, and, in the case of agricultural land, the value for agricultural purposes," but the valuation must be of "each piece of land which is under separate occupation," and, in the cases where the owner may think it desirable to ask for an appointment, "any part of any land . . . shall be separately valued." The number of different valuations thus required would be so stupendous that the brain reeled in the endeavour to form some idea of the ground to be covered.

OWNERSHIP VERSUS TENANCY.

Under the title "A Pilgrimage of British Farming," the *Times* published a series of 21 articles which dealt pretty fully with the condition of farming in the greater part of England, and in the Lowlands of Scotland. We reproduce here the 21st article which appeared on October 31st, in which the writer summarises his impressions of agriculture and land tenure in this country.

At Perthshire our pilgrimage had perforce to be determined; we had set out to get a rapid survey of the arable farming of the country, but though many important districts yet remained unvisited, our own harvest now claimed attention. The early potato growing in Ayrshire, the intensive cultivation of Lancashire and Cheshire, the mixed farming in Shropshire, the corn growing of the Midlands, and the market-gardening of Bedfordshire should all have a place in a survey of even the arable farming of Great Britain, but must be reserved for another occasion.

Ours had been a rapid survey, so rapid that any writing about it can only be justified by the fact that singly or collectively we possessed a considerable measure of previous acquaintance with most of the districts visited, which gave us some power of arriving at a general impression on seeing county after county in quick succession.

What, perhaps, we had hardly been prepared for was the great variety presented by British farming and the diversity of the methods that are practised. Great Britain is not a very large country, and the variations of climate and soil which occur within its limits might be considered trifling by men accustomed to continental areas, yet every few miles one finds oneself in a totally different country from a farming point of view. This means that the British farmer has learnt, partly by old tradition, partly by his personal skill, to adapt his methods very nicely to his particular environment, whether of soil, or of markets, or of climate. One sometimes felt inclined to disagree with the local practices, which a wider experience of other districts might have taught the farmer to modify with advantage; but one cannot be too diffident in advancing such opinions, so great is the value of tradition and experience in the workaday matters of agriculture. This diversity of British farming has been very imperfectly reported; many of the systems in vogue have not yet reached the text-books, and are little known outside their own districts, though they deserve serious economic study, and will doubtless receive it as the agricultural colleges grow in strength and the members of their staff obtain more leisure for personal investigation, for such investigations of local systems might easily lead to a most instructive method of teaching of what we might call "Comparative Agriculture."

But if the methods of British agriculture are very diverse, they seem uniformly to be meeting with a very fair measure of success, for one cannot but conclude that the industry as a whole is in a prosperous condition and has healthily and stably recovered from the great depression that lay upon it as recently as fifteen years ago. Our views were doubtless coloured by the fact that we almost inevitably saw one of the leading farmers in each district we visited, and did not meet with the number of other men who from lack of business aptitude or some initial handicap were still struggling desperately to make both ends meet. Still, we concluded that farming is prosperous and is yielding a fair return upon the capital embarked in it, though it is never likely to lead to a fortune. Of this the best external evidence was that we could very rarely hear of any farms to be let, while in every part of the country the good farms are bespoken long before they come into the market. Rents, too, are rising; we heard over and over again of re-letting at an increased figure, especially where the farms were put up for competition. We even heard of one or two cases of rent being raised on a sitting tenant, and no landlord or agent will incur the unpopularity of such an action unless he has very solid grounds for supposing that it is justified. Next it was noticeable that nearly all the advanced and skilfully-adapted farming we saw was being done by tenants. Large tenant farming has for the last century or more been the special characteristic of British agriculture; under this method has been built up our supremacy in production per acre and in live stock, and to-day it still seems the most effective form of dealing with the land on a wholesale scale. As a system it offers many points for criticism; it is often illogical, but its prime justification is that it works well when the landlords and tenants are such as we find them in this country. In the majority of cases the tenant is entirely on the side of the landlord, though their interests may appear to be contrary. We heard but rarely of any cases of injustice

or oppression, and when they did arise it was generally over game; as, for example, one landlord who had warned a tenant that he would be turned out if he did not take his fowls off the stubbles. In the south and east of England the game sometimes are allowed to interfere seriously with the farming.

We found little desire on the part of the large farmer to become his own landlord; he wants all his capital to put into his business. Occasionally we met with a farmer who had been driven to purchase his farm because the estate had been sold, and his business would have suffered too seriously from a change, but in most cases he was paying as much or more than his previous rent as interest on the mortgage, besides having put down a portion of the price in hard cash. Even when land can be bought outright at 20 years' purchase it can rarely be mortgaged at less than $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., which leaves only one-half per cent. for materials, for repairs, and other allowances which dip deeply into the landlord's pocket. Above all, in bad times the mortgage presses for payment, when the landlord will wait because he can trust the character of his tenant and measure the inevitable ups and downs in farming brought about by the seasons. Even for small farmers the same difficulties seem to be inherent in ownership; they are even increased by the fact that the small man will mortgage his land in order to acquire a little more—a proceeding which brings disaster as soon as times become bad. The economic value of the landlord can be more than justified in the history of English farming, and we believe that he might more than ever establish his position to-day if he would take the opportunities of leadership that lie before him. As a class, farmers are probably more disposed to take advice than they have ever been, but in social and economic matters they would be very slow to move by argument alone. Many questions of co-operative production and collective trading which are now hanging fire because they are all against the individualist habit of mind of the British farmer, would move rapidly if some of the great landlords, each in their own district, put themselves at the head of a workable scheme. Of course if the landlord is to become the *entrepreneur* and organiser of industry for his tenantry, he will have to work at his task very seriously; good intentions alone would only be harmful.

Naturally at the present juncture one heard much about small holdings and the prospects of the new tenants who have been set on the land by recent legislation. As might perhaps have been expected, the large farmers with whom we talked had very little belief in the future of the small holdings. Most of them held, and rightly enough so far as their own districts were concerned, that the large man with capital will get more out of the land than any small man possibly can. Even with fruit and vegetables the capitalist's power of organising labour, and his command of manures, his power of doing certain operations like spraying, which are only cheap on a large scale, must mean a greater production per acre. But while the intensive large farmer can thus beat the intensive small holder, there are many large farmers who never attempt to get the *maximum* profitable yield out of their land, but trust to skimming a small return off a wide area, and these are the men who from a national point of view are not doing their duty by the land but might profitably be replaced by small occupiers who will be driven to get more out of the soil in order to obtain a living at all. But though the large farmers do not agree with the small holding movement, they are not unsympathetic. Many of them admit there is an opening for a few men to meet local demands in their own district, while of course in certain places like the Isle of Axholme the small holder has been thoroughly tested, and holds his own even under disadvantageous conditions. Probably the new movement will show a sorry crop of failures during the next few years, until the unsuitable men are weeded out. All small holders also are likely to suffer again when the next turn of bad times comes round, unless by that time some method of giving them co-operative credit has become firmly established.

As a feature in the prosperity of the farmer of to-day we have put his adaptability to his conditions. In the main, the men who could not alter their system to meet the low prices prevailing only a few years ago have been shaken out of the industry, and the most capable have survived to take advantage of the recent rise in prices. But though the best of these men still maintain the supremacy of British farming over that of any other country, nothing is more striking than the contrast between them and some of their neighbours. In every district we visited we found good and bad farmers close together, men who are earning good incomes on one side of the hedge, and on the other men who are always in difficulties, who in many cases are only kept going through the tolerance of their land-

lords. Sometimes a man always manages to scrape his rent together, but he lives miserably, his farm is an eyecore and a source of weeds and infection to his neighbours.

SCOTTISH LEAGUE MANIFESTO.

WHY do the Lords hate and hinder the legislation passed by the present Government? The Lords hated the Small Landholders' (Scotland) Bill because it would have given the agricultural population, now leaving the country in thousands, access to the straths, glens, and fertile fields of their native land. The land of Scotland will yield its harvests to the tiller just as freely as the lands of Canada or America. There is only one reason why it does not do so—The House of Lords refuse the people the use of their own land. They prefer that it remain idle or be given over as the pleasure-ground of the "idle rich."

Why do the Lords hate the Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill? Because the Bill was designed to give the local assessing bodies in Scotland power to assess and rate upon land value in relief of local rates. The ratepayers should remember that the average rate is now 14s. 6d. per head of the population; and the increase per £ of assessed rental during the past sixteen years has been 2s. 5d. The land value of Scotland is created and maintained by the people of Scotland. The Lords deny you the right to levy a rate on the value which belongs to the community, but which they take.

Why did the Lords hate and reject the Budget of 1909-10? Chiefly because the Budget dared to touch the Sacred Ark of Hereditary Covenant-Land. "What, Tax my land?" The Budget secured a valuation of all land. This is anathema to all land monopolists.

What said the Home Secretary, Mr. Churchill, at Dundee, in October of last year:—"The land monopoly is not the only monopoly that exists, but it is the greatest monopoly by far. It is a perpetual monopoly, and it is the mother of all other monopolies."

"The unearned increment in land is not the only form of unearned increment which persons are able to derive, but it is the principal form, and it is the principal form which is derived from processes which are in themselves not beneficial, but actually detrimental to the rest of the community. Land, which is a necessity of human life, which is the original source of all wealth, which is strictly limited in extent, which is fixed in geographical position—land, I say, differs from all other forms of property in fundamental conditions."

Land monopoly, entrenched in the House of Lords, stands between the land and the landless, between the unemployed and the source of all employment, between the shivering widow and coal, and the starving children and bread. For the sins of the House of Lords you have no need to search blue books and finesse with statistics. Ask the empty Highland straths. Ask the depopulated country. Ask the overcrowded cities. Ask depopulated Ireland. Ask the millions driven across the sea. What will the answer be? Cut it down. There is not one gleam of light, one beam of mercy in the whole course of its history.

The time has now come when the people must throw off the incubus that hinders all real democratic progress. They understand the issue upon which they are to vote. They can now vote themselves into permanent power uncontrolled by hereditary Peers, or privileged persons.

It is not often the people have the opportunity of expressing their will, and attaining a great advance in liberty. The Electors can now choose to be guided and governed by essentially democratic and moral principles, or they can confirm the power which the House of Lords so arrogantly claims and wields. If they decree that the veto of the Lords must go, then they decree their own emancipation from Lordly domination. If they confirm the power the Peers claim, they elect to remain the slaves of a small, selfish, and privileged class of their fellow-countrymen.

If the nation desires to continue on the path of progress, to achieve further extensions of liberty, if the people desire to be upon the side of justice and good causes, if they desire their word and their will to be the permanent and abiding expression of public opinion, now is the time to set aside for ever the arrogant presumption of the House of Lords.

As to the claims of the Liberal leaders and the Liberal Party to the confidence of the people, let the people of Scotland be true to themselves whatever be the claims of leaders and parties. The Liberal Party and its accredited leaders are fighting the cause of freedom, justice, and independence against a small class of monopolists, and it is your duty to support them:

THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES OF OWNERSHIP OR TENANCY OF AGRICULTURAL LAND.

By W. ANKER SIMMONS.

A PAPER READ AT A MEETING OF THE FARMERS' CLUB IN LONDON, OCTOBER 31st.

