

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: