

As men are created equal; they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. —
U.S.A. DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

“Political liberty, when the equal right to land is denied, becomes, as population increases and invention goes on, merely the liberty to compete for employment at starvation wages.”—HENRY GEORGE.

REPORT
OF THE
LAND NATIONALIZATION
SOCIETY.

1881-3.

—:O:—

Established to equitably restore to the Nation the Land of the Nation, so that all may equally benefit by the revenue from the Land, and have equal facilities to use and enjoy it.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

NOTICES TO MEMBERS.

Change of residence should be notified to the Secretary.

Those who cannot increase their subscriptions to promote more worthily a cause so great, may at least evince their zeal by endeavouring to add to the Society's members. Literature can be had freely for judicious distribution, and it should be remembered that an average addition of only *one* new member by each present subscriber would *double* the strength of the Society.

It is respectfully requested that the Secretary be informed of any matters relating to the Land Question that may appear either in the London, Provincial, or Foreign Press.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

Those friends who may be disposed to assist the Society by bequest should use the following form:—

"I give and bequeath to the Treasurer or Treasurers for the time being of the Land Nationalization Society the sum of £ _____, free of Legacy Duty, to be paid out of such of my personal Estate as can be lawfully applied for the purpose, and to be used for the benefit of the said Society, as its Executive Committee may think proper."

MEMBERSHIP.

Concurrence with the Society's principles of Land Nationalization and Annual Subscription to its funds are the conditions of membership. A Donation of £5 5s. or more confers Life membership.

COUNCIL

PRESIDENT.

*ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., Frieth Hill, Geglaining

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

*DESMOND G. FITZGERALD,

*Professor F. W. NEWMAN.

*E. D. GIRDLESTONE B.A., Oxon.

*Miss HELEN TAYLOR.

TREASURER.

*A. C. SWINTON, Maybank, The Avenue, Upper Norwood.

HON. SECRETARY.

*H. W. LEY.

Rev. J. D. Alford (Birmingham)
J. G. Ashley
H. Atherton, B.C.S.
F. Gilmore Barnett
H. H. Hood Barrs, LL.B.
G. F. Bodington, M.D. (near Dyalley)
W. S. Booth (Gloucester)
*T. Briggs
D. Brodie, M.D. (Edinburgh)
*E. T. Craig (of Rahahue)
R. Cooper (Eastbourne)
R. S. Dick, M.D.
F. R. Dononey, M. Simpton S.B.
R. R. Douglas (Liverpool)
Rev. T. Dugard
*J. C. Durant
Col. J. M. Earle
*T. H. Elliott
R. P. B. Frost
A. Halstead (Harrrogate)
W. Hargrave, M.A. (Bristol)
Rev. S. D. Headlam
W. Hicks (Eastbourne)
J. Hooper
Rev. E. Pan Jones, Ph.D. (Mostyn)
*C. Lee
H. S. Lewis (Cambridge)
Mrs. Lowe

B. Lucraft, M.L.S.B.
*H. G. Moberly
Ernest Morley
*C. Murray
R. Owen
J. A. Parker
*W. Reeves
*W. Reynolds
Edgar Robinson (Isle of Man)
Lieut.-Col. W. A. Ross, F.G.S.
H. S. Salt
Rev. T. Travers Sherlock, B.A.
(Smethwick)
A. P. Snodgrass
T. W. Taunton
*Jonathan Taylor, M. Sheffield S.B.
Mrs. W. Tebb
J. Turle, M.D.
D. Uguibert
W. Volkman
T. F. Walker (Birmingham)
J. Whyte (Inverness)
*A. F. Winks
S. D. Williams (Malvern)
Howard Williams, M.A.
*F. A. Winder
Ed. Withy (West Hartlepool)

Those marked with an * constitute the Executive Committee.

SECRETARY.

JOHN S. H. EVANS.

June 27th, 1883.

The Society earnestly desires to enlarge the area of its work, but the vigour of its action depends, of course, upon the means at its disposal. Special appeal is therefore made to all who realise that the gigantic and perilous pauperism of the nation is mainly due to the existing land system, to strenuously aid in effecting this deeply-needed reform.

Remittances may be sent to the Treasurer, A. C. Swinton, Maybank, The Avenue, Upper Norwood, London. Cheques to be crossed "The Union Bank of London, Charing Cross." P.O. Orders to be made payable at Ludgate Circus, London, E.C.

SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
LAND NATIONALIZATION SOCIETY.

Held at the City Club, Ludgate Circus, London, June 27th, 1883.

A. R. WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS,

SUMMARISED.

Mr Wallace first reviewed the more interesting phases of the Land movement during the past year. The progress of public opinion was declared to be satisfactory, due in part to Mr. George's arrest in Ireland, and the consequent notice by the Press of his remarkable work, *Progress and Poverty*, but also largely to its great circulation, and the activity of several of the officers and members of our Society, who have contributed numerous letters to the Press. The case of the Skye crofters, and the destitute state of the Island of Lewis—for forty years the absolute property of a wealthy and benevolent banker—were adverted to, and it was shown that the miserable state of things there is entirely due to denial of any rights in the soil to the inhabitants of those islands. On the question of pauperism fresh proof was adduced of the very misleading character of the official statistics of pauperism, on which politicians found their optimistic and erroneous statements as to its diminution.

The case of the Southport foreshore was adduced, as a striking example of the need of nationalization in order to give to every locality power to utilise waste lands for the benefit of the community.

Referring next to the question of Mr. George and his teachings, the proposal to tax rent instead of at once nationalizing the land was examined, and it was shown that, "according to the principles laid down by Mr. George himself, such a method would be necessarily inoperative and worthless. The whole point of Mr. George's argument is to show that, so long as land is a monopoly in the hands of individuals, be they few or many, everything that benefits the community—the users of land,—must necessarily increase the value of land, and thus transfer the larger part of that benefit into the hands of the landlords. He shows that, however much the cost of production may be diminished, or the expenses of Government reduced, wages will not rise, but landlords will grow richer. Yet he proposes

to tax rent, and thus benefit the community. Is it not clear that *this* benefit, like all the other benefits he has examined in his Book VI., chap. i, must inevitably lead to a rise of rent, and further taxation to a yet further rise? Even if rents were fixed at the time they were taxed, does anybody imagine that that would prevent the landlords from getting the rise in the form of premium, or bonus, or by some other arrangement, the failure to carry out which would lead to ejection? In other words, the price of an article of necessity, which is a monopoly, is the highest competition price that can be paid for it, and any attempt to reduce this price by taxation, or by other legislative means, must fail so long as the monopoly continues. Land is an article of the first necessity. Men must have it or die. Whatever people can afford to pay for it now, they do pay. Make the community better off by taxing landlords, and the community can afford to pay more, and therefore it will have to pay more. The proposal to raise the land-tax to its original amount of 4s. in the pound on the full present value would merely cause rents to rise to that amount on the average, but as they would rise very unequally, enormous distress would be caused, and yet no one be benefited."

In conclusion, the President called attention to the very valuable works of the Belgian economists, Baron Colins and M. Agathon de Potter, and gave a summary of their views. In his opinion they formed the most complete system of social and political reform yet put forward, embracing not only the complete nationalisation of the land, on lines very similar to those adopted by this Society, but dealing also with the relations of capital and labour in a very thorough and practical manner. He trusted that these remarkable works would be soon translated and condensed for the study of English reformers.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE MEETING.

Resolution I., moved by Mr. T. F. WALKER (Birmingham), seconded by Mr. E. WITHY (West Hartlepool), and supported by Messrs. W. Volekman, B. Lucraft, and H. W. Rowland:—

"That this Meeting, deeply feeling the necessity of a just system of land tenure, and firmly believing that this is to be found only in the Nationalization of the Land, pledges itself to use every legitimate and constitutional means to accomplish this object."

Carried unanimously.

Resolution II., moved by Professor F. W. NEWMAN, and seconded by Mr. E. T. CRAIG (of Rahahine):—

"That this Meeting insists on the duty of the Legislature to retain the Public Lands, and to adopt measures to increase them at every opportunity."

Carried unanimously.

REPORT

Presented to the Members of the Society at its Second Annual Meeting.

THIS is the Second Annual Meeting of the Society, but no previous report has been prepared of the work accomplished. Some details of the formation of the Society, how it originated, and what has subsequently been done, therefore seem desirable.

In the *Contemporary Review* for November, 1880, there appeared an article, "How to Nationalize the Land. A Radical Solution of the Irish Land Question," by Alfred Russel Wallace. This article led to the foundation of the Society, and for the information of the members, it may be summarised thus: That the State, after a certain period should resume its ancient rights to the soil; that anything put in or upon the land should belong to the occupier, as long as he remained in occupation; that there should be no subletting; also absolute freedom from State interference with the occupier, as well as direct annual payment to the State for the use of the soil, the money so derived being applied in reduction of taxation, in payment of the National Debt, and for other State purposes; with equitable consideration for existing claims, and the appointment of a National Land Commission, or some other body, to carry the law into effect. In this important article Mr. Wallace states:—"It will no doubt be said that the title of this paper is misleading, since the arguments I have used are equally applicable to England as to Ireland. This is quite true. The principles laid down are of universal application, but the time and the mode of applying such principles are matters of expediency." As happens to many other valuable and philanthropic suggestions, very little public notice was taken of Mr. Wallace's proposals; but on the 28th November, 1880, Mr. A. C. Swinton addressed a letter to him, proposing the formation of a Land Nationalization Society. To this letter Mr. Wallace responded on the 30th of the same month.

Mr. Swinton proceeded, early in December, to ascertain what support would be rendered to form a Society, and it resulted in a preliminary meeting being held at Upper Norwood, on the 6th March, 1881, at which several gentlemen were present. Mr. Wallace claimed as a speciality of his scheme, that no previous one distinguished as did his between the land *per se*, and what man placed in or upon it, and this he considered essential to the successful working of Land Nationalization. He also maintained "that all land held from the State shall remain in the occupation of the

holder, who shall not sublet or mortgage." At that meeting it was decided that a Society should be formed, and called the "Land Nationalization Society," and the scheme, eventually agreed upon, is at present before the public. From December, 1880, to December, 1881, Mr. Swinton carried on an extensive correspondence with persons interested in the question, and ultimately accepted the office of Treasurer, with Mr. J. A. Parker as Hon. Secretary. A Conference was held at the Westminster Palace Hotel, on the 16th and 31st January, 1882. It was then stated by Mr. Parker that their proceedings had been noticed in ten London and more than twenty provincial papers, most of the latter notices being favourable. To the date of the Conference the receipts from various sources had been £36 ls. 4d., and the expenses £35 12s. 11d.

The Conference was influentially attended, an earnest and encouraging discussion being carried on under the presidency of Mr. Wallace. The resolutions passed at this meeting, with the names of the speakers, will be found on the opposite page.

During the remainder of the year 1882 gradual progress was made. Lectures were delivered by the President of the Society at Glasgow and Finsbury; by Mr. Parker at Hounslow, Hackney, Eastbourne, and Hastings; by Professor F. W. Newman at Bristol; by Mr. A. Hulstead at Harrogate; by Mr. W. Hargrave, and others. Up to the present date, some 11,000 official letters have been written. The Society's publications also have been widely circulated, upwards of 30,000 tracts and programmes having been sent out, as well as several hundred copies of Mr. Wallace's "Land Nationalization; its Necessity and its Aims." Within the last six months the Society has nearly doubled the number of its members. Of Mr. Wallace's work the Council have the pleasure to announce that the impression of 2,500 copies being nearly exhausted, a third and cheaper edition will shortly be issued. It may be stated that societies for the Nationalization of the Land are multiplying in various parts of the British Empire, New Zealand, among these, being the most prominent.