The tendency of the present time with regard to this question, is to advocate an increase in the number of occupying owners of the soil; political influence, on both sides of party politics, is directed towards that end; large estates are put upon the market for sub-division, and cheers greet the fall of the hammer to the bid of the former occupier; the moment is, therefore, opportune for consideration of the subject from a strictly practical point of view, and the importance of it should lift it to a more lofty plane than the political platform, which is too frequently occupied by those who possess no practical knowledge of either the ownership or tenure of land, and whose one aim and object is to coax votes.

I shall base my remarks upon my experience and observations, as a land agent and valuer, during the last thirty years, and avoid, I hope, any reference to the political aspect of the matter.

As a preliminary, it may be of interest if I refer to the Board of Agriculture returns of agricultural holdings "owned or mainly owned," and "rented or mainly rented," as on June 4th, 1909, viz. :—

	ENGLAND.		WALES.		SCOTLAND.	
	Owned Holdings.	Rented Holdings.	Owned Holdings.	Rented Holdings.	Owned Holdings.	Rented Holdings.
Above 1 and not exceeding 5 acres ..	13,766	66,429	1,111	9,099	1,031	17,022
Above 5 and not exceeding 50 acres	22,798	142,863	3,554	28,391	2,440	32,050
Above 50 and not exceeding 300 acres	10,730	99,038	1,667	16,337	2,181	20,958
Above 300 acres ..	2,220	12,422	74	313	491	2,186
TOTALS :	OWNED HOLDINGS.		RENTED HOLDINGS.			
ENGLAND	49,514	..	320,752	..
WALES	6,406	..	54,140	..
SCOTLAND	6,143	..	72,216	..
GREAT BRITAIN	62,063	..	447,108	..

Thus it will be seen that 13½ per cent. of agricultural holdings in England, 10½ per cent. in Wales, and 7½ per cent. in Scotland is to-day held by occupying owners; but in illustration of the fact that the area and advantages of occupying ownership depend in great measure upon the locality of the holding, it may be observed that while in the combined counties of Bedford, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Suffolk, Essex, Hertford, Middlesex, and London 17½ per cent. of the holdings are farmed by the owners, there are less than 10 per cent. of occupying owners in Durham, Derby, Chester, Cumberland, York, Westmorland, Northumberland, Lancaster, and Stafford. In England, the highest percentage is in London, 38½ per cent.; the lowest in Chester, 7½ per cent. In Wales, the highest, in Cardigan, 18½ per cent.; the lowest, Glamorgan, 6 per cent. In Scotland, the highest, Renfrew, 17½ per cent.; the lowest, Caithness and Sutherland, 1 per cent.

It must be borne in mind that these returns include the many home farms and farms in hand held by large land owners; probably the area owned by "yeomen farmers" forms but a small portion of the above averages; they also include small holdings of under 5 acres in the neighbourhood of London and our large cities; the average of these in London alone being nearly 48 per cent.

The characteristic of agriculture in this country has for many generations been the "tenant farmer's" system, and the question before us is whether, from an agricultural point of view, it is desirable to change this, and adopt that of occupying ownership.

The answer must, I think, depend entirely upon the financial position of the would-be owner; there are comparatively few farmers who possess sufficient means to purchase their holdings without drawing upon their working capital, or borrowing, and sensible men would hesitate to exchange their position as tenants

of an average landlord, for that of a mortgagor, nor could an occupying owner obtain anything approaching such a good return for his capital as he would derive from an investment, of the same amount of money, as a tenant farmer.

Let us consider a concrete case as an example. A capital of £2,000 would enable a man to take, with a fair chance of success, a farm of 250 acres, at a rent of, say, 20s. per acre; with that capital and holding he should be able to maintain a family, avoid compulsorily manual labour, and make at least £250 a year, or 10 per cent. on his capital, to meet his household expenses; but, as an occupying owner, he would only be in a position to purchase 60 acres of similar land, at £25 per acre = £1,500, leaving £500 as working capital; allowing 4 per cent. for the former item and 10 per cent. for the latter, he would only derive £110 as income, against £250 as a tenant farmer of 250 acres; his individual work, too, on a sixty-acre holding would necessarily be of a far more laborious character than on the larger holding. If the same man elected to put himself under a mortgagee, he could, by borrowing two-thirds of the

purchase money, buy 120 acres of similar land at £25 = £3,000, of which sum he would have to provide £1,000, leaving £1,000 of his £2,000 as working capital (in each case reckoned at £8 per acre), which, on the same basis of calculation, would give him a return of £140. The daily life of a man who has to cultivate a farm of 120 acres is also far harder than that of the occupier of 250 acres.

I do not propose to elaborate this illustration by applying it to other sums, but

whether you deal with a capital of £500 or £5,000, the result is proportionately the same. From a general point of view I do not believe that a change from the position of tenant to that of owner would be beneficial to the average farmer, and least of all to the small holder.

The aim of the practical and sensible farmer is to occupy as much land as his capital will warrant, and as he increases his capital by skill and energy, so he should seek to increase the area of his holding, upon the extent of which depends entirely his ability to produce wealth from the soil. If he sought to purchase rather than increase his tenancy, he would, of necessity, have to considerably diminish his holding, and be content with a much smaller return for his capital. In the course of my business life I have had constant opportunity of studying both systems in practice, and while I can scarcely call to mind a single case of a man who purchased his farm ever adding to it, I could name numerous instances—many of them well known to members of this Club—of men who, commencing with less than 250 acres, now occupy, as tenant farmers, thousands of acres.

The equipment of land with the necessary buildings, and the subsequent cost of maintaining them, is a question little understood by most of those who advocate occupying ownership and peasant proprietorship. I have recently been engaged in valuing an estate in Yorkshire, a large portion of which I found occupied as small holdings, averaging about 80 acres; in numerous cases the rents of these farms did not represent more than 4 per cent. on the sum expended in buildings and upkeep during the last ten years, and within the past month I have let a good mixed farm of 350 acres in my own district at 25s. per acre, the buildings on which cost over £10,000 less than seven years ago. Four per cent. is usually quoted as an ordinary

return for capital invested in the fee simple of agricultural land: my experience is that in the majority of cases, owners do not get into pocket more than half that sum, and in numerous instances the rents barely meet the estate charges.

Far too much stress is laid upon the advantages of occupying ownership in Denmark, France, and Germany: it is not possible, in my opinion, to draw a true comparison between our own and other European countries; the comparison we should keep in view is simply that of "ownership" or "tenancy" in Great Britain, under the conditions which prevail within its borders. Other countries depend upon different conditions of tenure, climate, and mode of life. I have never heard or read of any system of agriculture which offers more advantages, all round, than ours on the "tenant farmer" principle. To those who point to the alleged success of ownership in the countries I have named, I would refer them to an article on Italy, published in the *Times* in 1903, which stated that "the indebtedness of the southern agricultural population is equally notable. In the Neapolitan provinces alone, the Bank of Naples and the Bank of Italy held last April, through foreclosures of mortgages, landed property to the value of more than £2,000,000 sterling. The growth of debt, want of credit, scarcity of labour—brought about by emigration—the ruin and gradual disappearance of peasant proprietors—all causes which act and react upon each other—have conduced to a state of things which grows increasingly worse every year."

I would also remind them of a speech made by Sir Anthony MacDonnell on the eve of the introduction of the Irish Land Bill of 1903, in which he is reported to have said: "We have all read about, and some of us perhaps have seen, the working of the peasant proprietary system in Europe. I myself have had wide experience of the analogous systems in India, and my experience has always been the same. Everywhere the gradual declension of the peasantry from prosperity to ruin has been repeated. The process is this. First, there is a period of prosperity, with a rise in the standard of comfort; then follows indebtedness, slight at first, but ever-growing, with the facilities which are readily afforded by the usurer; next comes mortgages, and then comes sub-divisions and sale to meet the mortgagees' claims. Finally comes the crash; and the grandson of the tenant-proprietor becomes the sub-tenant on his former patrimony, while the usurer becomes the rack-renting landlord—a landlord of a far worse type than any which Ireland has presented in the past. This is the process with which I am familiar, and being familiar with it, I am naturally anxious that it should not be repeated in Ireland."

These are strong and ominous words of warning from the lips of a man of great character, ability, and experience; in reading them one is reminded of their truth in contemplating the end, in so many cases, of the old yeomen farmers of England. If the system of occupying ownership presents such a pleasing outlook for the future, why, may we well ask, did it fail in the past? Was it not because of "mortgages, sub-division, and sale to meet the mortgagees' claims?"

Occupying ownership was, perhaps, all right in prosperous times during the life of the absolute owner; but what happened when he died? In most cases, where the family exceeded one in number, the land was left to the widow or eldest son, subject to charges on it in favour of the younger children, based upon its then high value; then followed depression, failure to pay interest, calling in of the charges, sale, and ruin to the unfortunate so-called owner, on whose shoulders the load of interest alone was often heavier than the rental value of the land. I write from personal experience of many of these cases in my early business life, and I recall a particular scene when one of our oldest and most respected yeomen came to instruct my firm to sell his farm, and said, in answer to my father's regrets that such a course should be necessary, "There is an end to Cornwall, and I have reached it."

Taking the Schedule A returns as a guide, the annual value of land in this country fell from £52,000,000 in 1878 to £37,000,000 in 1900, which, capitalised at twenty-five years' purchase, gives a capital loss of £375,000,000 within a period of twenty-two years. How could such a loss be sustained by men who had to look to the land for their living?

Looked at, too, from a purely agricultural point of view, what could affect the productive capability of land more adversely than the withdrawal of capital from it necessary to cultivate it, which is the first effect of pressure upon a nominal occupying owner?

In my opinion, the difficulty of sub-division on death is of itself a complete bar to any general system of occupying ownership of agricultural land.

The position of the family of a tenant farmer on division at death is far better than that of an occupying owner of equal wealth, whose capital is largely locked up; the somewhat natural desire not to let the land go out of the family usually acts detrimentally to all concerned.

I believe it would prove a great blow to the maintenance of the high standard of English agricultural live stock if, by a change in our system, we lost the interest and pecuniary support of our great land owners, who, as proprietors of large estates, have in the past ungrudgingly and without stint encouraged in the interests of their tenants and fellow agriculturists the breeding and improvement of all kinds of stock, without regard to any direct personal benefit. If doubt exists upon this point, a visit to any of our leading showyards would quickly dispel it; this valuable support would necessarily be considerably lessened if the farms which comprise their estates pass from their possession, for although there are, fortunately, many leading breeders and exhibitors of pedigree stock in the ranks of our yeomen and tenant farmers, they form but a small proportion of the pioneers of this most important side of agriculture. This argument also applies with equal force to all kinds of agricultural machinery. The "man on the platform" draws a vivid and seductive picture of a tenure involving the payment, for a fixed number of years, of a less annual sum than the present rent and the subsequent ownership of the soil; but such a system must of necessity be hedged about by many restrictive conditions, under which the difficulties of division at death would be multiplied, and however advantageous it might prove to the holder at the time when actual ownership was acquired, it is to my mind certain that no lasting benefit would ensue, either to the individual or to agriculture, as the chief and most important of our national industries. Moreover, the advocates of this system always couple it with a scheme of State aid, without which it could not be hatched, and I doubt whether those who are concerned in industries other than agriculture, would, by their votes, pledge their credit in support of the personal interests of individual farmers. If such a system cannot be financed upon its own merits, without State aid, it is not likely in my opinion to be seriously entertained by the business side of the community. It is frequently argued that such a system as this having been adopted in Ireland, it should prove equally beneficial to England; but there has never existed here a similar dual ownership to that which the 1903 Irish Land Act was created to abolish, and the ultimate success of the system is open to grave doubt.

