

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