The social, moral, and religious well-being of the people depend so much on advantageous surroundings, that it is the duty of every true reformer to aid in a movement which, more than anything else, would bring about that end. For this object not only are constant and energetic exertions required, but also *EXERTS*. The appeal is urgent, because a lecturing campaign throughout the Kingdom in the autumn *must depend* on the sum now added to the Society's slender means. The President, Mr. Wallace, together with Professor F. W. Newman, Miss Helen Taylor, Messrs. J. A. Parker, E. D. Girdlestone and others, have kindly offered their gratuitous services as lecturers, and the Council would pressingly urge on those that have the means, to contribute heartily and liberally.

The receipts for the year 1882-3 amount to £207 13s. 5d. The Council have met twenty-six times since the last annual meeting.

The following were the resolutions passed at the Conference held at the Westminster Palace Hotel:—

Resolution I. — Moved by Mr. Wm. Volekman, seconded by Mr. Gordon G. Flaws: "That private property in land is the monopoly by a few of an element essential to human existence: that it had its origin, to a large extent, in force or fraud, or economic ignorance, and that its continued existence is a public wrong, and a danger to the community."

Resolution II.—Moved by Mr. Wm. Saunders, seconded by Mr. Walter Wren: "That the present system of private property in land in the country, by reason of the divided and often-conflicting interests it creates in the soil, leads to bad cultivation, greatly diminishes production, and checks permanent improvement; while, by depriving the labourer and public at large of any rights in the soil, it is one of the chief causes of pauperism, demoralisation, and crime."

Resolution III.—Moved by Miss Helen Taylor, seconded by Mr. Herbert Burrows: "That private property in land, by favouring monopoly and building speculation, has produced, and still produces, crowded and unhealthy dwellings, in which the mass of our people are forced to live and pay exorbitant rents."

Resolution IV.—Moved by Dr. G. B. Clark, seconded by Mr. Hy. Atherton: "That private property in land secures to a class what rightly should belong to the community and be appropriated to the relief of State burdens, namely, the inherent value or economic rent of land which is caused by population, wealth, and civilisation, and cannot be either increased or diminished by the action of any individual landlord or tenant."

Resolution V.—Moved by Mr. J. G. M. Vincent, seconded by Mr. Thos. Briggs: "That this meeting is of opinion that 'free trade in land' would have no tendency to remove the vast evils resulting from land monopoly; and that, by facilitating the extension of private ownership in the land by the monied classes, it would most probably aggravate rather than diminish those evils."

Resolution VI.—Moved by Mr. J. A. Parker, seconded by Mr. J. C. Durant: "That this meeting is of opinion that nationalisation of the land (on the lines suggested by the Land Nationalisation Society) would be an effectual remedy for the evils of the present system. Among other priceless advantages, it would carry with it a great progressive alleviation of our fiscal burdens, would stimulate cultivation and increase the production of food; and, finally, would render every Englishman free to share in the benefits which the possession of land for personal use is calculated to afford."

BALANCE-SHEET,

"From the first entry made in respect of the Society, up to June 30, 1882."

Received and approved by the Council at their meeting, July 8th, 1882.

DR.	£	s.	d.	CR.	£	s.	d.
Subscriptions and Do- nations	113	7	0	Postage	36	4	8½
Literature	0	19	7	Literature	22	0	9½
Ditto charged to the Society as cash ...	13	13	0	Stationery	7	4	7
				Printing	12	7	0
				Rent	21	5	7
				Incidental Expenses...	24	7	0½
				Balance	4	9	4½
	<hr/>				<hr/>		
	£127	19	7		£127	19	7

(Signed)

8th July, 1882.

D. G. FITZGERALD,
HENRY W. LNY,

Auditors appointed at the Annual Meeting,
held May 30, 1882.

BALANCE-SHEET,

RECEIVED AND APPROVED, WITH THE ABOVE, AT THE SECOND
ANNUAL MEETING, JUNE 27TH, 1883.

DR.	£	s.	d.	CR.	£	s.	d.
Balance, June 30th, 1882 (from Balance- sheet appended to Auditor's Report, July 8th, 1882).....	4	9	4½	Postage	33	11	6
Subscriptions.....	200	10	0	Literature	5	4	4½
Literature	4	19	7	Do., Mr. Wallace's <i>Land Nationaliza- tion</i> , Copies for the Press, &c.	17	14	6
Collected at Lecture For the purchase of Mr. Wallace's <i>Land Nationalization</i> ...	2	3	10	Stationery	6	11	11
Office Furniture	30	0	0	Printing	29	9	9
	9	10	0	Rent	14	13	7
				Expenses of Lectures	22	9	5
				Office Furniture	10	0	0
				Secretary's Salary ...	13	0	0
				Purchase of remainder of Mr. Wallace's <i>Land Nationaliza- tion</i>	35	18	6
				Incidental Expenses...	7	11	11
				Balance	50	7	4
	<hr/>				<hr/>		
	£251	12	9½		£251	12	9½

"I have examined the above Balance-sheet, compared it with the vouchers,
and hereby certify the same to be correct."

(Signed)

JOHN RONALD SHEARER, A.C.A.,
Auditor.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS, 1881-3.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
A Friend	55	0	0	R. P. B. Frost	0	10	6
S. D. Williams	35	0	0	J. James Ridge, M.D.	0	10	6
Thos. F. Walker	32	2	0	Mme. S. Weatherley	0	10	6
Thos. Briggs	30	19	6	W. Dinken	0	10	6
A. C. Swinton	20	0	0	H. S. Lewis	0	10	6
Prof. F. W. Newman	20	0	0	E. T. Craig	0	10	0
A. K. Wallace, LL.D.	15	0	0	J. G. Ashley	0	10	0
C. C. Massey	10	0	0	J. Swinburne	0	10	0
J. C. Durant	8	0	0	Geo. Reynolds	0	10	0
Mrs. Lowe	7	5	0	Henry Webster	0	10	0
Edward Withy	7	1	0	H. G. Moberly	0	10	0
Miss Helen Taylor	7	0	0	Rev. Michael D. Jones	0	10	0
A. Parker	6	5	0	Ernest Morley	0	10	0
Desmond G. Fitzgerald	6	1	0	Tnos. Boldchild	0	7	6
W. Voleckman	5	5	0	B. Desquesnes	0	6	0
Col. J. M. Earle	5	5	0	James Hole	0	5	0
Isaac Pitman	5	5	0	A. P. Snodgrass	0	5	0
Jas. Leigh Joynes, B.A.	5	0	0	John Wytte	0	5	0
A Radical Farmer	5	0	0	H. W. Rowland	0	5	0
Malcolm Mackenzie	5	0	0	Arthur Reynolds	0	5	0
Mrs. Wm. Tebb	4	14	6	P. R. Dononey	0	5	0
Wm. Saunders	3	3	0	A. F. Winks	0	5	0
Dr. Eliz. Blackwell	2	12	0	Miss Rosa M. Barrett	0	5	0
Mrs. Minns	2	10	0	F. Gilmore Barnett	0	5	0
Lieut. Col. Ross, F.G.S.	2	2	0	W. Hargrave, M.A.	0	5	0
A Friend	2	2	0	Rev. J. D. Alford	0	5	0
J. Morton	2	2	0	Rev. E. Van Jones, Ph.D.	0	5	0
Hally Stewart	2	2	0	Robert S. Dick, M.D.	0	5	0
E. F. Bodington, M.D.	2	2	0	J. F. Oakeshott	0	5	0
E. D. Girdlestone, B.A.	2	0	0	Raymond Unwin	0	5	0
Robert Miller	2	0	0	Miss L. Bidlake	0	5	0
H. Atherton, B.C.S.	2	0	0	W. H. Jackson	0	5	0
Charles Lee	1	11	0	Manning P. Squirrel	0	5	0
Edgar Robinson	1	10	0	Jos. Andrews	0	5	0
Jonathan Taylor	1	10	0	Alfred Halstead	0	3	0
D. Brodie, M.D.	1	10	0	Philip L. Newman	0	2	6
Wm. Reeves	1	6	0	Eugene Teesdale	0	2	6
R. R. Douglas	1	5	0	D. L. Lowson	0	2	6
Wm. Reynolds	1	5	0	D. Urphert	0	2	6
H. H. Hood Barrs, LL.B.	1	1	0	Rev. S. D. Headlam	0	2	6
Jas. Turle, M.D.	1	1	0	H. W. Ley	0	2	6
W. Hicks	1	1	0	Rev. F. T. Sherlock, B.A.	0	2	6
J. A.	1	1	0	B. Lucraft	0	2	6
Rev. T. Dugard	1	0	0	T. W. Taunton	0	2	6
W. S. Booth	1	0	0	F. A. Winder	0	2	6
R. Owen	1	0	0	Miss Mary Bird	0	2	6
H. S. Salt	1	0	0	F. J. Harrington	0	2	6
Wm. Urwin, M.A.	1	0	0	A. H. Woods	0	2	6
J. A. Brown	1	0	0	Robt. Cooper	0	2	6
W. G. Knowles	1	0	0	Charles Higham	0	2	6
T. H. Elliott	1	0	0	W. Fredk. Keen	0	2	6
Edward Keep	1	0	0	A. E. Jacob	0	2	6
Jas. Hooper	0	15	0	Rev. W. O'Mant	0	2	6
A. C. Reynolds	0	15	0	F. Rayner	0	2	6
C. Reynolds	0	15	0	Wm. Lucas	0	2	6
Howard Williams, M.A.	0	13	0	T. Bromner	0	1	0
H. H. Champion	0	10	6	E. Hatzfeld	0	1	0

The List includes the subscriptions received since the Annual Meeting, June 27th, 1883, up to the date of issue of the Report.

LAND NATIONALIZATION SOCIETY.

All who are interested (and who are not?) in Land Law Reform are cordially invited to become Members of the Society, and to assist it in the formation of branches. Copies of the Society's detailed Scheme, Rules, and other Literature may be had on application.

The Council supply Lecturers where friends find a Chairman and a Public Room, and are always glad to hear from those willing to co-operate in the movement.

Crown 8vo, pp. xiv.—244, Original Edition, Cloth, Price 5s. Cheap Edition, paper cover, 8d.; limp cloth, 1s. 6d.

LAND NATIONALIZATION:

ITS NECESSITY AND ITS AIMS.

Being a Comparison of the System of Landlord and Tenant with that of Occupying Ownership in their Influence on the Well-being of the People.

BY

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE,

Author of "THE MALAY ARCHIPELAGO," "ISLAND LIFE," &c., &c.

LAND NATIONALIZATION SOCIETY TRACTS.

	<i>s. d.</i>
I.—The Land Difficulty :—How shall we deal with it? Per 100	2 0
II.—The Land for the People	2 0
III.—How Land Nationalization will benefit Householders, Labourers, and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	4 0
IV.—The <i>Times</i> and Land Nationalization (J. A. Parker)	4 0
V.—Land Tenure Reform (Professor F. W. Newman)	1 6
Programmes of the Society	4 0

LONDON :

W. REEVES, 185, Fleet Street, E.C.

DEPOT FOR THE LITERATURE OF THE SOCIETY.

"The notion of selling for certain bits of metal the Iliad of Homer, how much more the land of the world Creator, is a ridiculous impossibility."—THOMAS CARLYLE.