Many of the advantages which might be attached to occupying ownership of agricultural land have been effaced by the legislation of recent years. The Agricultural Holdings Act of 1908 gives to a tenant farmer fixity of tenure, compensation for improvements and game damage, and freedom of cultivation, all of which were *non est* twenty years ago. He can also rent land at a much lower proportionate cost than he can purchase it, for owing to the conditions of rural life in England, where sport and amusement are so largely connected with the ownership of land, the price of it to buy is out of all proportion to its purely agricultural value, and also to the rent it commands as an agricultural holding, so that except for sentimental ambitions or sporting reasons there is very little attraction in the ownership of land to those who seek their living from the cultivation of it.

I am convinced that a man of moderate means is far more likely to secure a good income and improve his position as a tenant than as an owner. If a man has for choice the buying of stock which will pay him 4 per cent., or the purchase of his farm on a twenty-five years' capitalising basis, and can so invest his money without touching his working capital, let him, if it gives him any pleasure, acquire his farm; but occupying ownership is not a poor man's system, and only those situated as I have described should seek to adopt it. I have no doubt that many of those tenants who, in recent times, have purchased their holdings have only done so rather than leave their old homes, and would far rather have remained in them as tenants. It is not uncommon now to hear of petitions to owners not to sell, and voluntary offers of increased rent, as an inducement to let the old order of things remain. The joys of ownership are much exaggerated, and the popular idea that a man will cultivate his own land on a higher standard than he would adopt as tenant is not borne out by my personal observation. The tendency of modern legislation is also detrimental to the ownership of land. I know many landlords who are in a far worse position than their leading tenants—unable to occupy the family residence, worried by burdens, charges and death duties, and in many cases only too glad to seize a good excuse—such as now presents itself—to get rid of their agricultural holdings. Our platform

friends appear to think it must be a fine thing for poor tenants to seek to acquire that which their old landlords are only too glad to get rid of. I fail to see any advantage in doing so, and in my humble opinion it will be a bad day for English agriculture and those who are engaged in it, if the old system of landlord and tenant is abolished in favour of a return to that of occupying ownership. We can best judge the future by the lessons of the past, and the disappearance of the old yeoman farmer—so often described as the backbone of England—should be a warning to us in these days that the system failed for economic reasons, and that farmers with only the necessary capital for the cultivation of land within their reach, are far better off under existing laws, and more independent as tenants than they are likely to be as owners of the soil they occupy.

Many of the arguments I have used against ownership of land do not apply to small holdings of less than twenty acres, within easy reach of our large cities and towns, where the value is practically sure to appreciate as time goes on, and where it is particularly essential to provide against disturbance. Over 47 per cent. of these holdings, within the county of London, are now occupied by the owners, and no doubt the same result obtains within the precincts of most of our large cities. It is these cases which account for the apparently high average of over 13 per cent. of English holdings being held by the owners. There is much to be urged in favour of a large increase of this class of occupying ownership, and also of encouragement by means of State aid in inducing the best of our agricultural labourers, who are without capital, to eventually become owners of small country holdings. Last year, as "Minister for Agriculture" in our local Parliament, I successfully piloted a Bill dealing with this question, which I based upon borrowing capital for the purposes of occupying ownership from the Postmaster-General, who, I argued, could well afford to lend the money in the Savings Bank Department, upon which he allows 2½ per cent., at 3 per cent. on the principle of repayment of the capital in equal yearly instalments over a period of thirty years, all payments to be in advance. Briefly, the effect of this works out that for every £100 so borrowed the rent or interest would be £6 6s. 8d. for the first year, decreasing 2s. each year until the last, when it would be £3 3s. 4d., and then full ownership; but while such a system as this would doubtless prove a great incentive to thrift, and perhaps induce small holders to practise the highest form of cultivation within their power, the difficulties which would arise on death or failure to continue the occupation would be multiplied, and I am doubtful of any ultimate real benefit to agriculture, which is the one point of this discussion. Political advantages do not always coincide with practical results, and in preparing this paper I have assumed that we are dealing with cases of men with limited capital at their command, anxious to do their best as cultivators of the soil under our existing conditions; and comparing the alternative of ownership or tenancy to such cases I have no doubt at all that as a general rule men with a capital of less than £500, desirous of becoming "small holders," would prosper more rapidly as tenants than as occupying owners.

In dealing chiefly with the disadvantages of ownership as opposed to tenancy of agricultural land, I have thrown down a challenge to members of the Club to enliven the debate which will now ensue by unearthing and bringing to light some of the advantages of ownership which I have failed to discover.

October, 1910.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE IN EAST LONDON.

WHAT THE BUDGET HAS DONE.

Mr. Lloyd George opened the campaign in a brilliant, defiant speech at Mile End, London, on Monday evening, 21st November. In the course of the address he said:—

All the Protectionist Budgets have been a failure. They have not produced the cash they were estimated to produce. What about ours? (A Voice: "Gone well, boy!" and laughter.) Listen to this—and now that I have come to the East End, where I started my campaign for the Budget, I have got to give an account of what I have been doing. The Budget has been in operation six months; some resolutions have been in operation eighteen months. Out of the money from the Budget we voted

twenty millions last year to raise the old people above need. What more have we done? They talk as if we had done nothing for the Navy. Why, out of the money raised by that very much abused Budget we have spent ten millions more upon building ships and upon the equipment of the Navy, and we have found every penny of it. (Cheers.)

But that is not all. We are going to bring in an additional 200,000 poor old people—(cheers)—who are now branded with pauperism. We are going to make them State pensioners—like the Dukes. (Laughter and cheers.) What is more, we have got the cash to start an insurance scheme that will insure two millions of workmen against the evils of unemployment. (Cheers.)

That is not all. We are starting a scheme next year, and all the money is arranged to ensure 15 millions of workpeople—men and women—against the anxiety and distress that come to households when the bread-earner's health breaks down. (Cheers.) All the taxes are coming in, including whisky. All the estimates have been justified. We have these great schemes for keeping the invader from our shores—yes, for keeping hunger and want away, and distress from invading the hearths of the people—all that is in this Budget, and they threw it out, these Lords, as if it were an unclean thing. We will reckon with them when we get back. (Loud cheers.) Why did they do it? We dared—we dared—to touch the Ark of the Covenant—(laughter)—the land. We taxed the landlords' rents.

They will say to us, Raising money is not the sole test of the Budget. No; it is not. You must raise money in a way that does not injure business, trade, commerce, and industry. Of course, you must. That is why I object to tariffs. Now, did we injure trade? Before the Budget trade was depressed; we were down in the trough of the wave. Since then the good old ship has been rising, and rising, and rising, and we are not yet on the crest. (Cheers.)

Since the Budget trade has gone up. Our foreign trade is leaping up by millions. Is that all due to the Budget? I don't say so. All I say is by means of this fiscal instrument we have extracted 25 millions a year without injuring business. Not only has the Budget been a complete financial success, but trade and industry and commerce have improved since then.

I do not say it was due to the Budget. But I am constantly reminded that I am a Celt—(laughter)—and that I sometimes suffer under the delusion of that imaginative race. (Laughter.) I will admit it, and there is one delusion, if it be a delusion, I will always cherish—that the government of this world is not wholly material. When I see a great nation like ours pausing amid its commercial troubles and saying to itself that it is the time above all others to think of those who suffer amongst us, and then, in the year 1908, a year of depression, saying, "We will now incur heavy liabilities in order to raise above the bread of charity the poor old men who have faithfully served their country through life"—and when I see that nation from that moment beginning to prosper, I say to myself, Celt as I am, that I still believe what the old king said three thousand years ago, "Blessed is he who considereth the poor."

But, said Mr. Balfour the other day, what about the building trade? Well, before the Budget was brought in there was no doubt the building trade was in a very bad way. Things have improved ever since. The figures of unemployment in the building trade during the last six months are better by forty per cent. than they were in the month before the Budget was introduced. I do not say it is what it ought to be, but it has improved, and it is going to improve. I believe the Budget will open a new era of prosperity for the building trade. It has unlocked the land, for you notice how the landlords are beginning to sell. (Laughter.) I knew they would do it sooner or later, but I never thought they would begin so soon.

And, by the way, let me say how pleased I was, amongst all these sales to see that Captain Pretymann had such confidence in the future of the land—that he bought a few hundred acres. (Laughter.) The President of the Land Union—Ah! he's a gallant fellow. He dared land taxes—undeveloped tax, reversion tax, increment tax, royalty duty—he was not even afraid of Form IV. (Laughter.) He was unafraid by his own bogeys—broke through them all into the auction room, and, cash in hand, carried off a few hundred acres of the tax-ridden land of England. I like to see bravery and audacity of that character, and I have not the faintest doubt, from what I know of Captain Pretymann, that it will be thoroughly rewarded. Well, all that has been rejected by the Lords, and we say, "No more." (Cheers.) This time we mean to take a decision—an irrevocable decision—on the subject.

NEWS OF THE MOVEMENT.

THE HIGHLAND CAMPAIGN.

FORMATION OF HIGHLAND LAND VALUES LEAGUE.

The Highland campaign in favour of the taxation of land values arranged by the United Committee (see October issue) was carried out successfully and culminated in a Conference and mass meeting at Inverness on November 11th. A Highland Branch of the United Committee, to be known as the Highland Land Values League, was formed at the Conference.

The meetings, at all of which Mr. Dundas White, LL.D., M.P., was the principal speaker, commenced at Oban on October 20th, and keeping to the programme outlined in our October issue, the meetings have been eminently successful. Large and enthusiastic audiences have listened to brilliant and convincing addresses by Dr. White, who was accompanied throughout by Mr. Joseph Macleod, Liberal Organising Secretary at Inverness. At each meeting resolutions thanking the Government for the Budget, and urging the further taxation of land values, were passed.

Mr. Robert C. Orr represented the United Committee and was in charge of the arrangements in Mr. McLeod's absence with Dr. White. Mr. Paul went north later and along with Mr. Orr addressed several preliminary meetings in the Inverness district. Mr. Paul also spoke at Broadford, Skye, taking Dr. White's place there, to enable him to get to Stornoway and return in time for the Inverness conference and demonstration.

THE INVERNESS CONFERENCE.

A Conference to promote the Taxation of Land Values and the Scottish Small Holders' Bill, of delegates from all parts of the Highlands, was held in the United Free East Church Hall, Inverness, on Friday afternoon, November 11th. The conference was held under the auspices of the United Committee, the Scottish League and the Highland Liberal Associations. The chair was occupied by Mr. Duncan Mactavish, chairman of the Inverness-shire Liberal Association. After the chairman's opening speech, Councillor George Young (Inverness) moved the following resolution, seconded by William Cuthbert Helmsdale, and supported by Ex-Provost Anderson (Stornoway) and Mr. John Paul, secretary of the United Committee, which was carried unanimously:—

That this meeting heartily thanks the Government for the inclusion in the Budget of 1910 of the proposal to secure a complete valuation of all land in the United Kingdom—the first essential to any policy of land reform, and trusts that the Government will seek an early opportunity of using the valuation for the purpose of levying a rate on land values in relief of existing rates.

A second resolution, expressing the hope that the Government will resolutely adhere to the principle of the fixity of tenure contained in the Scottish Small Land Holders' Bill, was moved by Mr. J. T. Macleod (Ardgay). Councillor Innes (Rogart) seconded, and Mr. J. Annan Bryce, M.P., Mr. Davidson (Knockbain), Mr. Calder (Wick), Mr. Mackenzie (Forres), Rev. Ross, and Ex-Provost Anderson, supported the resolution which was unanimously carried.

Mr. Murdo Mackenzie (Forres), representing the Provisional Committee appointed to consider as to the advisability of the formation of a Highland Branch of the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, approved of the formation of such a Branch and submitted the following resolution to the Conference:—

That this meeting resolve itself into a Highland Branch of the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values to be called The Highland Land Values League.

Councillor Miller (Bower) seconded, and the resolution was carried unanimously.

Mr. Mackay (Inverness) moved that copies of these resolutions be sent to the Prime Minister, the Secretary for Scotland, the Lord Advocate, and the various members of Parliament for the Highland counties. (Applause.) This was unanimously agreed to.

The following office-bearers were appointed:—President, Mr. Mactavish; vice-presidents, Mr. J. G. Mackay (Inverness-shire), Councillor Miller (Bower), Mr. J. G. Mackay (Inverness-shire), Councillor James Walker (Inverness), Mr. Murdo Mackenzie (Forres), Mr. Lindsay (Golspie), Mr. John Paul (London), Mr. James Busby (Glasgow); hon. treasurer, Mr. I. McKenzie; secretary, Mr. W. M. Cameron.

THE PUBLIC DEMONSTRATION.

In the evening a largely attended meeting was held in the Music Hall. Mr. J. Annan Bryce, M.P. for the Inverness district

of burghs, occupied the chair, and he was supported on the platform by Mr. Dundas White, M.P. for Dumbartonshire, and Mr. James Falconer, M.P. for Forfarshire, and leading Liberals from different parts of the Highlands. At the outset the audience joined in singing "The Land Song."

The speeches of Messrs. Bryce, Dundas White and Falconer were enthusiastically received and a resolution supporting the policy of the Government was passed, and the speakers were accorded votes of thanks.

Extensive reports of the Conference and all the meetings appeared in the local papers.

DR. WHITE'S HIGHLAND TOUR.

The Highland campaign of meetings reported in this issue, with Dr. Dundas White, M.P., as the chief speaker, and the Conference held at Inverness, were highly successful in all respects. It was by far the most satisfactory of the fugitive visits yet made to the Highlands by the land reformers who mostly confine their activities to the south of the Grampians. Dr. White, I was assured, was in splendid form at all his meetings. His explanation of the taxation of land values, and how it is related to the demand for land for agricultural uses was received with enthusiasm everywhere. Certainly his masterly exposition of the case for taxing land values at the public demonstration held at Inverness at the conclusion of the campaign reminded me of some of the best platform efforts of the Lord Advocate, when that powerful and engaging exponent of the case devoted himself exclusively to the rating and taxing of land values.

Dr. White, by his voice and pen, and by his questions in the House of Commons on prices paid by the Government for sites for lighthouses, &c., has rendered much good service to the movement for land values taxation, and these three weeks' incessant speaking on the subject in the Highlands of Scotland, makes one more brilliant contribution to the debate.

The campaign was widely reported in the local press wherever Dr. White spoke, and provoked the widest possible discussion in all circles.

We have been told by Highland M.P.'s, or rather by the Liberal M.P.'s representing Highland constituencies, that the taxation of land values cannot be made plain to the crofters and cottars. What these gentlemen mean is, that they cannot make it plain, which without being in any way offensive is quite true. But Dr. Dundas White made it quite plain as other competent speakers have often done before.

The Highlands of Scotland is the most fertile ground for propaganda on the taxation of land values. This is Dr. White's view, and it is the view of every genuine advocate who has ever had the good fortune to address a meeting of Highland crofters and cottars on the subject.

The one thing needful in the Highlands, as in all agricultural districts, is missionary work; a well sustained educational effort by speakers and organisers who know the land question, teachers who can show land values taxation as the bridge connecting town and country, and without which it is impossible to solve the problem. Such a crusade means money, much more money than is at present available for immediate needs. But this additional financial support must be forthcoming if we are to make the land question a burning issue.

The politicians of either party will not help, mainly because they do not see what the solution of the land question as we advocate it means to the country and to democracy. We must rely on our own people for funds. The more they give, and some of them give most generously, the more work can be carried out, and as we get things done, the more hope there is that others will come to us able and willing to help to reach out to the new duties.

But this is another story, and one which we intend telling our readers and friends at greater length. We shall take an early opportunity of doing this.

To return to the Highland campaign: the arrangements for Dr. White's tour were carried out by our Highland friend and co-worker, Joseph McLeod, of Inverness. He put his whole heart and soul into the work, and himself accompanied Dr. White as advance agent, and at most of the meetings took part in the speaking. Mr. McLeod is an enthusiastic land reformer, widely respected by his friends, and feared not a little by those on the other side of the land question. He is a tireless worker, and has in Mrs. McLeod and their family his strongest support. Joseph McLeod, the man and the reformer, has a large and enthusiastic following in the Highlands. He has won this by hard work, sincerity, and devotion to the

reform movement. How much of this goodwill and influence he owes to his wife he will gladly acknowledge, and he is never so happy as when entertaining a land reformer in his characteristic Highland home. For his services in this campaign I can gladly pass to him on behalf of the United Committee, and on Dr. White's behalf, the warmest thanks and appreciation.

Mr. Robert C. Orr represented the United Committee in the unavoidable absence of Mr. Busby, Secretary of the Scottish League, and when I got to Inverness four days before the Conference, I found Mr. Orr busy addressing meetings, interviewing merchants, farmers and crofters, and making friends for the movement all over the town and district. The smaller meetings, he'd for a week or ten days before the big event, a recognised feature of the policy of the United Committee, were most useful at Inverness, and were the means of much wholesome discussion. The Conference and demonstration, and the inauguration of the new Highland Land Values League, have put the question of taxing land values, with the abolition of rates and taxes on improvements firmly in the forefront of Highland politics, and we can cordially congratulate the men of the new League on the fine field they possess for any amount of educational effort on the Taxation of Land Values.—J. P.

MANCHESTER.

The Secretary of the Manchester League, 134, Deansgate, Manchester, writes that, in addition to meetings already announced in LAND VALUES, the following have been held:—

- Oct. 21.—Municipal Election Meeting, St. Michael's Ward, A. H. Weller.
- " 24.—Municipal Election Meeting, St. Michael's Ward, A. H. Weller.
- " 26.—Brooke Street Liberal Club, E. Manchester, L. W. Zimmerman, "The Land Clauses."
- " 27.—Hyde L.Y.L., A. H. Weller, "Alternative to Socialism and Tariff Reform."
- " 29.—Municipal Election Meeting, S. Gorton Ward, A. H. Weller.
- " 31.—Municipal Election Meeting, St. Michael's Ward, A. H. Weller.
- Nov. 8.—Altrincham Women's Liberal Association, L. W. Zimmerman, "The Land Clauses."
- " 11.—Littleboro' L.Y.L. (For '95 Club), A. H. Weller.
- " 14.—Kingsley Liberal Association, A. H. Weller, "Land Question and the Budget."
- " 17.—Crossley's Works, Openshaw, J. Bagot and A. H. Weller.
- " 17.—Annual Meeting at Manchester League's Office.
- " 30.—Higher Crumpsall Liberal Club, A. H. Weller, "Land Values and Rating Reform."
- " 30.—Adlington Women's Liberal Association, J. Bagot, "Progress and Poverty."

Up to the time of going to Press, the following meetings have been arranged:—

- Dec. 4.—Queen's Park Parliament, 3 p.m., D. Catterall, "Democracy, What is it?"
- " 6.—Didsbury Liberal Club, 8 p.m., J. Bagot, "Taxation of Land Values."
- " 9.—Astley Bridge Reform Club (For '95 Club), Dr. P. McDougall.
- " 12.—Gorton Liberal Club, A. H. Weller, "Taxation of Land Values."
- " 13.—N. Reddish Literary Society, J. Bagot.
- " 13.—Hale, Cheshire (For '95 Club), Dr. P. McDougall.
- " 14.—Hanley Liberal Club, Dr. P. McDougall, "Untax Industry and Tax Land Values."
- " 16.—Public Library, Sale, Debate between Dr. P. McDougall and J. M. McLachlan, on "Socialism v. Taxation of Land Values."
- " 19.—St. Anne's L.Y.L., J. Bagot.

At the Economic Class meeting on November 10th, a resolution, congratulating Mr. Henry George, Junr., on his election to Congress, was unanimously adopted, and the Secretary was requested to forward copies to Mr. Henry George, Junr., and to the local press.

The Annual Meeting of the Manchester League was held in the League's office on November 17th. There was a good attendance of members, presided over by the President, Mr. L. W. Zimmerman. In the Secretary's report it was shown that there had been a gratifying increase in the membership during the past year, and the number of meetings addressed by the officers and members of the League (205) showed a big advance upon the records of previous years.

During the recent Municipal Elections the local Leagues of Young Liberals published a circular which contained the following:—

The valuation of sites now proceeding under the Finance Act for 1909-10 brings into practical politics at one bound the transference of rating to site values, and we would urge as a plank in our programme that Manchester and Salford should at once promote Bills for securing this salutary change within their own areas.

At a meeting of the Hyde L.Y.L., addressed by the Secretary recently, it was stated by one of the members of that Society, quite as a matter of course, that they were all Single Taxers. Perhaps, coming from Hyde, says the Secretary, that ought not to occasion surprise, but it provides encouraging evidence of the spirit animating the Young Liberal movement.

MANCHESTER LEAGUE ANNUAL REPORT.

The Manchester League has been in existence four years, having been founded in October, 1906. The year just closed has been marked by greater activity than was possible before the opening of this office. There has been an increase in the membership from 163 to 233, but if the number of members was at all proportionate to the number of our converts and supporters, we should be able to show a much greater advance.

A very satisfactory increase is found in the number of meetings addressed by the officers and members of the League. During the past twelve months these meetings number 205, as compared with 116 and 68 in the two previous years. This means that the League is carrying its message of hope to an ever-increasing number of people, and the educational value of such work must be very great. These 205 meetings include 21 held in the Manchester Parks and several Croft and street-corner meetings organised by the Manchester League, and amongst the members and friends who have given most valuable and untiring help are the President, Treasurer, Messrs. Bagot, Catterall, O'Grady, Fielden, Norman, Hutchinson, Naylor, Musson, Johnson, Humphreys, Gough, Moyle, Hinton, and several others. The most important of these meetings was the demonstration in Alexandra Park on Sunday, October 2nd, when an audience of between 2,000 and 3,000 was addressed by Mr. Francis Neilson, M.P., Mr. Joseph Fels, Mr. R. L. Outhwaite, Dr. McDougall, Mr. Harry de Pass and Mr. Bagot.