"Whilst another man has no land, my title to mine, your title to yours, is at once vitiated."—RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

"However difficult it may be to embody the theory of the Nationalisation of the land in fact, equity sternly commands it to be done."—HERBERT SPENCER.

R E P O R T
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION
SOCIETY.

1883-4.

—:O:—

Established to equitably restore to the Nation its Land, so that all may have equal facilities to use and enjoy the Land, and equally benefit by the revenue from it.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

LITERATURE DEPOT, 185, FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.

NOTICES TO MEMBERS.

Change of residence should be notified to the Secretary.

Those who cannot increase their subscriptions to promote more worthily a cause so great, may at least evince their zeal by endeavouring to add to the Society's members. Literature can be had freely for judicious distribution, and it should be remembered that an average addition of only *one* new member by each present subscriber would *double* the strength of the Society.

It is respectfully requested that the Secretary be informed of any matters relating to the Land Question that may appear either in the London, Provincial, or Foreign Press.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

Those friends who may be disposed to assist the Society by bequest should use the following form:—

"I give and bequeath to the Treasurer or Treasurers for the time being of the Land Nationalisation Society the sum of £ ; ; , free of Legacy Duty, to be paid out of such of my personal Estate as can be lawfully applied for the purpose, and to be used for the benefit of the said Society as its Executive Committee may think proper."

MEMBERSHIP.

Concurrence with the Society's principles of Land Nationalisation, and Annual Subscription to its funds, are the conditions of membership. A Donation of £5 5s., or more, confers Life membership.

REGULATIONS FOR BRANCHES.

- 1.—Branches of the Land Nationalisation Society are required to accept the general principles of the parent Society.
- 2.—Each Branch is expected to contribute, annually, one-fourth of its subscriptions to the parent Society.
- 3.—Each Branch shall furnish to the parent Society a yearly report of its proceedings and a statement of its position.
- 4.—Each Branch, for every one hundred of its members, or portion thereof, may elect a representative, who shall be entitled to a seat and vote on the Council of the parent Society.

Branches will, as far as possible, be assisted with lecturers, and it is desirable that each Branch should have delivered under its auspices at least two lectures each year.

The literature published by the parent Society will be supplied to Branches at cost price.

The attention of Branches is particularly directed to the use of the local papers as a means of propagandism.

COUNCIL.

PRESIDENT. *

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., Frith Hill, Godalming.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

DESMOND G. FITZGERALD, | Professor F. W. NEWMAN,
E. D. GIRDLESTONE, B.A. Oxon. | Miss HELEN TAYLOR.

HON. TREASURER.

A. C. SWINTON.

HON. SECRETARIES.

A. C. SWINTON, }
H. W. LEY, } Maybank, The Avenue, Upper Norwood, London, S E.

FINANCIAL SECRETARY.

H. G. MOBERLY.

Rev. J. D. Alford.
J. G. Ashley.
H. Atherton, B.C.S.
F. Gilmore Barnett.
H. H. Hood Barrs, LL.B.
Rev. S. E. Bengough, M.A.
G. F. Bodington, M.D. (Dudley).
T. Briggs.
D. Brodie, M.D. (Edinburgh).
*E. T. Craig (of Ralahine).
R. Cooper (Eastbourne).
*T. W. Rhys Davids.
R. S. Dick, M.D.
P. R. Domoney, M. S'impton, S.B.
R. R. Douglas (Liverpool).
Col. J. M. Earle.
*T. H. Elliott.
A. Halstead (Harrogate).
W. Hargrave, M.A. (Bristol).
W. Hicks (Eastbourne).
H. Hutchinson (Derby).
J. Hooper.
Spencer Jackson.
Rev. F. Dan Jones, Ph.D. (Mostyn).
*C. Lee.
H. S. Lewis.
B. Lucraft, M.L.S.B.
*A. McDonnell.
Chas. Mackay, LL.D.

Ernest Morley.
C. Murray.
*C. P. Newcombe.
R. Owen.
J. A. Parker.
Chas. Peach.
*Rev. W. H. Ratchiff, M.A.
*W. Reeves.
*W. Reynolds.
Edgar Robinson (Isle of Man).
Lt.-Col. W. A. Ross, F.G.S.
H. S. Salt.
Rev. T. Travers Sherlock, B.A.
(Smethwick).
A. P. Snowgrass.
T. W. Taunton.
Jthn. Taylor, M. Sheffield S.B.
Mrs. W. Tebb.
*W. Trant.
J. Turle, M.D.
D. Urophert.
W. Volckman.
T. F. Walker (Birmingham).
J. Whyte (Inverness).
A. F. Winks.
S. D. Williams (Malvern).
Howard Williams, M.A.
*E. A. Winder.
E. Withy (West Hartlepool).

Those marked with an * and the Officers constitute the Executive Committee

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

C. A. WINDUST.

June 15th, 1884.

The Society earnestly desires to enlarge the area of its work, but the vigour of its action depends, of course, upon the means at its disposal. Special appeal is therefore made to all who realise that the gigantic and perilous pauperism of the nation is primarily due to the existing land system, to strenuously aid in effecting this much-needed reform.

Remittances may be sent to the Treasurer, A. C. Swinton, Maybank, The Avenue, Upper Norwood, London. Cheques to be crossed "The Union Bank of London, Charing Cross." P.O. Orders to be made payable at Ludgate Circus, London, E.C.

THIRD ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

HELD AT ANDERTON'S HOTEL, FLEET STREET, LONDON, JUNE 18, 1884.

A. R. WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

During the first two years of our existence as a Society, some of us (I myself was among the number) thought that we were too far in advance of the public, and that the time was not yet ripe for our propoganda to have any useful result. Now, however, I feel that all such doubts are at an end, and that Reform of our System of Land Tenure has come to the front as the great question of the day.

During the last and present Sessions of Parliament no less than six Bills have been brought in (and two of them carried), each aiming at a remedy for some one of the grievous evils which result from Land Monopoly. Other branches of the subject have been dealt with by means of two Royal Commissions and a Special Committee. Numerous Associations, Conferences, and Committees are discussing and inquiring, while the public press teems with articles and correspondence indicating the great Land question as at the root of all the evils of poverty and overcrowding in our towns, and the horrors that result from them, which have recently excited a spasmodic interest throughout the country.

Surely, *now*, it is impossible to maintain that the question of the Land, in its relation to national well-being, has not entered the domain of "practical politics." It is true that politicians and philanthropists still scoff at our remedy; but what do they propose them-

selves? They steadfastly shut their eyes to the fundamental causes of the evil, and struggle frantically to ameliorate a few of the more distressing symptoms by methods which cannot possibly produce any permanent result. We alone go to the root of the matter, and strive to abolish the fundamental injustice which is the primary cause of the terrible poverty in the midst of our ever-increasing wealth. Every fresh development of the question, every successive failure of remedial legislation, or of private charity, to grapple with the evil, affords us additional proof of the soundness of our views. We feel sure that we have grasped a great principle of vital importance to humanity. Our facts and our arguments are alike unanswerable, and, sooner or later, the truth we advocate must be accepted and acted on.

The past year has, indeed, been one of especial interest to Land Nationalisers. It probably marks a turning point in the growth of public opinion upon the question, and I therefore propose to pass in review some of its more striking incidents, and to remark upon their tendencies and results.

Let us first consider what has been done in Parliament.

During last Session the Agricultural Holdings Acts for England and Scotland were passed. These Bills afforded the first indication of a real attempt to satisfy the just claims of farmers for compensation for their improvements, while the Ground Game Bill gave them some protection for their crops; but in both cases this was very imperfectly done, and future legislation in the same direction is inevitable, unless some approach to nationalisation first takes place. More interesting, perhaps, to us, as directly affecting the labourers, was Mr. Jesse Collings' Allotments Bill. This was almost identical with one brought in 5 years ago (during the last Ministry) by Sir C. Dilke for two successive Sessions, but which was not allowed to go on. It has, however, at last been passed, and it may be considered as a temporary sop to the agricultural labourers. Its provisions, however, apply solely to charity lands, and do not interfere with any individual's private property, and this is probably the reason why it was allowed to be passed. The provisions of this Act are very simple. It declares that trustees of charities who possess land in any part of the country are to offer that land, or as much of the land as is suitable for the purpose, in half-acre allotments to the

labourers of the district, at a fair rent (or at any rent that they choose to ask so far as I can see); and they are further empowered to hire land for the purpose of allotments if their own land is *not* suitable. The Act, however, has not been allowed to get into effective operation. In the original Bill, it was intended that the person to decide any question of dispute as to whether land was suitable to be let or not should be the Judge of the County Court, but it was insisted in Parliament that the Charity Commissioners should be the parties to decide this question; and these two facts, that there is to be a third party to decide what is suitable, and that that party is to be the Charity Commissioners, has led, at present, to the Act becoming a dead letter; for it seems, from some strange and incomprehensible reason, that the Commissioners are decidedly opposed to the labourers having land in any part of the country. They have, consequently, decided in several instances that land is not suitable because it is now pasture land—just as if this was not a reason tending in exactly the opposite direction, for everyone knows that pasture land, by being broken up by spade industry, is not only doubled, but often quintupled in value, therefore the argument ought to have been just the reverse. And this shows us how wrong it is to allow one class of men to decide what is best for another class. The labourers alone should have been left to say what land would suit them and what not. Nobody else could possibly know so well. Mr. Collings states that in some cases the Governors and Trustees of Charities as soon as the Act was passed hastily leased out their lands, so that their hands were tied, and they were unable to let the poor have them. Such conduct is simply amazing. It is astonishing that people connected with the Government should be so blind as not to see that in this way they are forcing on the question to a much more radical solution than would be otherwise arrived at.

The next Bill of importance is Mr. Broadhurst's, for the "Enfranchisement of Leaseholds." This also is a very mild measure, aiming simply to stop further confiscation by landlords of other people's property, and, as might be expected, it was rejected by the House of Commons. We must not mind this, however, for the next House of Commons will certainly have to pass a much better Bill. We then come to Mr. Bryce's "Access to Mountains in Scotland Bill," which simply proposes to give the people the right of walking over the unculti-

vated lands of their own country—a right which has in many cases been disputed and denied. It is said that there is an old Scotch law in existence which is to the same effect. It is entitled, “Free Foot on the Forest,” and declares the absolute freedom of all mountain lands to be traversed by the public. But this has been allowed to drop into disuse, and it was necessary to bring a fresh Bill into Parliament. This being such a small matter, and costing no one a penny, is likely to be passed by the House of Commons, but whether the Lords will pass it, it is impossible to say. Another Bill Mr. Bryce has brought in, but which I have not seen noticed by the public Press, is of rather more importance from our point of view. It is a Bill to stop that kind of petty land robbery going on all over the country—the enclosure of roadside strips. Everyone in the country must have noticed, that in some of the old roads handed down from the time of our forefathers there are wide green strips by the roadside; but, in a great majority of cases, these have been enclosed, and rows of trees, 20 or 30 feet inside the field, show where the old road was, and where the land has been robbed from the public. A case has recently occurred in my own neighbourhood. (Godalming), where the broad green strips on each side of a beautiful country road are being now enclosed. I wrote to the Highway Board, and got the stereotyped answer, that they did not consider it an encroachment on the highway. I therefore wrote to Mr. Bryce, chairman of the Commons Preservation Society, and he sent me a statement of the law on the subject. It appears that the Society’s lawyers, including Mr. Hunter, the greatest authority there is on common rights, maintain that these enclosures are quite illegal, and I should like to read you one passage from this statement, because I think it almost settles the question:—

“It has been decided that no part of the space between the hedges, whether metalled or not, if all forms part of the highway, can be legally enclosed without an order of the justices; and, therefore, the first question to be decided is, whether the green strip forms part of the highway.”