During the General Election in January last the Manchester League did much active work in support of Liberal and Labour Candidates who were pledged to the Taxation of Land Values. Many meetings were addressed in different constituencies in and around Manchester, and great numbers of leaflets were distributed. A full report of these activities was published in the March Number of LAND VALUES.

At the request of the United Committee, I spent nine days in London during the L.C.C. election campaign in March, working on behalf of Baron de Forest, who is now a member of the Council. The Baron made a splendid fight for the Taxation of Land Values, and, I think, won his election in consequence. In June I conducted an independent campaign in Hartlepool for nine days during the by-election, on behalf of the United Committee, and afterwards assisted Chapman-Wright, who was doing similar work in the East Dorset by-election. Perhaps I may say that in this way the influence of the Manchester League has extended far beyond the boundaries of our own diocese.

In the Municipal elections that have just taken place, the question of rating land values had some prominence. In the

The IDEAL Policy

ISSUED BY

The CITY LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, Ltd.

(Formerly the British Homes Assurance Corporation, Ltd.),

PROVIDES

LIFE ASSURANCE WITHOUT MEDICAL EXAMINATION.

For full particulars of this unique scheme send post-card to

M. GREGORY, Managing Director, 6, Paul St., Finsbury, London, E.C.

AGENTS WANTED.—EXCELLENT PROSPECTS.

DAILY NEWS, of October 21st, it was stated that "the rating of land values, with the unification of the three existing authorities as the first administrative step towards it, was the main plank in the platform of the Progressive Party in the Manchester municipal elections." I am rather afraid that this newspaper is a good deal in advance of the municipal candidates it speaks for. Certainly some of them very successfully concealed their enthusiasm for their "main plank." The Manchester and Salford Leagues of Young Liberals, however, are fully awake to the importance of our reform, as may be seen by a Circular published by them last month, from which I have taken the following extract:—"The valuation of sites now proceeding under the Finance Act for 1909-10 brings into practical politics at one bound the Transference of Rating to Site Values, and we would urge as a plank in our programme that Manchester and Salford should at once promote Bills for securing this salutary change within their own areas." A copy of a "Summary of various proposals for rating reform," compiled by Dr. McDougall, was sent to every member of the Manchester and Salford Council as well as to all the candidates, and some of our speakers took the few opportunities that were open to them to put our proposals, before the public from the platforms of progressive candidates.

The Economic Class meetings, which were started in October, 1909, have been held every Thursday evening throughout the past year, and though the attendance fell off during the summer months, there is good reason to be gratified with the continued and growing interest of the members in the subject of study, "Progress and Poverty." One very encouraging result of these meetings is that the League has now several new speakers who give valuable help at our outdoor meetings.

An event of great importance to our movement was the National Conference organised by the United Committee, held in Manchester from September 30th to October 2nd. Delegates from all parts of the United Kingdom were present and took part in the various meetings. The Lord Advocate opened a discussion on "Land Valuation and the Finance Act" in the Manchester Town Hall on the Friday evening; Mr. Fredk. Verinder opened a discussion on the Taxation of Land Values in relation to Free Trade, housing, and unemployment, in the Memorial Hall on the Saturday afternoon; and a Henry George commemoration dinner was given in the Grand Hotel, on the Saturday evening, at which over 150 members of the Conference and friends were present. Besides these, meetings were held in the Grand Hotel on the Friday afternoon, Saturday morning and Sunday morning and evening; and the general feeling seemed to be that the Conference was in all respects thoroughly successful and enjoyable. A full report of the proceedings appears in the November issue of LAND VALUES.

The scheme of the United Committee to distribute sets of leaflets to every house in the country, is making good progress in Lancashire and Cheshire, as well as in other parts of the country. The work of distribution has been, or is about to be done, in 34 neighbouring constituencies (for which over 300,000 sets of leaflets have been ordered through this office), and several other political associations are expected to offer help soon. These leaflets are now being issued in pamphlet form with an index and in this handy and attractive form they will no doubt receive more attention than loose leaflets, and the educational effect over the whole country is likely to be very great indeed.

Another matter of great importance to our movement, as well as of considerable local interest, is the recent publication by Mr. John Bagot of a new, cheap, unabridged edition of "Progress and Poverty," that can be sold at 4d. with paper covers, and 8d. with cloth covers. It is sometimes said that the most important work of the Manchester League is to make Henry Georgeites, and as nothing can do so much in that direction as the reading and study of Henry George's great book, the appearance of such a cheap edition ought to make this work easier in the future, and greatly increase public interest in the reform we are working for. During the past year we sold 305 copies of the old edition of "Progress and Poverty," but during the next 12 months, in view of the greatly reduced price of the new edition, a very much larger quantity will, no doubt, be disposed of.

In these and other ways encouraging progress is being made, and I think we may look forward hopefully for a career of increasing usefulness and influence for the Manchester League in the future.

ARTHUR H. WELLER, Secretary.

YORKSHIRE.

The following meetings have been held by the Yorkshire Land Values League:—

- Nov. 3.—Guiseley Liberal Club, F. Skirrow.
- " 7.—Silsden Liberal Club, F. Skirrow.
- " 8.—Scarboro' W.L.A. at Liberal Club, F. Skirrow.
- " 9.—Liberal Club, Hightown, Liversidge, Wm. Thomson, J.P.
- " 17.—Oakworth Liberal Club, Wm. Thomson, J.P.
- " 22.—Wharfedale and Silkstone Debating Society, F. Skirrow.
- " 25.—Thornton Liberal Club, F. Skirrow.
- " 27.—Boothtown Liberal Club, F. Skirrow.
- " 28.—Public Meeting, Blackburn, F. Skirrow.
- " 29.—Public Meeting, Blackburn, F. Skirrow.
- " 30.—Public Meeting, Blackburn, F. Skirrow.

Mr. John Paul visited the Yorkshire district last month, and addressed a public meeting at Keighley on November 14th, in the Temperance Hall, Keighley, on the subject, "What Form IV. means to the Advocates of the Taxation of Land Values." There was a good attendance.

The address, which was interesting and instructive, was followed by a number of questions, to which Mr. Paul replied. Mr. E. A. Lassen, of Bradford, presided, and other speakers were J. Z. Ogden, Mr. Horace Wilson, Mr. William Thomson, J.P., and Mr. Fred. Skirrow. A resolution thanking the Government for the Budget of 1909-10, and urging the Government to continue the policy of making Land Values available for public needs, and further freeing industry from the grip of land monopoly, suggesting that the valuation of land should be completed with all possible speed and made accessible to the public; that the tax of Land Values so ascertained be levied to provide funds for education, poor relief, main roads, police, asylums, and in substitution for the remaining duties on the food and comforts of the people; and expressing the hope that at the earliest possible moment local authorities throughout the country would be empowered to raise local revenue on the land valuation basis with the view to relieving houses, factories, farm buildings, machinery, and other instruments of production from the ever-growing burden of rates.

At the close a collection to defray the expenses of the meeting was taken; this amounted to thirty shillings.

A NEW LEEDS OFFICE TO BE OPENED.

The following evening (November 15th) on the invitation of Councillor C. H. Smithson, of Halifax, some forty active supporters of the movement in Yorkshire met Mr. Paul at the Liberal Club, Bradford, to consider the question of the reorganisation of the Yorkshire Land Values League, and the desirability of opening a central office in Leeds. Mr. Smithson, who presided, stated that along with Messrs. Sam Dugdale, T. B. Lund, and Fred. Skirrow, he had already taken an office in West Bar Chambers, Boar Lane, Leeds, provisionally. Mr. Paul opened an interesting discussion dealing with the growth of the movement and the hope there was of making a stronger organisation in the County of York. He gave an extensive report of the work of the United Committee and appealed to all concerned to take the present time as a most opportune moment to better the local organisation. An interesting discussion took place, at the close of which about £130 was subscribed for the new movement. It was agreed to open a new office at Leeds, to rename the organisation "The Yorkshire Land Values League," and to have representatives on the central committee from the various centres of activity throughout the country. The gathering was like a "gospel meeting," and clearly expressed that all present viewed the new opportunities for educational effort with enthusiasm and hope.

The usual kindness and consideration of Mr. Smithson found expression in the tea and sandwiches that were served during the course of the evening.

A most successful business-like meeting was brought to a close by votes of thanks to Messrs. Smithson and Paul.

F. SKIRROW, Secretary.

NORTHERN LAND VALUES LEAGUE.

Mr. Reid, the Secretary, and the members of the Northern Land Values League, are working steadily in the Northern Counties. Their motto for the present is "slow but sure" until they get the measure of the district and to know who's who. Already some 266,000 packets of Land Values leaflets have been distributed throughout 24 constituencies in the district. The office of the League is at 90, Pilgrim Street, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

MIDLAND LAND VALUES LEAGUE.

List of recent meetings:—

Date.	Place.	Speaker.
Oct. 27	Redditch	Chapman Wright.
" 29	Oldbury	T. R. Stokes.
Nov. 4	Digbeth	Chapman Wright.
" 7	Stoke-on-Trent	"
" 8	Cheadle	"
" 9	Oswestry	"
" 12	Bilston	"
" 14	League Office	Rating of Land Values Discussion.
" 17	Wythall	Chapman Wright.
" 18	Digbeth	"

Owing to the special work in connection with the General Election all further meetings have been cancelled.

W. C. WRIGHT, Secretary.

The Midlands Land Values League are actively carrying out propaganda work by means of meetings and the distribution of literature. The local "Parliament" affords a good means of spreading the light, and Mr. Chapman Wright and his co-workers are using it as an economic class to educate young men in Land Values ideas. On November 11th, Mr. Wright introduced a Bill giving local authorities the option of rating Land Values.

On November 3rd Mr. Wright addressed a meeting at the Redditch Liberal Club; on November 7th at the Stoke-on-Trent Workmen's Club and Institute; on November 8th at the Cheadle Liberal Club; and on November 17th, under the auspices of the Midlands League, at the Silver Street Schools, Wythall.

LIVERPOOL.

The Secretary of the Liverpool Land Values League, Mr. Wm. Noble, writes that the League is maintaining its activities, and the members report a growing keenness in their audiences to understand the land question and our solution.

During the past month Mr. H. Cowper has addressed several meetings, including, among others, one at the Domestic Mission, Mill Street, and another at Windsor Street Free Church. He also took part in a debate at the Hamlet Free Church, after which a resolution in favour of Land Values was carried.

Mr. Geo. Ball has been addressing an average of over two meetings a week for the last two months, on the northern boundaries of the city and in Bootle.

On the Birkenhead side of the river several of our members belong to the 1910 League in connection with which they keep our propaganda on the move.

Mr. Wm. Noble has addressed meetings at Seaforth, Ormskirk, Birkdale, Frodsham, Mold, Liscard, and Oxtun, as well as in the city.

Mr. E. J. M. McManus continues his Friday evening class with certain members of a C.Y.M.S., who are looking forward to a team debate with another C.Y.M.S.

Several members of the League belong to the Liverpool Parliamentary Debating Society, where, naturally enough, our reform is often the subject of debate.

LAND VALUES is now on sale in the city at 70, Lord Street, and at the Cook Street bookstall; in Toxteth at 47, Park Place, and at 337, Aigburth Road, Otterspool.

The Committee are hoping to resume their periodic meetings, a notification of which will be sent to the members by post. It is hoped that all of them will endeavour to attend.

SOUTH ISLINGTON.

Under the joint auspices of the United Committee and the South Islington Liberal and Radical Association, a crowded and enthusiastic meeting in support of the Taxation of Land Values was held in Myddelton Hall, Upper Street, N., on October 27th. Mr. Thomas Wiles, the member for the division, presided over an attendance of about 800 persons, and Mr. E. G. Hemmerde, K.C., M.P., was the principal speaker. Among those on the platform were Mrs. Wiles, Mrs. Hemmerde, Dr. Rowe, J.P., Dr. J. A. Sherry, many prominent local Liberals, and for the United Committee Mr. and Mrs. S. J. Phillips. During the three weeks preceding the date of the meeting a house to house distribution of the United Committee's leaflets had been carried out, and the good effect of this was plainly evident in a keenly interested audience. The Chairman in his opening speech,

amid loud cheers, called for the repeal of the breakfast-table duties and the substitution of a tax on land values. Mr. Hemmerde followed with a brilliant speech in support of the principle. As a clear and convincing exposition of the new taxation system and an invincible condemnation of the present system, Mr. Hemmerde's address was all that the most enthusiastic single-taxer could desire and the intelligent and appreciative manner in which the audience received his remarks, marked the progress that the movement has made in this quarter at least.

Quite a feature of the meeting were enthusiastic renderings by the audience of "The Land Song" for some time prior to the speaking.

LIBERAL OPEN-AIR SPEAKERS' LEAGUE.

LAND VALUES LECTURES.

At the invitation of the Liberal Open-Air Speakers' League (working in conjunction with the London Liberal Federation and the Home Counties Liberal Federation), the United Committee are providing lecturers to address lectures to speakers and canvassers. The metropolis has been, for the purposes of the lectures, divided into ten groups. During October, November and December five of these groups will be taken in hand by the United Committee lecturers and five by the Free Trade Union. After Christmas it is proposed that the United Committee should take over those groups dealt with by the F.T.U. before Christmas and *vice versa*. The syllabus of land values lectures is:—

1. Form IV. and the Finance Act.
2. The Reason of the Budget's Popularity. The Valuation: Its Meaning and Purpose.
3. Valuation in the Country and Towns. Prices and Rents of Land, Rates and Taxes. Tenancy under Valuation or Small Ownership.
4. Land Values and Free Trade.
5. Land Values, Housing and Unemployment.
6. Land Reform and the Lords.
7. Taxation of Land Values: Its merits as a Business Proposition—Its Justice.

GROUP 1. Speakers and canvassers from seven South-East London Divisions meet every Monday evening at the offices of the Walworth Liberal Association, 219, Walworth Road, S.E., where Mr. John Orr is the lecturer.

GROUP 2. From five Islington and Hackney (N.) Divisions at offices of South Islington Liberal Association, 302, Upper Street, N., every Tuesday evening. Mr. John Paul had arranged to address these lectures, but being called to Scotland and the North of England on business, Mr. Harry de Pass has taken his place.

GROUP 3. From seven North-East London Divisions at offices of Central Hackney Liberal Association, 15, Amhurst Road, N.E., every Wednesday evening. Lecturer: Mr. A. W. Madsen.

GROUP 4. From five St. Pancras and Hampstead divisions at offices of West St. Pancras Liberal Association, 263, Hampstead Road, N.W., every Thursday evening. Lecturers: Messrs. C. J. Cawood and A. Lumley.

GROUP 5. From extra Metropolitan divisions at Essex Hall, Strand, W.C., every Friday evening. Lecturer: Mr. Frederick Verinder (General Secretary, English League, T.L.V.).

Owing to the General Election all lectures after November 19th have been postponed.

SCOTTISH NOTES AND NEWS.

The Municipal Election in Glasgow has resulted in a signal triumph in the return of Mr. John Muir for the White Vale Ward. Mr. Muir for long years has been known as an able and devoted Single Taxer. He is widely respected in the East-end of Glasgow, as a representative Liberal and a public spirited citizen; but in whatever circle he moves, he is recognised first and foremost as an uncompromising teacher of the gospel expounded in "Progress and Poverty," his only besetting sin being his extreme modesty. But for this, he might have been in the Town Council long years ago.

We do not expect our friend to splash around and make a noise in the manner of some of the demagogues, who have so wantonly afflicted the Council in recent years in the name of democracy with their confused and confusing tongues, but neither will he sit quietly by when an opportunity avails itself to put before the Council and through it to the people of Glasgow, the cause of land and rating reform. He will, we are certain, in the near future do

something to re-establish at the Council and in the public mind the municipal movement for the rating of Land Values. And when the valuation of the land is effected, as it soon will be, Mr. Muir will have any number of supporters to help him to make Land Values the basis of local rating. The valuation of the land will speak volumes and bring the new men with the new ideals of civic righteousness and freedom.

The election this November was fought mainly on the question of the tramway surplus. In nine out of ten wards contested, the candidates against using the tramway surplus to reduce the rates were victorious, while several of the candidates who voted for the surplus being devoted to what ex-Lord Provost Chisholm correctly named a "grant in aid of the local landlords" were defeated.

The series of meetings addressed by Mr. Josiah C. Wedgwood, M.P., in the West of Scotland were a great success. The meeting in Hutchesontown (Glasgow) was rather poorly attended. This no doubt was partly due to the municipal election campaign, and to the fact that the Labour Party had organised a meeting in the same hall (St. Mungo Hall) for the following evening, at which Mr. G. N. Barnes, M.P., was to be the principal speaker. Mr. Barnes occupied the chair at Mr. Wedgwood's meeting, and delivered a rousing speech on the Taxation of Land Values, which was well reported by the local press.

At the meetings addressed by Mr. Wedgwood at Maryhill, Ayr, Langside, Camlachie, Partick, Saltcoats, and at the Glasgow University there were large and enthusiastic audiences. In all these places he has made many friends and admirers who recognise in Mr. Wedgwood a man of sterling worth, and a sound social reformer. He will have a warm welcome whenever he chooses to return to Scotland.

The members and friends of the Scottish League gave Mr. and Mrs. Wedgwood a complimentary reception on Saturday, November 5th, in the Arcade Café, 108, Argyle Street. There were 120 present, Mr. Alexander MacKendrick, President of the League, presiding. Mr. John Paul proposed, "Our Guests." Mr. and Mrs. Wedgwood replied. The other speakers were ex-Bailie Burt, Mr. William Cassels, Mr. David McLardy, Mr. John Muir, Mr. J. M. Hogge, and Mr. John Gordon. Miss Aster McLardy, Mr. Findlay and Mr. Allan Wilson entertained the company with a number of songs which were finely rendered. The meeting in every respect was a splendid success; Mr. Wedgwood paid the League a high compliment by saying "that nowhere out of Scotland could such a meeting of Single Taxers be held."

The following meetings have been addressed by members of the League:—Mr. W. K. Brymer—Troon, Bo'ness, Patrick, Irvine, Mauchline, Dalry, Beith, Anderson, Clydebank, Darvel. John Gordon—Langside, Battlefield. Alexander MacKendrick—Young Street U.F. Church, Calton, Eastern Co-operative, Townhead, Glasgow, Cathcart. Ex-Bailie Burt—Whitevale, Bellgrove, Calton, Bridgeton. William Cassels—Whitevale. Graham Cassels—Calton, Newmilns, Tolcross, Irvine. Robert Cassels—Carmyle. David McLardy—Bishopbriggs. G. B. Waddell—Bellgrove. Wm. D. Hamilton—Saltcoats.

MR. WEDGWOOD AT SALTCOATS.

Under the auspices of the Liberal Associations of Ardrossan, Saltcoats and Stevenston, and the United Committee, a largely attended meeting was held in the Town Hall, Saltcoats, North Ayrshire, on November 9th. Councillor James Fulton occupied the chair, Mr. Josiah C. Wedgwood, M.P., was the principal speaker, and on the platform was a large and representative party of Liberals of the district. After the chairman's opening remarks, Mr. Wedgwood, who received a most hearty reception, gave, in the words of the *ARDROSSAN HERALD*, "a full and lucid explanation of the principle of the taxation of land values, and of the benefits to be derived from it." Several questions were put to Mr. Wedgwood, and answered by him.

A resolution expressing high appreciation of Mr. Wedgwood's work in social reform movements and further expressing approval of the 1909 Budget, which secured complete valuation of land in the United Kingdom, the first essential of any policy of land reform, and urging the Government to seek an early opportunity

of using the valuation for the purpose of levying a rate on land values in relief of existing rates, was moved by Mr. Morrison, seconded by Mr. Douglas, and carried unanimously.

On the motion of Councillor Fawcett, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded Mr. Wedgwood.

EDINBURGH.

The Annual Report and Balance Sheet of the Edinburgh League for 1909-10 has just been issued. It has been compiled by the hon. secretary, Geo. Arnott Eadie, S.S.C., and was submitted at the annual meeting of the League held in Oddfellow's Hall on 30th November. In Edinburgh and the East of Scotland, by means of lectures, debates, and the consistent spreading of literature among the electors, the League has kept the agitation for land values in the foreground, and thus prepared the electors on the question. Whenever desired, literature has been given for distribution, while our members gave regular lectures and addresses during the winter to various Literary, Labour, Socialist, and other bodies interested in the subject.

At the Free Trade Congress in Antwerp, in August, 1910, Mr. W. J. Young represented the Edinburgh League.

The League expresses its indebtedness to the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values in London, and to the Scottish Liberal Association for their support and co-operation.

The League has undertaken and issued a large number of leaflets on its own behalf dealing with the Land Question.

The report shows that much effective work has been done, and we must congratulate the members of the League for a successful year's work.

GLASGOW CORPORATION.

LAND VALUES RESOLUTION.

On November 17th, Bailie Alston moved at a meeting of the Glasgow Corporation:

"That, having regard to the facts (1) that the principle of the taxation of land values has been consistently supported by the Corporation with the view of securing to the city and the ratepayers the benefit of such taxation, and (2) that the Government are at present collecting, or are in contemplation of collecting, information and all relative data as to the true valuation of all lands situated in urban and suburban districts throughout the country for the purpose of such taxation, the Corporation, following out their recognised policy in regard to this matter, resolve to petition Parliament to the effect that powers be granted to all local rating authorities throughout the country—country, urban, and town councils—to impose and levy on the new valuation a tax on the value of land for local purposes, distinct and separate from the increment duty to be imposed and levied under the provisions of the Finance (1909-10) Act, 1910."