Therefore, you see, that in every case in which this green strip is level with the road, so that people have walked and ridden over it for untold generations—in all these cases it has certainly formed part of the highway; and therefore these enclosures are completely

illegal. The Highway Boards, being so largely composed of landlords, will not in any way interfere unless the public stir them up. I think it would be a very good thing if this society, and all interested in the land question would take every opportunity, through the local Press, and by other means, to call the attention of the public to these roadside robberies. When Highway Boards are elected they might also be urged to do their duty in protecting the rights of the public.

The next Bill of importance is Mr. Trevelyan's Land Purchase Bill (Ireland), which aims at carrying still further one of the objects of the Irish Land Act. It will enable Irish tenants to buy their farms, by advancing three-quarters or the whole of the money, to be repaid by terminable rentals. For that purpose five millions sterling is to be advanced each year for four years, making twenty millions sterling in all, with an elaborate scheme for a guarantee by means of County Land Boards. This is really a Bill to enable landlords to obtain full money value for their otherwise unsaleable lands; while, at the same time, nothing is done for the labourers, or to secure the rights of the public. The Bill will, of course, pass, but I cannot think it will produce much permanent good, since the fundamental evil in Ireland is, that large portions of the country are overcrowded, while others are denuded of inhabitants and given up to large grazing farms, and the measure is in no way calculated to remedy this state of things.

We now come to the Parliamentary inquiries, and the most important of these is the Crofters' Commission, of which the Report and Evidence has just been issued. Years of patience and submission having resulted in systematic neglect of their just claims, the crofters began, two years ago, to resist their persecutors and the robbers of their land. The result was a Royal Commission, consisting, of course, mostly of landlords; and, considering that circumstance, the report is quite as impartial as could be expected. Nevertheless, its recommendations are altogether insufficient. The Commissioners admit the truth of most of the allegations of the crofters as to insecurity of tenure, arbitrary evictions, payments extorted for getting seaweed and cutting peat or thatching material, and other oppressions, including the taking away of mountain pasture to make sheep-walks and deer forests; while the restricted

holdings, the excessive rents, and the harassing rule of factors are all proved by much independent evidence.

Every one of these things is admitted, but the suggested method of stopping them for the future, and bringing about an improved condition of the population is altogether ineffective. For instance, it is admitted that nearly two million acres of land are exclusively devoted to deer forests, large portions of which are not only suitable for cultivation, but have actually been cultivated, yet it is not proposed that one acre of all this land shall be given back to the use of the people. The Commissioners propose certain restrictions on forming fresh forests, and one of those restrictions is the very obvious and fair proposal that such forests are to be assessed at their real letting value and not as now, at their supposed agricultural value; but when this little bit of justice is done, they take care to state that it is not to apply to any existing forests, so that the whole of these two million acres is to be always assessed at a mere nominal agricultural value while bringing in an enormous sporting rental. The case is exactly parallel to what is going on at the present moment between us and the Egyptians. We have a Commissioner of Crown lands in Egypt, Mr. Rowsell, and he has proposed that the taxation shall be equalised for the Pashas and the poor tenants. At present the Pashas pay about one-half of what the tenants pay, and they strongly object to the new proposal. The country won't be worth their living in if they are taxed the same as the poor peasants. These Pashas are astonished if we tell them how unreasonable and unjust they are. But our own "Pashas" are just as bad, or even worse. They first drive out the people to make Deer Forests, and then refuse to bear their fair share of taxation!

• There is a very good proposal for the establishment of Highland townships, with elected officers to manage the mountain pasture, fuel-cutting, &c., with power to claim an extension of the pasture if it is insufficient, and similar power to claim extension of crofts when the existing crofts become overcrowded. This reads very well, and looks as if there was something really to be done for the crofters, but, if examined, the whole thing is found to be a farce. With all this power of claiming more land, there is no provision whatever either for security of tenure or fixity of rent. When the township comes to be overcrowded, and there is a chance of its officers claim-

ing a little more land, all the landlord has to do is to evict a few tenants, and the place ceases to be overcrowded. But if the landlord wants a little more pasture for deerforests or sheep farms, the people can be driven away, just as of old. As landlords have always done this in the past, what reason is there to suppose they won't do it in the future? The landlord is still to have the power of eviction, and of raising the rent, and will therefore be absolutely master of the situation. Yet, even this small and utterly ineffective proposal of the Highland townships is opposed by two of the Commissioners, and Parliament will take advantage of this opposition, so that it is not likely anything will be done, and the excitement and agitation of the last few years will have to go on for an indefinite period longer. Every unprejudiced person who knows the Highlands and their history during the present century is convinced that, to effect any permanent good, the crofters must have absolute security; that they must have fair rents, fixed by a Land Court; and that there must be a restitution of all lands from which men have been driven during the present century to make room for animals, so that they may be again cultivated and dwelt upon by men.

This Report forms a bulky volume which few people will have time to read through. I would, therefore, recommend them, when they have read the Report itself, which is not very long, to read two statements by independent parties, relating to the Island of Lewis, which may be taken as a fair specimen of the state of the Highlands. For forty years the whole island belonged to the late Sir James Mathieson, who was universally admitted by friends and foes alike to have been benevolently inclined. He was also a very liberal man, spending money to any extent; yet under this benevolent landlord, who had 26,000 people living as his tenants for 40 years, the state of things was such that a Mansion House Committee had to be formed last year to save these people from absolute starvation. It seems difficult to understand how this could have been brought about, but the statements of the Rev. Donald J. Martin, Free Church Minister of Stornoway, and of Napier Campbell, Esq., Solicitor, Stornoway, will give you an insight into the whole matter, showing the cruel, grinding despotism of agents under whose absolute rule the people have to live. They will show you how the crofters are kept down in a

state of slavery, almost as bad as anything we read of under the Turks, and leading to chronic discontent, misery, and starvation, even under this exceptionally benevolent landlord. Anyone who reads these two statements from thoroughly independent and well-informed witnesses will find terrible revelations, illustrating and enforcing Mr. George's well-known assertion, that the owner of the land is virtually owner of the people—that the people who live upon the land are actually his slaves.

We next come to the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Poor. This Commission, so far as we can see of what it is doing at the present time, confines itself to effects, without going at all into the causes of the evil, and it will therefore almost necessarily fail to effect any permanent good. Any partial amelioration will be overbalanced by the ever-increasing overcrowding in towns, the ever-increasing competition for work, with their results, starvation and grinding poverty. What we want—what alone will do any good—is to get the congested population of towns back into the country. How to do that is what the Royal Commission will *not* inquire into.

A Special Committee of the House of Commons is also now engaged in trying to find out if the public have any rights whatever in the river Thames above its tidal waters. Landlords in England claim not only the land, but the water; they claim every river in the country. No person can row on a river, bathe in it, or drink of it without the landlord's permission, and the balance of legal opinion seems at present to support the landlords' claims. Now here is a case in which the people of this country should unanimously rise up against such iniquitous claims. (Applause.) The rivers of a country at least should be free, and if the newly enfranchised electors do not insist upon this, they hardly deserve their enfranchisement. (Applause.) Not only should the rivers themselves be free, but it is important for the public at large that they should have free access to them. Along both banks of every river in the country there should be a public right of footway, except through gardens attached to private dwelling houses—(Mr. Pagliardini: That is the case in France)—so that the people may everywhere have free and easy access to the most enjoyable and beautiful features of their native land. This great boon,

however, we shall never get by any of the usually proposed systems of land reform. The nationalisation of the land is the only measure which will secure such benefits as these for the whole community.

The Census returns issued last year give us some alarming information. They tell us that the rural districts are almost universally becoming depopulated, the towns becoming overcrowded, and land going out of cultivation. The agricultural labourers have decreased 10 per cent. in the last 10 years; in 13 counties the total population has decreased, and in 17 more the increase in each county was less than 10 per cent. That means that in all these counties the rural districts are being depopulated, because the towns are generally increasing largely. In Hampshire the increase is one of the largest—very close upon 10 per cent. Yet one town, Portsmouth, alone absorbs one-half the increase, and, if you add a lesser increase for the other towns, you will see that there must be a decrease over a large portion of the county. It follows that for 30 counties, two-thirds of all England, the rural districts are being depopulated by the people being driven away from their homes.

The land, too, is going out of cultivation. As much as one million acres of arable land have been converted into pasture in the last ten years, and the process is now going on even more rapidly. People do not generally ask what that means, but it means something very serious indeed. It is calculated by some of the most eminent agriculturists of the kingdom that 100 acres of average pasture land produce enough food for five men, while 100 acres of average arable land will produce enough food for 250 men. It seems incredible that there should be such a difference, but the statements are those of two eminent agriculturists, Mr. R. Scott Burn and Dr. Hunter. It follows from these figures that when you put a million acres back from arable to pasture, you destroy the food for about two million of human beings.

A Lady: How can landlords make it pay to produce only enough food for five instead of 250 men?

Mr. Wallace: The food is a different class of food. The pasture only produces animal food—mutton at 1s. a pound. The arable land produces potatoes and bread.

A Member: Five men will never pay as much as 250.

Mr. Wallace: Five men pay 1s per lb. for meat, and the cost of labour is far less to the landlord.

Mr. Pagliardini: If it was turned into beer, milk, butter, and cheese it would give more than corn. It does so in France.

Mr. Wallace: I take these figures from the authorities named, and give them for what they are worth.

A Member: The difference is in food produced by means of great labour, while the grass is produced without labour.

Mr. Wallace: The fact of the depopulation and the turning of land to a lower state of cultivation is caused by the direct action of wealthy landlords, and it is the normal result of land being private property. Town land, as we all know, is worth from 10 to 50, and even 100 times as much as rural land, and this fact, with the love of power over tenants, and the dislike of independent poor near their country seats, produces these terrible consequences. When will people see that free access to land is absolutely necessary for the welfare of the community!

During the past year a considerable number of associations and societies for land-law reform have been formed. The Highland Land Law Reform Association in London is one of those, and a very excellent one, with the object of securing fixity of tenure, fair rent, compensation for improvements, the reapportionment of the land to man instead of animals, and assisting tenants to become owners. We can only trust that they will go on in that course, and continue to agitate till they get all they ask. There is also the local "Lewis Highland Land Reform Association," whose declared object is to obtain a restoration of the land of which the Lewis Islanders have been unjustly deprived, and which came down to them from their forefathers. We have also the Scottish Land Restoration League, a more recent association, which was established in consequence of the enthusiasm produced by Mr. George's lectures. This League has for its declared object quite a different thing, "to shift the taxation on to the land, and finally to take all ground-rent for public purposes." This appears to me to be not only a very indirect method of Land Reform, but to be useless, and even mischievous, because it leave all power to the landlords, and does not necessarily tend to restore the land to the people. To tax the great Highland landlords will only make them get more out of the wealthy sportsmen who rent

deer forests, and higher prices from all who want, and must have, land for houses or other purposes, while it will not give the crofters or the public any benefit whatever.