Mr. Nicol seconded. Treasurer Graham moved the previous question and Mr. A. McClure seconded. Mr. W. F. Anderson moved that the matter be remitted to a committee to discuss it in its various bearings. Mr. Duncan Graham seconded.

Bailie Alston withdrew his motion in favour of that of Mr. W. F. Anderson. His reason for doing so was, he said, that Mr. Anderson and certain others did not seem to understand the difference between the taxation of land values and the increment duty.

On a division Mr. W. F. Anderson's motion was carried by 38 to 28.

It was agreed to remit the question to the Parliamentary Bills Committee, with the addition of Bailie Alston.

THE LAND CLUB LEAGUE.

At the annual meeting of the Land Club League, held on November 16th, the following resolution was passed:—

"This meeting of the Land Club League welcomes the valuation of land under the Finance Act (1909-10) and resolves to do everything in its power to secure an accurate valuation, and to make that valuation available as a means of obtaining land for small holders at rents which will leave to them the full market rate of interest on their capital, and a full reward for their labour, and also as a means of transferring the burden of rates and taxes from improvements to the value of land, thus bringing all land into use."

Copies were sent to the Prime Minister, Chancellor of the Exchequer and President of the Board of Agriculture.

WHAT THE ENGLISH LEAGUE IS DOING.

A few of the meetings announced in the November issue had, towards the end of the month, to be cancelled in consequence of the dissolution. The following additional meetings have, however, to be reported:—

- Nov. 2.—St. Alban's Debating Society. T. W. Toovey, C.C.
- " 4.—Whitstable, Liberal Association. A. Wilme Collier.
- " 7.—Wells, Women's Liberal Association. Mrs. Pease.
- " 7.—Silsden, Liberal Club. Fred. Skirrow.
- " 8.—Thornton Heath. A. Wilme Collier.
- " 9.—Hightown, Liversedge. William Thomson, J.P.
- " 16.—East Finsbury Liberal Association. Harry de Pass.
- " 16.—Abbott's Langley. T. W. Toovey, C.C.
- " 16.—Haggerston, Canal Road School. H. G. Chancellor, M.P.
- " 17.—Kensington, Blechynden Hall. H. G. Chancellor, M.P.
- " 17.—Oakworth Liberal Club. William Thomson, J.P.
- " 18.—Hailsham Women's Liberal Association. Mrs. Pease and Harry White.
- " 22.—Wharnccliffe and Silkstone Liberal Club. F. Skirrow.
- " 22.—South Islington. H. G. Chancellor, M.P.
- " 23.—Hailsham, League of Young Liberals. Harry White.
- " 23.—Haggerston. H. G. Chancellor, M.P., and P. W. Raffan, M.P.
- " 25.—Haggerston, Seawell Street School. H. G. Chancellor, M.P.
- " 26.—Congregational Church, Burnt Ash Road, Lee. F. Verinder.
- " 27.—Greenwich Ethical Society. W. Chas. Wade.
- " 27.—Boothtown Liberal Club. Fred. Skirrow.
- " 28.—Haggerston Road School. H. G. Chancellor, M.P.
- " 28.—Blackburn League of Young Liberals. F. Skirrow.
- " 29.—Blackburn League of Young Liberals. F. Skirrow.
- " 30.—Brierfield League of Young Liberals. F. Skirrow.

A special circular has been posted to all members of the League, asking for (1) subscriptions towards election expenses; (2) personal help in distributing literature in the constituencies; (2) copies of candidates' election addresses.

The President of the League, Mr. H. G. Chancellor, is again contesting the seat which he won so brilliantly in January, and is again opposed by the Hon. Rupert Guinness, whom he then unseated. A contest on so old a register in a constituency like Haggerston is a specially difficult one. There are said to be 4,000 removals on a register of 8,000. Members of the League who can give any help in Haggerston are earnestly requested to report themselves at the Central Committee Rooms, 178, Kingsland Road, to Mr. R. J. Child, who is Mr. Chancellor's agent.

Mr. E. G. Hemmerde, K.C., President of the League last year, has resigned his candidature for East Denbighshire—a perfectly safe seat—in order to fight a hard battle in Portsmouth. The members of the Portsmouth League for the Taxation of Land Values may be relied upon to do their utmost for a candidate who has already rendered such eminent service to our cause. All members of the League who are within reach of Portsmouth are asked to give all the help they can to Mr. Hemmerde.

A like appeal is made to local friends on behalf of the candidature of Mr. Josiah C. Wedgwood (President, 1908-9) in Newcastle-under-Lyme; of Mr. W. R. Lester, M.A. (President, 1907-8) in Mid Norfolk; of Mr. J. H. Whitley (President, 1904-7) in Halifax. A number of other members are likely to be candidates, but, at the time of writing, many remain to be definitely adopted, and no full list of candidates is available.

The General Secretary addressed, on November 1st, a meeting of the Central London Branch of the Women's Labour League, in place of Mrs. Marjory Pease, who had been announced to speak, but was unable to be present. The Branch subsequently adopted the following resolution: "This meeting recognises and appreciates the principle of the separate Valuation of Land: it earnestly urges the Government to continue this policy, by making taxes on Land Values available for public needs, especially in substitution for the remaining duties on food." The resolution has been sent to the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to the leaders of the Labour, Irish and Conservative parties.

The RICHMOND LIBERAL MONTHLY (November) makes a strong appeal to the local Free Traders, who are reorganising the Surrey Branch of the Free Trade Union, to extend their objects so as to cover the securing of real Free Trade. The

argument is reinforced by a long extract from the League's latest pamphlet, "Free Trade and Land Values."

Mr. Verinder was announced to deliver the following course of lectures to open air speakers of the London Liberal Federation at Essex Hall:—

- Nov. 4.—"Land and Taxation: Historical Sketch."
- " 11.—"Land Values and the Budget of 1909-10."
- " 18.—"Land Values and Free Trade."
- " 25.—"Land Values and Housing."
- Dec. 2.—"Land Values and Unemployment."
- " 9.—"Land Values and Rating Reform."
- " 16.—"Land, Labour and Monopoly."

Owing to the sudden announcement of a December election the lectures had to be suspended after November 18th.

The WILLESDEN CITIZEN of November 11th contains a three-column report of an address given by Mr. Chancellor at the People's Hall on "An Ideal City and how to Get it."

A Spanish member of the League has sent us a Spanish version of "The Land Song." He is now engaged in translating "The Story of my Dictatorship."

There is still some uncertainty about the meetings already arranged for December. Some of them may have to be postponed, or the arrangements altered, to suit the exigencies of a General Election. It is certain that a very large number of addresses will be arranged and delivered in connection with the election itself.

DECEMBER MEETINGS.

- Thurs. 1.—Blackburn League of Young Liberals. Fred. Skirrow.
- Sat. 3.—Sevenoaks Liberal Association, Central Hall. Fredk. Verinder, "Rural Districts and Land Value Taxation." 8 p.m.
- Mon. 5.—Ascension Working Men's Society, Baxter Road, Custom House, E. W. G. S. Coad. "Those Wretched Rates!" 8 p.m.
- Tues. 6.—Central Finsbury, Women's Liberal Association. Fredk. Verinder, "Woman's Interest in the Land Question." 8 p.m.
- Thurs. 8.—Peterborough Liberal Forwards. Fredk. Verinder. Keighley Y.M.C.A. William Thomson, J.P.
- Tues. 13.—Surbiton and District I.L.P., Hall adjoining Coffee Room, 38, Brighton Road. Fredk. Verinder. "The Land Question and the Unemployed." 8 p.m.
- Thurs. 15.—Peckham Liberal Radical and Progressive Association, Woods Road School. Fredk. Verinder, "Land and Labour." 8.15 p.m.
- Sun. 18.—Men's open meeting, Anerley Congregational Church. Fredk. Verinder, "The Land Question and the Unemployed." 3 p.m.

UNITED COMMITTEE.

The following meetings have been addressed during the month in addition to the class meeting of the Open-Air Speakers' League of the London Liberal Federation:—

- Nov. 1.—Finchley Ratepayers' Association. C. J. Cawood.
- " 2.—Langford, Beds. John Orr and P. J. Cawood.
- " 4.—Haggerston. Harry de Pass.
- " 7.—Putney. Harry de Pass.
- " 10.—North Kensington. Harry de Pass.
- " 10.—Norwood W.L.A. C. J. Cawood.
- " 13.—Harringay P.S.A. John Orr.
- " 16.—East Finsbury. Harry de Pass.
- " 16.—Croydon League of Young Liberals. A. W. Madsen.
- " 17.—Fulham. A. W. Madsen.
- " 18.—Kenilworth (Warwickshire). Harry de Pass.
- " 19.—Muswell Hill. Harry de Pass.
- " 19.—Eccles W.L.A. A. W. Madsen.
- " 21.—Rochester (afternoon). Harry de Pass.
- " Chislehurst (evening). Harry de Pass.
- " 23.—South Kensington. Harry de Pass.

But in saying that Great Britain is in the lead, we do not allude to legislation. The land taxes over which British politics are convulsed are much below the land taxes which the American States impose and actually collect. What really makes the British land tax movement a Henry George as well as a Lloyd George movement, is not the petty tax burdens the Liberal Party is imposing on land values, and which the British landed interests have been desperately resisting, but the reasons proclaimed for doing it.—THE PUBLIC, Chicago, November 18th.

COLONIAL AND FOREIGN.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Mr. W. H. Rebbeck, who kindly keeps us posted with events in Western Australia, writes that the Labour Party are now in full possession of the Government in the Commonwealth with a pledged majority in both Houses to support them. The chief measure of interest to Land Reformers is, of course, the Land Tax measure which is now being discussed. Unfortunately there is no principle underlying the Bill which can be supported enthusiastically by single taxers. Introduced for the purpose of breaking up large estates is the plea put forward, but the Bill applies to city lands which are put to use and are not large estates. Then it is hampered with an exemption of £5,000 capital value, which quite destroys the value of the Bill. The debates have clearly shown that few of the Federal members have given any study to the economic aspect of land taxation. Taxation of wealth, regardless of the method of its acquisition, is the principle of the Labour Government. The opposition are just as much at sea regarding the principle involved.

Mr. Alfred Deakin, the late Prime Minister, speaking a month ago on the Bill, said one thing was certain: the poor landlord would have to pay as he could not pass the tax on to the tenant. The Mayor of Melbourne last week said on the same question that one of the first results of the passing of this Bill would be that landlords would at once raise the rents of tenants all round to make up the tax.

If the leaders of the politicians speak like this, what must the common people think?

Still another important reason why reformers are not anxious to see this Bill passed is that it infringes the rights of the several States. Centralisation of power always means curtailment of Liberty. Therefore those who love liberty are against handing over more power to the central Government. Mr. Rebbeck fully believes that if this measure could be held over they would get a more just Bill from the various States within a few years. However, there is no chance of that happening. Land Reformers in Australia must do as Land Reformers are doing with the Budget in Britain, which is not all to their liking—make the best of it. It is expected the tax will bring in one and a half million a year, which is a good sum to take out of the landlords' cake, even if not on the lines Land Reformers sincerely desire.

In this State we are on the verge of a political crisis, and all Land Reformers are uniting to get our basis of local Government taxation to include, as in New South Wales, the right to tax on land values, and also an increase on our present halfpenny unimproved land values tax.

In spite of arbitration acts and other devices, there is no diminution in the number of labour disputes. When will the workers cease tinkering with effects and strike at the cause—Land Monopoly?

NEW SOUTH WALES.

The Sydney Single Tax League have instituted a Press Bureau on similar lines to the one in connection with the United Committee. Mr. A. G. Huie, the hard-working secretary of the League, is sending out to the New South Wales papers some excellent matter. We have just received a batch of letters and articles. Several of the articles criticise very effectively the lack of principle in the Commonwealth Land Tax Bill brought in by the Labour Government, and the £5,000 exemption. One letter to the papers gives a brief sketch of the Lord Advocate (Right Hon. Alex. Ure, K.C., M.P.), an extract from one of his speeches, and particulars concerning the petition, signed by 134 members of Parliament, recently addressed to the Government in this country, for abolishing the breakfast-table duties and substituting land values taxation.

According to a TIMES cable of October 26th, Mr. Nielsen, Secretary for Lands, states that from January 1st next no more freehold titles to land will be granted. Nothing, however, will be done to disturb the form of tenure of present landholders.

NEW ZEALAND.

After a good voyage Mr. Arthur Withy, who at the invitation of some friends of the single tax movement in New Zealand, is to undertake a campaign there in favour of land values taxation, arrived at Auckland during the first week in October. On his way he addressed gatherings of Single Taxers at Adelaide and

Melbourne, and two indoor and an open-air Sunday meeting at Sydney. Writing of Melbourne and Sydney, he says the single taxers there are determined to push the fighting. They are "getting together" well in Victoria, and we may hear great things from them soon.

Mr. Withy delivered his first lecture in the St. James' Hall, Auckland, on October 4th. A "Welcome" soiree was held in his honour on October 10th, and on October 17th he attended a Conference at Wellington.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

FIRST LABOUR BUDGET.

When last year the South Australian Labour Party was successful at the polls and a Labour Ministry formed, we heard with satisfaction that Mr. Crawford Vaughan had been entrusted with the honourable position of Treasurer, or, as it would be called in this country, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. Vaughan understands the Taxation of Land Values sufficiently well to know that the direct cause of the social ills that attend our advancing civilisation, associating poverty with progress, and in the newer countries enabling forestalment to precede, hinder and exploit settlement, is the recognition of private property in land, and of the right or power of the private individual to appropriate to himself its publicly created rental value. And that all the advantages of the exclusive possession of land might be reconciled with the justice of recognising the equal rights of all to the use of the land and to a share of the natural bounties, by the simple method of substituting for the taxation now imposed upon industry—upon improvements, and the earnings, processes and methods of industry—a tax upon the unimproved value of land, whether in full use, partially used, or entirely withheld from use. As Treasurer, however, though his speech might indicate his own ideals, his proposals would only show how far he had succeeded in getting his views endorsed by his colleagues and by the Party with which he was acting. And after carefully reading his speech and studying his proposals, with some knowledge of the country and its past history, we must express our conviction that by his first Budget and Budget speech Mr. Vaughan has shown himself worthy of his training and has earned the grateful thanks of the Land Reformers of the world.

For the coming year—1910-11—Mr. Vaughan estimated the Expenditure at £3,900,320 and the Revenue at £3,908,328, showing an estimated surplus of £8,098—a somewhat narrow margin. He raised the exemption under the Income Tax from £200 to £300, involving a loss to the revenue of about £17,000; and remitted the Stamp Receipt Tax, involving another loss of revenue of approximately £17,000. To make good the deficiency caused by these remissions and in order to allow for a reduction in railway freights to an extent of £75,000, the all-round land tax was increased by ½d. in the pound, that is, from ½d. to 1½d.

Mr. Vaughan formulated the taxation policy of the Labour Government in the following trenchant words:—

"The taxation proposals of the Government are designed to take the burden from industry and production, and place it upon values created by the energy of the people and the expenditure of public money. It is manifestly unfair and against the interests of the State that the man who uses his land, who develops the capabilities of the soil, whose energies convert waste spaces into habitable and productive areas, should be penalised by oppressive and inquisitorial methods of taxation, while the speculator, who benefits by these pioneering efforts, and the value of whose lands is equally enhanced by the railways with that of the genuine land user, should so largely escape taxation."

And in defending the increase in the Land Tax he said:—

"The relief afforded the primary producer by the reduction in railway freights, as well as by the increased road grants, and the remission of the income tax will more than compensate the average land user for the extra tax upon the unimproved value of his land. It must not be forgotten that one acre in William Street is worth many hundreds of thousands of acres of farming land in the country, and that a large portion of the increased land values tax must fall upon city and suburban acres, country town lands, and rich pastoral areas, while the main relief afforded by the reduction of railway freights will go to the man upon the soil. Such a tax as I have proposed will bring into cultivation large tracts of land held under fee simple, and under lease, by speculators who are waiting for the pioneer to show what the country is capable of producing. It will add largely to the railway revenue, and so stimulate production and increase

demand for commodities, by settling people genuinely upon the soil, that trade must increase and the condition of the general worker be improved."

In addition to the increase of the all-round Land Tax, Mr. Vaughan introduced "an increment tax similar to that which is now the law of Great Britain," a tax of 20 per cent. upon the increment value. "Such a tax," he argued, "will secure an honest assessment, and it will give to the State merely one-fifth of the added value which the services of the State have conferred upon the land held by the individual." He further pointed out that the land speculator does not have to pay income tax on the increased value given to his land, nor on the profit he derived when selling his land, and, therefore, it is only fair that he should pay some tax. Mr. Vaughan concluded his speech with the following eloquent peroration:—

"This year promises to eclipse all records, and if nature smiles for another month the harvest should reach—I say it with some hesitation—nearly 30 million bushels. Bad seasons are as inevitable as the revolution of the earth, but the genius of the people will rise superior to the vicissitudes of nature; of that I have no doubt. Our policy—the policy upon which the Budget is framed—is that those who labour and toil, whether on the farm or in the factory, and by their energy produce the national wealth, shall in the future share more adequately in the proceeds of their own labour than they have done in the past. (Cheers.) Is it in vain to hope that some of the consideration hitherto bestowed upon the production of wealth will be devoted to solving the greater and far more menacing problem of its equitable distribution? (Hear, hear.) That time will be expedited by the adoption of a wise and just financial policy. Then we will reach the happy period—

When wealth no more will rest in mounted heaps,
But smit with freer light shall slowly melt,
And fatten lower hands,
And right shall spread,
And man be liker man,
Through all the seasons of the golden year."

We would again cordially congratulate Mr. Vaughan upon his speech and the policy it inaugurated. South Australia is to be

congratulated on the fact that men holding and avowing such views are entrusted with the highest public positions at the disposal of its citizens.

L. H. B.

UNITED STATES.

MR. HENRY GEORGE, JUNR., RETURNED TO CONGRESS.

MR. GEORGE CHANGED a Republican majority of over 8000 into a Democratic majority of over 2,300.

Mr. Thomas Scanlon, Secretary of the Tariff Reform Committee of the New York Reform Club (in the United States, of course, Tariff Reform means the movement for the reduction and abolition of tariffs), writing from New York City about the elections for Congressional seats that has just taken place, says:—

Of course, you have heard all about our great Democratic victory which means an early reduction of the tariff. . . . But you will be particularly glad to know that we have elected Henry George, Jr., to Congress. Yes, and elected him not by a mere partisan vote but openly as an avowed and aggressive Free Trader and Single Taxer. Indeed when one considers that the district for which he was elected is one of the most conservative in New York, and that his opponent, an estimable man and one who stood high in the councils of his party, and had six years' Congressional experience to his credit, had carried the seat by 9,000 majority on the last occasion, the victory is enough to set one thinking. George put the Single Tax and Free Trade in the forefront of his canvass. "Do you adhere to the principles of your father?" asked a voter when "heckling" George. "Certainly I do," replied George. "Do you believe in Free Trade?" "I do." "Do you believe in Single Tax?" "With my last breath." The above is an indication of the perfect frankness with which George avowed his "unpopular" doctrines. The fact is that these doctrines are much more popular than our diplomatic reformers suspect. At all events the plain fact is that George won his seat upon these very issues, and this startling instance—startling even to all of us, including George himself—suggests the inquiry whether the bolder policy is not the more successful, and whether our own timidity is not a greater obstruction to us than the public indifference.

The great influence that helped George and helped the democratic movement generally is the high cost of living. You remember the pregnant sentence of John Bright, telling about the repeal of the Corn Laws, "Famine itself against which we had warred, joined us." So it was here. Not all the argument in the world could have been more effective than the widespread, visible hardship of the consumer, which he feels is due to the tariff, and which has shaken his faith in the whole doctrine of Protection, since he had long been taught to believe that there could be no hard times under Protection.

The papers all spoke kindly of George and recommended his election, even some who, like the NEW YORK TIMES, have no sympathy with Single Tax. He is sure to do a lot of useful work in Congress and we are very glad to have such a representative there to keep his eye upon what goes on and to keep us informed as to same.

BOOK REVIEW.

LAND REFORM IN THEORY AND PRACTICE.*

Mr. J. Dundas White, in his new pamphlet, has provided us with a most useful little handbook on the land question. Needless to say, the "Land Reform" he discusses is the reform of land tenure by the taxation and rating of Land Values. In his treatment of the subject, he deals lucidly and comprehensively with all the issues involved. He emphasises the importance of enabling the people to make the best use of the national resources of their country, and explains the only means by which this can be effected.

In his chapter on the incidence of rating, Mr. White throws out several valuable suggestions. Who is to be liable for the tax or rate on Land Values, the occupier or the owner? Are existing contracts to be respected? Mr. White argues for a period of transition with a time limit of twenty-one years on long leases and feus, after which each person sharing the land value would pay his proportion of the tax direct.

There is a preface by Mr. Lloyd George, who pays a well-deserved tribute to Mr. J. Dundas White's ability to write on the subject.

* "Land Reform in Theory and Practice," by James Dundas White, LL.D., M.P., with a Preface by the Right Hon. David Lloyd George, M.P. Published, price 1d., by the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values.

DEMOCRATIC DELUSIONS

Is the title of a series of articles now running through "The Open Road," and written by a member of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values. These articles are designed to let a little daylight into the minds of those who profess and call themselves reformers, but who unhappily happen to have got on the wrong track so far as the Land Question is concerned.

"THE OPEN ROAD"

is a Monthly Magazine concerned with **Education, Health, Social Questions and Religion**; It can therefore hardly fail to appeal to Land Leaguers.

Now, considering this announcement will appear for six months, and represents a goodwill gift, not from the writer of the articles but from another Land Leaguer who wishes to press forward the propaganda of "THE OPEN ROAD," you may be certain it is worth your while to send four penny stamps to . . .

THE PUBLISHER, "The Open Road,"

3, Amen Corner, London, E.C.,

for a specimen copy and other pamphlets.

Having sampled one copy you will certainly send 3/- to secure "THE OPEN ROAD" post free for 12 months.