Another indication of the great interest felt in these questions, and everything connected with them, is shown by the series of conferences at the Health Exhibition on the Dwellings of the Poor, and these conferences have brought out a few bold assertions of fact on the land question, and some of the speakers have acknowledged that the land is at the root of the matter. One of the papers read was by Mr. C. M. Sawell, of the London City Mission and Mansion House Committee. He says the housing of the poor is a practical monopoly, and all monopolies being wrong, this particular monopoly must somehow be destroyed. He then goes on to say:—“The agricultural population of our country decreased 10 per cent., or 91,550, between 1871 and 1881. And *what* are the inducements offered to our industrious poor to remain in the country? Did God Almighty create the land to afford pastime to a few great landlords, or to grow corn for the service of man? This migration from the country districts to the towns must be checked; and not only so: we want a migration from the towns to the country, if the cries of socialism and communism are to be stopped. A land hunger is coming upon the people, and I greatly fear, if they cannot obtain this ‘means of subsistence’ by honest means, Mr. George’s dishonest means will gain their attention and support. With the old race of English yeomen again encouraged to occupy their small freeholds, instead of being improved off the land for the rearing of deer or cultivation of game, some of the £26,000,000 given to the foreigners for eggs, butter, vegetables, cheese, bacon, and hams might be produced at home, to say nothing of ‘jam.’ Until our political economists can relieve our large towns of their plethora of hands, with its consequent acute and inhuman competition for labour—leading to shirts made at 1d. or ¾d. apiece, trousers-finishing at 3½d. or 4½d. per pair, match-boxes at 2½d. per gross, the maker finding brush, paste, fire, and factory—by making the country *more* attractive and large towns less so, I see no hope of properly housing our poor in any decent fashion, except by way of charity.” I have read that passage to show that there are some who speak plainly on the fundamental cause of the misery and degradation of our people.

I must now say a few words on the important publications of the year. Professor Thorold Rogers's admirable history, "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," is a most instructive piece of original research, thoroughly radical in sympathy and feeling, though I am sorry to see that Mr. Rogers has not come to our way of thinking on the land question. He gives us, however, some very interesting and suggestive facts. After a review of the whole history of our working classes for six centuries, he says, that from 1782 to 1821 was the very worst period of English labour, when the labourers were the worst off, and labour was paid for at a very low rate—a rate which would not, and did not, support life, and was systematically supplemented by means of the Poor Law. That was the period, or one just succeeding it, to which Giffen and others refer when they compare the high rate of wages to-day with that of some time back, for the purpose of showing that everything is now as it should be. Again, Professor Rogers says, "in a country of small agricultural proprietors, hired labour is always absolutely and relatively dearer." That is important. We want to make labour dear, and until we do that we cannot raise the labourer. Permanent high wages are essential to a nation's real prosperity. Another important fact is brought out in Professor Rogers' review, namely, that in the 13th century, and afterwards, eight hours was the regular day's labour: all day work was reckoned in that way, so that the labourer had an advantage then which he is now striving to obtain. Mr. Rogers strongly advocates cottage farms, but, unfortunately, he does not show us how they are to be got, or how kept when they are got. He opposes Land Nationalisation, but has evidently not studied it in any way. He speaks, for example, of "George's remedy of universal confiscation," which, he says, "will include not only palaces and parks, mansions and farms, but every freehold cottage or homestead in which working men have invested the savings of their lives. (Laughter.) That shows he has not in the slightest degree grasped the difference between land which no man made, and property which men have created—a difference which is the essence of our teaching as well as of that of Mr. George.

We now come to one of the most recent books published this year—"The Land and the Labourer," by the Rev. C. Stubbs, a Buckinghamshire clergyman. Being strongly impressed with the desirability

of getting the labourers on the land, and being in possession of a considerable glebe, he let out 22 acres in half-acre allotments to labouring parishioners, at three guineas an acre. The land is heavy clay land, not very well drained, but with good aspect and slope. He kept an acre himself to get practical knowledge, cultivating it by paid labour, and on the average of six years made a net profit of £3 8s. per annum per acre. We may be sure the labourers would work much more economically than that, and their work being all free, they would make a great deal more profit, in addition to the value he paid in wages. The most interesting thing he brought out is this. He showed that these rude, ignorant agricultural labourers produced better crops and more food off these small pieces of land than the largest and best farms in the kingdom. In this particular parish where Mr. Stubbs lives, the ordinary farmer's average of wheat is 25 bushels per acre; Mr. Lawes, the great scientific farmer, on a somewhat similar soil in the adjoining county, has an average of 36 bushels. The average of these Buckinghamshire labourers is 40 bushels; Lawes's maximum of 36 years is 55 bushels, and one of these poor labourers has got 57 bushels, so that he actually beat the highest scientific farming in England on the same kind of land. (Applause.) Mr. Stubbs points out the immense social and material benefit to the poor in these small holdings, and shows clearly how if the landlords of the country chose, they could give the poor all these advantages without loss to themselves. The common statement is, that cottage building does not pay. If you build a cottage for a labourer without land, it does not pay, but if you build the same cottage, and give an acre of land with it, you may charge a higher rent, and it *will pay*. Another thing is important in these experiments, the complete answer they give to the bugbear always thrust in your face when you talk of giving the poor land—that they cannot cultivate the land without capital. Capital is a thing which will necessarily grow. Look at the fact of this poor man getting a higher crop of wheat than the highest scientific farming—and without capital. (Applause.) He had only his own labour, and a few sixpences put by, but in a few years he would be able to cultivate a small farm. The result of giving free access to the land would be that the best of these labourers would in a very short time take these small farms, having obtained the necessary capital by their own savings. The

proposition of philanthropists always is, you must advance capital to these men. I think it is one of the worst things you could do in the settlement of this question to put a man, who has never farmed, in a good-sized farm with borrowed capital; in this way you will almost certainly ruin him. But if you let him have an acre to begin with, and another acre or two as he requires it, he will obtain experience, step by step, and gradually accumulate his own capital, which is infinitely better than giving him money. I was asked the other day whether I had read a book entitled "Sinnett's Practical Husbandry." In that work there is an account of a linen-draper who got two acres of land in his native place, after spending a large part of his life behind the counter. He sat down on this land to cultivate it, and lived upon it. He had two acres of admirable pasture land, which he bought for £240—freehold. From that time he has been living upon the two acres, and bringing up his family upon it. Until he took this freehold this man never had in his hand an agricultural implement. Yet he invented new tools, and has written on "How to feed pigs," and "How to grow three crops on the same land," and he affords a wonderful example of what may be done even by people who have lived in towns all their lives. (Applause.) He says that he has health and peace of mind, which he never had before. This book, taken together with Mr. Stubb's experiences, prove conclusively the falsity of the statement constantly made, that small farming does not pay—that it would not be any good giving the labourers land because they could not live upon it. We see, however, that ordinary labourers, and even some shopkeepers, can cultivate the land, and make more profit than the average, or even than the highest scientific farmer.

Now, I come to a most important book, one of the most important and remarkable I have ever read, Henry George's "Social Problems." I consider this book to be even more powerful than the same writer's "Progress and Poverty," and calculated to do more good. It gives you a sketch of the various aspects of our social condition from the point of view of evolution. It is, therefore, strictly a philosophic work; and deserves to be carefully studied on that account only. At the same time, it is so free from technical political economy and speculations of that kind, that the least educated reader can understand and enjoy it. In twenty-two short chapters such questions are

dealt with as: "The Wrong in Existing Social Conditions," "Unemployed Labour," "The Effects of Machinery," "The Functions of Government," &c. The whole of the chapters are written in the brilliant style of which the author is a master. Every chapter bears upon the Land question. Every chapter brings out fresh arguments and illustrations on the wrong and evil of land monopoly. I am sorry to say, however, that there is one blot in this great and wonderful book—the illogical chapter entitled "The First Great Reform." After showing that it is the monopoly of land by the few that is the fundamental wrong, and that free access for all to the land is the fundamental necessity, he proposes, not to secure this, but something quite different—to tax land, and, ultimately, "to take as near as possible the whole ground rent for common purposes"—nothing else whatever! It is clear that this would be utterly useless; that it would not give the labourers land, and therefore would not raise wages. It would tend, on the contrary, to intensify the monopoly of land, because the landlords, possessing the houses and other improvements as well as the land, would raise the price of these improvements to recover what they had lost in taxation. And this could not be prevented, because the owners of a necessary of life are masters of the situation, and can command any prices which those who must have these necessaries are able to pay. It is, therefore, absolutely impossible that such a course as Mr. George proposes should produce any good whatever.

Another remarkable book is called "Du Peuple," by M. Romain Delaune, published in Paris in 1881, just about the time I published my book, and when George's book first became known. It is a history of the past and present state and condition, and suggested proper future, of the working classes. A curious thing is, that we all, quite independently arrived at very nearly the same results. He maintains land nationalisation as the essential feature of his system. There is one suggestive passage:—"The true proprietor (of land) is not even the existing nation—it is the race past, present, and future; the earth lends itself to all, and to each, passing from hand to hand, and from age to age, but gives itself to none." (Applause.) I think that is a great and suggestive truth. (Renewed applause.)

A considerable number of pamphlets have been published during the

year, showing how deep is the public feeling on the question. The first I must mention is on "The Political Economy of George," by our member Mr. B. S. D. Williams, of Malvern, which gives an excellent summary and defence of some of Mr. George's novel views. Mr. C. C. Cattell's tract, "The Land: How to Make it Feed the People and Pay the Taxes," is a very good exposition of the evils of landlordism, with a proposal for nationalisation by compulsory purchase from the landlords. I think that has been shown to be impracticable. There is also a brochure by William Trant, "The Question of the Day," which is a powerful address on the Land question, but adopts George's illogical proposition to tax rent. There is another interesting pamphlet by G. C. Thompson, barrister-at-law, entitled, "A Neglected Aspect of the Land Question," which exposes the iniquitous legal powers of landlords, the full exercise of which, the author maintains, "would render England uninhabitable." There is also a little book, "Millionaires the Cause of Poverty," by T. A. Binney. It is very forcible, showing the striking increase in millionaires in recent years, and the concomitant and consequent increase of pauperism. The Rev. Thomas Meager, a priest in Ireland, has written a pamphlet on the general law of landlord and tenant, with suggestions for occupying ownership on the plan proposed by the late Mr. Scully, M.P.

Finally, we have Giffen's "Progress of the Working Classes in the Last Half Century," which is a piece of pure special pleading, full of errors, fallacies, and illogical statements, the author utterly ignoring the real causes which produce the depopulation of the country, and the congested state of the towns, with their terrific consequences. This is a paper which has been highly praised in high quarters, and will probably be soon answered in detail.

In our colonies the subject is also attracting attention. Mr. John Quick, LL.D., M.P. for Victoria, has sent me a "History of Land Tenure in Victoria." Mr. Thompson also sends a pamphlet on land tenure in Queensland. Mr. Quick says in his preface:—"The wholesale alienation of the public lands, and their stealthy but rapid absorption into large estates, is a crime and a calamity which can only be averted by the steady, intelligent, and irresistible opposition of the people of Victoria to a policy at once demoralising and destructive."

This history is most instructive. It gives you a parallel to the rise and growth of landlordism in this country, in the rise of the squatting interest in the Colonies. These squatters monopolise many hundreds of square miles, and notwithstanding numerous Acts of Parliament passed to prevent this monopoly from being effective, they have all failed. Squatters have always found the means of evading these Acts and turning them to their own benefit, so that the monopoly goes on to this day, and produces disastrous results.

The widespread interest in the Land question, as manifested in Parliament, in Society, in Literature, and in the daily Press—of which I have now given you an imperfect sketch—is most encouraging for the success of our movement. The apathy and indifference with which the whole subject has hitherto been regarded has passed away, and when inquiry once begins our work is half done. Already we hear less of the old Liberal panacea—free-trade in land—as being the all-in-all of land reform, and that dogma will soon be dead and buried. How great is the advance in public opinion may be shown by the way in which the Press now treats the land problem. Two weeks back that very Conservative-Radical journal, the *Spectator*, in an article on Bosnia as the *Austrian Ireland*, after showing how closely the conditions of Ireland are there reproduced, with identically the same results, concludes thus:—
“No fact is better established than that cultivating ownership is the only sure cure for agrarian troubles, and where whole populations are engaged in the cultivation of the soil, as in Ireland and Bosnia, landlordism is almost necessarily a disastrous failure.”

This is a great advance, and study of the subject may convince the *Spectator* that landlordism is an equally disastrous failure in England, where it directly produces that rural depopulation and town-congestion, that dependence upon other countries for food which we could grow in superabundance at home if our labourers were allowed to cultivate their native soil for themselves, and that consequent paralysis of home trade which seems now to have become chronic, and for which there is no other sufficient explanation.

If “cultivating ownership” is the “only cure” for these “disastrous failures” of landlordism, some form of Land Nationalisation is absolutely necessary, for in no other way can you secure

universal "cultivating ownership" to begin with, or keep it when you have once got it.

Looking, then, at the character and extent of the movement now going on—considering that the masses are acquiring education, and will soon have political power—and knowing that our cause is founded on immutable justice, we cannot doubt our ultimate, and, perhaps, not very distant, success. We have now reached a turning point in our career. The tide of public opinion is setting in our direction. It is for us to take the fullest advantage of it, to work earnestly and unremittingly in the good cause, in the firm conviction that truth is great, and will surely prevail.

FREE LAND FOR A FREE PEOPLE.

BY CHARLES MACKAY, LL.D., Honorary Member of the Society.

(Written for the Society.)

I.

Thank God for the Sunshine, the Air, and the Sea,
 For the Rain and the Dew, ever free to the free!—
 No landlords can parcel them out, or conspire
 To sell them, or tax them, or let them on hire;
 And close up with barriers, what Nature design'd
 In Mercy and Love for the needs of mankind!

II.

There's a break in the clouds,—there's a gleam in the sky,
 There's a beautiful star, brightly shining on high,
 That heralds the dawn of the long-promised day,
 When Right shall be Might, and shall flourish for aye:—
 When man on the strength of his manhood shall stand,
 To enjoy and possess and replenish the land!

III.

With our faces to Heaven and our feet on the sod,
 We swear by the Faith that we cherish in God,—
 By the breeze of the sky, by the light of the sun,
 That the Land shall be ours, and that Right shall be done.
 Hear it, ye tyrants that hold us in thrall!
 God the great Giver gives freely to all!

REPORT

Presented to the Members of the Society at its Third

Annual Meeting.

In presenting its Report, the Executive feels itself in a position to congratulate the Members on the improved position and prospects of the Society. It is not so much that this improvement is shown financially, as it is in the number of the Society's Members being now more than double what it was twelve months since, and in the steadily increasing work of the Society, the correspondence, especially, becoming daily more onerous. The Report, which is chiefly an account of work done, is conveniently divided under the heads of Lectures, Literature, Branches, Parliamentary Election, and Journalistic Work.

LECTURES.—The lecturing arrangements for the past season have resulted in the delivery of twenty-one lectures, namely, seven by the Society's President, being two at Bristol, two at Newcastle-on-Tyne, one at West Hartlepool, one at Derby, and one in London; eleven by Miss Helen Taylor (a Vice-President of the Society), being eight in Wales, at Mostyn (two), Bala, Aberystwith, Maestig, The Werne, Flint, Bagillt; one at Sheffield, one at Liverpool, one at Hartlepool: one by Mr. Jonathan Taylor at Eltham; one by Mr. T. H. Elliott at Camberwell; and one by Mr. Lloyd Jones at Leicester. To the Society the direct cost of these lectures has been (as will be seen from the balance-sheet) but £2 11s. 3d. This is due to the generosity of the lecturers, and that of those under whose immediate management the lectures were severally delivered. To Miss Helen Taylor the Society is particularly indebted for her untiring zeal and financial support, especially in connection

with lectures in Wales. Besides her lectures above mentioned, Miss Taylor has delivered during the season about as many more on Land Nationalisation for other societies.

LITERATURE.—During the past year the Society has continued to circulate its pamphlets and leaflets to the full extent of its ability. The want of funds, however, has prevented it from doing so to anything like the extent that so effective a means of education demands. The additions to the Society's literature during the year have been: a very useful "Protest" for signature by Prof. F. W. Newman (a Vice-President of the Society); *The "Why" and the "How" of Land Nationalisation*, by Mr. Wallace, the President (being a reprint of an article in reply to Prof. Fawcett's on *State Socialism*, both of which articles appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* of June, August, and September last); *The Land as National Property*, by Prof. Newman; *How to Experiment in Land Nationalisation*, by Mr. Wallace; *Land and the Family in China*, being a translation of a portion of an article by G. E. Simon, formerly French Consul in China; *The Great Land Suit*, by Mr. H. Hutchinson; and *Running Notes on the Pamphlet by Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., entitled "National Progress and Poverty,"* being a brief reply by Prof. Newman to that pamphlet. The publication of a third edition of Mr. Wallace's *Land Nationalisation* at 8d. may also here be noticed, and it is hoped that the members of the Society will exert themselves individually to make this unanswerable book much more widely known. The remainder of the second edition, which was purchased by the Society, has been entirely and profitably circulated. In connection with the subject of literature, it may also be stated that by the influence of one of its members, the Society can supply at less than half the published price that excellent work to the student of land systems, *Primitive Property*, by Prof. Emile de Laveleye.

BRANCHES.—It is to be regretted that the want of more strength to meet the lecturing demand has seriously limited the formation of Branches, and two only have been actually formed, one at Mostyn, and one at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Other Branches, however, will, it is believed, be shortly formed at Tottenham, in West Kent, at Hartlepool, in Wales, and in New Zealand.

Closely associated with the subject of Branches is that of Societies, at home and abroad, with the same object as the Land Nationalisation Society. From the inability of some of the most energetic members of this Society to concur with its consideration to landlords, or other principles, they seceded from it, and eventually formed the late "Land Reform Union." That Society, now known as "The English Land Restoration League," has, by means of Mr. Henry George's lecturing tour, effected a very successful agitation throughout the kingdom, and more especially in Scotland, where a strong association known as "The Scottish Land Restoration League" has been established.

In New Zealand a Land Nationalisation Society exists, and seems to have vigorous life, and another is said to be forming, or is formed in Australia, at Melbourne, under the auspices of Mr. C. E. Jones, editor of *The People's Tribune* there. The former Society has its chief centre at Dunedin, and Mr. Stout, ex-Attorney-General, is one of its active leaders. A third Land Nationalisation Society abroad, probably the most

powerful one of all, is Mr. Henry George's "Free Soil Society," of New York, U.S.A., which is stated to have branches in most of the chief towns of the Union.

Here, too, it may be mentioned that in September, 1882, news reached this country of the partial acceptance of the Land Nationalisation principle by the New Zealand Legislature, and to Sir George Grey and his colleagues the congratulations of this Society were sent. Shortly after its last Annual Meeting the following acknowledgment from Sir George Grey was received, and published by the Press of this country:—

Kawan, N. Zealand, June 17th, 1883.

MY DEAR SIR,

I received with much pleasure your letter conveying to me a copy of the resolution passed at a meeting of the Council of the Land Nationalisation Society, in reference to the legislative action taken by the New Zealand Legislature in reference to the Land Question.

I communicated a copy of the resolution to my late colleagues. I have received the replies of all but one of them to my letter, and they all participate in the pleasure which I have expressed to you.

I hope during the present Session of the Legislature some advances will be made in the direction of the Nationalisation of Land in this colony; any information you can from time to time afford me, may be of great use here.

Faithfully yours,

[*Signe*] G. GREY.

The Hon. Sec., Land Nationalisation Society.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION.—In view of the approaching General Election, it may be stated that the Executive has adopted (on report of a Sub-Committee) the following three questions, to be pressed upon Members of Parliament and candidates for Parliament on every available occasion:—

1. Are you in favour of the Nationalisation of the Land?
2. Are you acquainted with Mr. A. R. Wallace's scheme to effect it?
3. Will you support any movement in that direction?

The attention of the Society's members is earnestly directed to these questions, and to the imperative need for carrying out the course indicated.

Public protest has already been made by the Society, and, whenever possible, will be made by it, against illegal enclosure and sale of Commonland. The Executive recently became aware of the enclosure of a portion of the road margin from Haslemere to Farnham, the sale of which, together with some 40 acres of adjoining land, occurred on the 26th ult., at the Mart, Tokenhouse Yard, by Messrs. Prior and Newson. Several members of the Executive attended, and protested against the illegality of the sale, and stated that the purchaser should not expect peaceful possession.

JOURNALISTIC WORK.—A considerable number of letters, mostly controversial, and written by the President, Prof. F. W. Newman, the Treasurer, the Hon. Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and by Mr. C. Lee, Mr. Reynolds, and Mr. Winder, of the Executive, have appeared in various London and provincial journals. As this mode of working is so highly important, it is most desirable that the members of the Society should engage in it, whenever able, and make use of the local Press to "spread the light."

The following is a list, representing the chief portion of the journals, London, provincial, and colonial, which give support, or fair hearing, to the cause:—

Mark Lane Express.

Echo.

Times.

Daily News.

Pall Mall Gazette.

Daily Chronicle.

Referee.

Truth.

Public Opinion.

Nineteenth Century.

Westminster Review.

Modern Review.

Contemporary Review.

Reynold's Newspaper.

Weekly Times.

Christian Commonwealth.

Christian Socialist.

Church Reformer.

Enquirer.

Unitarian Herald.

National Reformer.

Macmillan's Magazine.

Red Dragon, or Magazine of Wales.

Celtic Magazine.

To-Day.

Financial Reformer.

Co-operative News.

Western Daily Press.

Northern Ensign.

Greenock Advertiser.

Glasgow Weekly Mail.

Hull Express.

Norfolk News.

Newcastle Examiner.

Newcastle Chronicle.

Sheffield and Rotherham Daily

Independent.

Blackburn Times.

Chester Chronicle.

Northern Echo.

North British Daily Mail.

People's Journal, Dundee.

Strathmore Advertiser, Perth.

Ross-shire Journal.

Freeman's Journal.

Manchester Express.

Sydney Morning Herald.

The Liberal (Sydney, N.S.W.)

Adelaide Observer.

The People's Journal, Melbourne.

Kapunda Herald, N.S.W.

Otago Witness (N.Z.)

Daily Telegraph, Launceston.

Boston Herald, U.S.A.

The Executive, in conclusion, has the pleasure to make the first announcement of bequest to the Society. Two members of the Society desire to have some land that they hold devoted to promote the realisation of the Land Nationalisation principle. One of these members has bequeathed a freehold interest to the Society, and the fact is happily recorded that these, the first offerings of the kind to the Society, are both from members of the Medical profession.

Viewing the rapid growth of the Land Nationalisation movement, as shown by the number of kindred associations that have been formed since the advent of the Land Nationalisation Society, the Executive trusts that the members may find in this evidence that they are working to good purpose, a powerful incentive to increased effort.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, DONATIONS, etc., 1883-4.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
A. B.	1	1	0	Forsyth, J.	0	2	6
Akhurst, H.	0	2	6	Fullford, J.	0	2	6
Akhurst, W.	0	2	6	Gill, F. W.	0	10	0
Alford, Rev. J. D.	0	5	0	Girdlestone, F. D., B.A.	1	1	0
Alvey, C. P.	0	2	6	Gledstone, Rev. J. P.	0	5	0
Andrews, J.	0	5	0	Glendinning, A.	0	2	6
Applegarth, R.	0	5	0	Hackney Workmen's Club	1	1	0
Ashley, J. G.	0	5	0	Hairstead, A.	0	5	0
Asherton, H., B.C.S.,	1	0	0	Hamilton, W., F.R.G.S.	0	2	6
Atkinson, B. J.	0	2	6	Hanne, G. F. M.	0	2	6
Barclay, Miss Isabella	0	2	6	Hart, S.	0	5	0
Baldry, Thomas	0	2	6	Hatzfeld, E.	0	4	0
Barlow, Rev. W. C., M.A.	0	2	6	Hayter, W. H.	0	2	6
Barrett, Miss Rosa M.	0	2	6	Hayward, Miss	0	5	0
Bengough, Rev. S. E.	0	2	6	Hazell, W.	1	1	0
Beruard, W. Leigh	0	5	0	Higham, C.	0	2	6
Bertin, G.	0	2	6	Howell, J.	0	5	0
Bidlake, Miss L.	1	15	0	Howell, M.	0	5	0
Bilton, Ernest	1	1	0	Hudson, F. A.	0	10	6
Blackwell, Dr. Elizabeth	2	1	0	Hutchinson, H.	12	2	0
Bodington, G. F., M.D.	2	0	0	Ingram, Eustice	0	2	6
Boldchild, T.	0	10	0	Istead, J.	0	2	6
Booth, W. S.	1	6	0	J. A.	1	1	0
Braby, Clement	1	0	0	Jackson, Spencer	15	5	0
Briggs, T.	0	12	6	Jackson, W. H.	0	7	6
Brodie, D., M.D.	1	0	0	Jenkins, D. M.	0	5	0
Brown, J. A.	1	0	0	Jenkyn, R. I.	0	2	6
Browne, G.	0	5	0	J. F.	0	2	6
Browne, J. S.	0	5	0	J. F. S.	1	1	0
Buller, C.,	0	2	6	Jones, Rev. David, B.A.	0	5	0
Buttfort, A. G.	5	5	0	Jones, Lloyd	2	2	0
Caplin, C.	0	5	0	Jones, Rev. Michael D.	0	10	0
Caudon, E.	0	2	6	Jones, Owen	0	2	6
Chandler, C.	0	2	6	Keen, W. F.	0	2	6
Chapman, D. W.	0	5	0	Keep, E.	1	0	0
Chapman, Jesse	0	2	6	Kenealy, M. E.	0	2	6
Chapman, R.	0	5	0	Kildewitz, E. J.	0	5	0
Covey, Miss Kate	0	5	0	Kingdom, A.	0	5	0
Cowan, C.	0	2	6	Kitson, —	0	2	0
Cowburn, W.	0	5	0	Leach, Mrs. J.	0	5	0
Cox, A.	0	2	6	Leach, J.	1	0	0
Craig, E. T.	0	10	0	Le Fevre, W. H.	0	5	0
Dauids, T. W., Rhys	0	10	0	Lewis, H. S.	1	6	0
Denney, D.	1	1	0	Ley, H. W.	0	2	6
Desquesnes, B.	0	5	0	Lillis, Patrick	0	2	6
Dick, R. S., M.D.	0	5	0	Lowater, W.	0	2	6
Doremus, F. P.	0	5	0	Lord, Miss Frances	0	10	0
Domoney, P. R.	0	5	0	Lucas, W.	0	2	6
Dougherty, J.	0	10	0	Luerast, B.	0	2	6
Durant, J. C.	2	2	0	Macdonald, W. A.	0	5	0
Elliott, T. H.	1	4	0	Mackenzie, Malcolm	3	2	0
Evans, G. F.	0	2	6	Manning, W. S.	0	5	0

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.		
Manns, Rev. J. W.	...	0	2	6	Smith, A.	0	1	0
Marson, Rev. C. J.	...	0	5	0	Smith, H. B.	...	1	1	0
Massey, C. C.	...	10	0	0	Smith, M.	...	0	5	0
McAllan, R.	...	0	10	0	Smith, W. R.	...	0	2	6
Mather, J. H.	...	0	2	6	Snodgrass, A. P.	...	0	7	6
McDonnell, A.	...	1	1	0	Soper, J. L.	...	5	5	0
McIntyre, Miss J. A.	...	0	5	0	Spink, T.	...	0	5	0
McKirdy, R.	...	0	10	0	Squirrel, M. P.	...	0	10	0
McLaren, J.	...	0	2	6	Stafford, W.	...	0	10	6
McNeill, G.	...	0	5	0	Steele, F. E. M.	...	0	19	6
Melland, E.	...	2	0	0	Stephenson, J. H.	...	0	5	0
Miller, R.	...	2	0	0	Stewart, Halley	...	2	2	0
Minns, Mrs.	...	3	1	0	Swann, E. A.	...	0	5	0
Moberly, H. G.	...	0	15	0	Swinburne, J.	...	0	5	0
Monteith, J. A.	...	0	5	0	Swinton, A. C.	...	20	0	0
Moon, E. M.	...	0	2	6	Taylor, Miss Helen	...	20	0	0
Morley, Ernest	...	0	5	0	Taylor, Jonathan	...	1	0	0
Mozley, H. W.	...	0	5	0	Tebb, Mrs. W.	...	2	2	0
Neville, C.	...	0	5	0	Thomas, Rev. D., D.D.	...	0	3	0
Newcombe, C. P.	...	1	0	0	Thomas, J.	...	0	10	0
Newman, Prof. F. W.	...	11	1	8	Thomas, L.	...	0	2	6
Newman, P. L., B.A.	...	0	12	6	Tomkins, E. F.	...	0	2	6
Nichols, T. L., M.D.	...	1	1	0	Trant, W.	...	0	5	0
Oakeshott, F. J.	...	0	10	0	Trist, Rev. J.	...	0	2	6
Owen, R.	...	1	10	0	Trower, W.	...	0	10	6
Pagliardini, T.	...	0	10	0	Unwin, R.	...	0	10	0
Papin, P.	...	0	2	6	Unwin, W., M.A.	...	1	1	0
Peach, C.	...	0	2	6	Walker, J. F.	...	5	0	0
Pearson, C.	...	0	2	6	Walker, R. B.	...	0	2	6
Phillips, M. H.	...	1	0	0	Wallace, A. R., LL.D.	...	15	0	0
Pitman, Isaac	...	5	5	0	Weatherley, Me. S.	...	0	10	6
Ratcliff, Rev. W. H.	...	2	2	0	Webster, H.	...	1	1	0
Rayner, F.	...	0	2	6	Weldon, Mrs. G.	...	0	2	6
Reid, R.	...	0	5	0	Wellwood, Rev. J.	...	0	5	0
Reynolds, A.	...	0	15	0	Whates, H.	...	0	2	6
Reynolds, A. J.	...	1	0	0	Westlake, E.	...	3	1	0
Reynolds, C.	...	1	0	0	Williams, Howard, M.A.	...	0	15	6
Reynolds, G.	...	0	15	0	Williams, S. D.	...	10	0	0
Reynolds, W.	...	0	15	0	Winder, F. A.	...	0	7	6
Robinson, F. J.	...	0	10	6	Windust, C. A.	...	0	5	0
Rowland, W.	...	0	2	6	Withy, E.	...	10	0	0
Salés, Me. M. J.	...	0	2	6	Wright, T. R.	...	0	2	6
Salsbury, J.	...	0	2	6	Wright, W. C.	...	1	0	0
Salt, H. S.	...	1	1	0	X. Y.	...	0	10	0
Shearman, T. G.	...	10	0	0	Young, A. A.	...	0	5	0

Crown 8vo, pp. xiv.—244, Original Edition, Cloth, price 5s. Cheap Edition, paper cover, 8d., by post. 11d.; limp cloth, 1s, 6d., by post, 1s. 9d.

LAND NATIONALISATION;

ITS NECESSITY AND ITS AIMS.

Being a Comparison of the System of Landlord and Tenant with that of Occupying Ownership in their Influence on the Well-being of the People.

By **ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE.**

Author of "The Malay Archipelago," "Island Life," &c., &c.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY TRACTS.

	<i>s. d.</i>
I.—The Land Difficulty :—How shall we deal with it? Per 100	1 0
II.—The Land for the People	,, 1 0
III.—How Land Nationalisation will benefit Householders, Labourers, and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	,, 2 0
IV.—The <i>Times</i> and Land Nationalisation (J. A. Parker)	,, 1 0
V.—Land Tenure Reform (Professor F. W. Newman)	,, 1 0
VI.—The Why and the How of Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace) ...	12 0
VII.—The Land as National Property (Professor F. W. Newman)... ..	4 0
VIII.—How to Experiment in Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace) ...	1 0
IX.—The Great Land Suit (H. Hutchinson)	6 0
X.—Running Notes on the Pamphlet by Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P. entitled "National Progress and Poverty" Per 100	1 6
Programmes of the Society	,, 1 0

All who are interested (and who are not ?) in Land Law Reform are cordially invited to become members of the Society, and to assist it in the formation of Branches. Copies of the Society's detailed Scheme, Rules, and other Literature may be had on application.

The Council, as far as possible, supply Lecturers where friends find a Chairman and a Public Room, and are always glad to hear from those willing to co-operate in the movement.



R E P O R T

OF THE

LAND NATIONALISATION
SOCIETY.

1884-5.

: O :

Established to equitably restore to the Nation its Land, so that all may have equal facilities to use and enjoy the Land, and equally benefit by the revenue derived from it.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

OFFICE, 57 AND 59, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C.

NOTICES TO MEMBERS.

Change of residence should be notified to the Secretary.

As the work of the Society is daily increasing, and severely taxes its resources, those who cannot increase their subscriptions are invited to evince their zeal by endeavouring to obtain additional members, or subscriptions to it. Literature, for judicious distribution, can be had gratuitously on application to the Secretary. An average addition of only *one* new member by each present subscriber would double the strength of the society, and quadruple its efficiency.

It is respectfully requested that the Secretary be informed of any matters relating to the Land Question that may appear either in the London, Provincial, or Foreign Press.

FORM OF BEQUEST.

Those friends who may be disposed to assist the Society by bequest should use the following form :—

"I give and bequeath to the Treasurer or Treasurers for the time being of the Land Nationalisation Society the sum of £ : : , free of Legacy Duty, to be paid out of such of my personal Estate as can be lawfully applied for the purpose, and to be used for the benefit of the said Society as its Executive Committee may think proper."

MEMBERSHIP.

Concurrence with the Society's principles of Land Nationalisation, and Annual Subscription to its funds, are the conditions of membership. A Donation of £5 5s. or more, confers Life membership.

REGULATIONS FOR BRANCHES.

- 1.—Branches of the Land Nationalisation Society are required to accept the general principles of the parent Society.
- 2.—Each Branch is expected to contribute, annually, one-fourth of its subscriptions to the parent Society.
- 3.—Each Branch shall furnish to the parent Society a yearly report of its proceedings and a statement of its position.
- 4.—Each Branch, for every one hundred of its members, or portion thereof, may elect a representative, who shall be entitled to a seat and vote on the Council of the parent Society.

Branches will, as far as possible, be assisted with lecturers, and it is desirable that each Branch should have delivered under its auspices at least two lectures each year.

The literature published by the parent Society will be supplied to Branches at cost price.

The attention of Branches is particularly directed to the use of the local papers as a means of propagaudism.

COUNCIL.

PRESIDENT.

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., Frith Hill, Godalming.

VICE PRESIDENTS.

DESMOND G. FITZGERALD.
E. P. GIRDLESTONE, B.A. Oxon.

Professor F. W. NEWMAN.
Miss HELEN TAYLOR.

TREASURER.

A. C. SWINTON.*

HON. SECRETARY

A. McDONNELL.*

ASST. HON. SECRETARIES

Wm. JAMESON and C. A. WINOUST.*

HON. FINANCIAL SECRETARY.

H. C. MOBERLY.*

Rev. J. D. Alford.
J. G. Ashley.
H. Asherton, B.C.S.
G. Gilmore Burnett.
H. H. Hood Barrs, LL.B.
Rev. S. E. Bengough, M.A.
*A. G. Buttifant.
*E. T. Craig (of Radabine).
R. Cooper (Eastbourne).
*T. W. Rhys Davids.
P. S. Dick, M.P.
P. P. Domoney, M. Stampton S.B.
R. R. Douglas (Liverpool).
Col. J. M. Earle.
*T. H. Elliott.
A. Halstead (Harrogate).
*E. Hitzfeldt.
W. Hicks (Eastbourne).
H. Hutchinson (Derby).
Spencer Jackson.
Rev. E. Pau Jones, Ph.D. (Moslyn).
H. S. Lewis.
H. W. Ley.
B. Lucraft, M.L.S.B.
Chas. Mackay, LL.D.

Ernest Morley.
C. Murray.
R. Owen.
J. A. Parker.
Chas. Peach.
*Rev. W. H. Ritchie, M.A.
W. Reeves.
*W. Reynolds.
Elgar Robinson (Isle of Man).
Lt.-Col. W. A. Ross, F.G.S.
F. E. M. Steele.
Rev. T. Travers Sherlock, B.A.
(Smethwick).
A. P. Snodgrass.
T. W. Taunton.
Mrs. W. Tebb.
*W. Trant.
J. Tarle, M.D.
D. Urquhart.
W. Volckman.
T. F. Walker (Birmingham).
J. Whyte (Inverness).
S. D. Williams (Malvern).
Howard Williams, M.A.
*F. A. Winder.

Those marked with an * and the Officers constitute the Executive Committee.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

ROBT. B. HOLT.

May 13th, 1885.

The Society earnestly desires to enlarge the area of its work, but the vigour of its action depends upon the financial means at its disposal. Special appeal is therefore made to all who realise that the extent of the Nation's perilous pauperism and increasing misery is primarily due to the existing system of land tenure. They are invited to give effect to their convictions either by personal effort in connection with the Society, or by such pecuniary aid as they can afford to give it.

Remittances may be sent to the Treasurer, A. C. Swinton, 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill, London E.C. Cheques to be crossed "The Union Bank of London, Charing Cross." P.O. Orders to be made payable at Ludgate Circus, London, E.C.

All who are interested (and who are not?) in Land Law Reform are cordially invited to become members of the Society, and to assist it in the formation of Branches. Copies of the Society's detailed Scheme Rules, and other Literature may be had on application.

The Council, as far as possible, supply Lecturers where friends find a Chairman and a Public Room, and are always glad to hear from those willing to co-operate in the movement.

FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

HELD AT ANDERTON'S HOTEL, FLEET STREET, LONDON, MAY 13, 1885.

A. R. WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

Although, as a society, we may not have made very great progress during the past year, yet our cause is none the less advancing with giant strides, and we may, I think, lay claim to having done good work in helping it on. In a question which is so vast and which involves such momentous issues it is not to be wondered at that there is a great diversity of opinion, and that people in general are somewhat confused by the vague and discordant teachings of the public press. While our doctrines are far too radical for the ordinary politician, a considerable body of our Socialist friends think we do not go far enough; but we have confidence in the position we have taken up, and we already see indications that both parties are drawing nearer towards us. It is, I think, a most encouraging sign that the dogma of "free trade in land," which till quite recently was put forth as the one and only needful land reform, is now almost universally admitted to be quite insufficient, and it is avowed that something more is required in order to remedy the terrible state of things brought about by unrestricted land-monopoly. The disastrous overcrowding of towns and depopulation of the rural districts is now sought to be remedied by the establishment of joint-stock societies, to set up "industrial villages" and create a body of "peasant proprietors." These proposals invariably receive the warm support of all parties, including landlords, and none of our political teachers seem to have any misgivings as to the success of this mode of renovating our social system on commercial principles. But they have very imperfect knowledge if they think that such measures will suffice, while the causes which year by year

compel the rural population to leave their native villages and flock into the towns remain still in action. On this important subject I propose to make a few remarks in connection with the most recent, and in many ways the most noteworthy, of these proposals, "*The Small Farm and Labourers' Holding Company*," as to the merits of which the Press has been almost unanimous and has blown the trumpet in its praise accordingly.

This company is essentially a landlord's movement, since I find among its founders and supporters the names of sixteen great landholders, and a large number of the junior branches of noble and landlord families. The sixteen great landlords—from Dukes downwards—who attended at the meeting at which the Society was founded, or wrote expressing their warm approval of it, hold between them more than *half a million acres of land*. The speakers who represented them at the meeting all expressed their sense of the vast importance of small farms and peasant-holdings. The country was being ruined for the want of them; and, accordingly, these holders of half-a-million acres proposed that the public should subscribe money and buy other people's land (when and where it happened to be for sale), and establish the small farms and peasant-holdings in regions quite away from the sacred half-million acres owned by themselves! It never seems to have occurred to them, or to anyone present, that no "Company" was needed, that not a penny need be raised, that secretaries and directors and chairmen (with their respective salaries) were quite unnecessary, if the owners of the half-million of acres then present would agree together that each and all of them would divide their own estates into "small farms," would themselves allow "labourers" to have "holdings," would permit population freely to grow on *their* lands, letting everyone, in fact, who wanted land for personal occupation have it on a permanent tenure, at the same rents as the farmers now pay for it. If only *half* of the 500,000 acres were so used, it would supply 5,000 small farms at an average of 25 acres, and 62,500 labourers' holdings at an average of 2 acres—about 67,000 additional families settled on the land, of a population of over a quarter of a million. How long will it be before the "Society" "Limited" will do as much as this? Will it be able to do as much in 10 years, or 20 years, or even 50 years—if it should continue to exist so long? I feel pretty confident that it will not; while what it does do will be far less beneficial, because, instead of allowing population to flow naturally over the land, people themselves deciding where they can best get a living upon it, they will be forced to live only on the particular farms and estates that may be purchased by this or similar companies, while the rest of England, Scotland, and Ireland remains subject to the very same influences which have depopulated and continue to depopulate their rural lands.

Now, is it not a most suggestive fact that not one of the landlords present promised to do anything of the kind, but by their silence made it pretty clear that they intended, as heretofore, to keep their own estates

quite free from such low things as "small farms" and "labourers' holdings." One landlord indeed, Sir R. Loyd-Lindsay, offered the Company an estate of 400 acres, which he had just purchased in Berkshire at £10 an acre, "on any terms they might suggest"; but he was careful to add that it was not in the division of the county which he inhabited. This was apparently stated in order not to set the bad example of allowing poor people to have land in the neighbourhood of a great landlord's own domain—a thing evidently most repulsive to the landlord mind! One of the noble speakers referred to the fact that they would have "to face the expense of transfer" and to the necessity of having many small owners together in order that they could hire horses, with many other difficulties which are altogether imaginary, or would be obviated if they would simply let people have land *where they require it and on a secure tenure*. One—and so far as I can hear, only *one*—landlord in all England has done this—Lord Tollemache. On his estates in Cheshire and Suffolk he has numerous small farms, and no very large ones: he allows every labourer to have enough land to keep a cow and he allows *anybody*—mechanics, or retired tradesmen—to purchase or lease land to build and live upon, with ample space for gardens, and a field or two in addition at a fair rent wherever they desire it. And the result is, that here is a little oasis of comfort and contentment in the midst of the wilderness of misery and discontent produced by landlordism. Here there is no agricultural distress, the farms are eagerly sought after—the tenure of them being practically permanent at fair rents—the labouring population are well off and contented, and the farmers find that these independent and well-to-do labourers are the best of workmen, and, as the correspondent of the *Daily News*, says, "are loud in praise of the system." Strange to say, Lord Tollemache is described as a Tory of the old school, but he evidently realises as a fact, what others only state as a theory, that property is a trust, that the people have a *right* to have land to live and work upon, and that to allow them freely to have it is not only a great boon to them and to society, but is equally beneficial to the landlord himself. All honour to him for having so consistently acted upon these convictions! But what are we to think of those landlords who, having had this example before them for half-a-century, even now make no attempt to follow it, but come before the public as promoters of the "*Small Farm and Labourers' Holding Company (Limited)*," a company formed to throw dust in the eyes of the public, to find purchasers for otherwise unsaleable farms, and to keep the objectionable "small farmers" and "labourers" as far removed as possible from their own estates.

In order to show you the magnitude of the evils which this precious Company is supposed to be adequate to remedy, I will give you a few facts as to rural depopulation which are not generally known, as they have been allowed to remain buried in the Census Reports.

There are in England and Wales 2,175 registration sub-districts, each

containing four or five parishes, and the population of these is given for the last two censuses, showing their increase or diminution. Thinking that this would afford the means of determining over what area the exodus of the rural population to the towns has extended, I have drawn out a table showing the proportion of each county in which the population has actually diminished during the ten years 1871—81. This table shows that, with the exception of those counties which form residential suburbs to London, and a few others which are thickly covered with manufacturing towns, the depopulation extends to every part of England, and apparently to almost the whole of the agricultural districts. The amount of diminution of population in the Counties of England and Wales, and extending over more than half their area, is 308,941. But this by no means shows the amount of migration from these districts. For during the same ten years the population of the whole country increased nearly 15 per cent., and rural populations increase naturally much more rapidly than those of towns. The births in the country are about three per cent. more, the deaths about twelve per cent. less; so that we cannot put the normal increase of the rural populations at less than 17 per cent. But the population of the decreasing areas in 1871 was

Normal increase at 17 per cent.	4,876,000
	<u>828,900</u>
Population ought to have been	5,704,900
But the actual population by the census is . .	<u>4,567,000</u>
Difference	1,237,900

We thus see that the real exodus of the people from these particular districts has been nearly 1½ million. But even this is not all; for, besides these areas where the population has actually decreased there must be a large additional area where they have increased *less than the normal rate of 17 per cent.*, and this implies migration from a still wider area. Taking for example a few typical counties, I find that in Sussex, which shows but a small absolute decrease, the whole county except a few towns and their suburban districts have increased much below the normal rate, implying migration of the surplus rural population to the towns. In Hampshire the same occurs, only Portsmouth, Southampton, and Christchurch having increased up to or beyond the normal rate. In Buckinghamshire, not a single sub-district has increased normally. In Norfolk the same. In Leicestershire only the towns and some of their suburban districts have increased normally. In Derbyshire only 9 out of 25 sub-districts have increased up to the normal standard. In Cumberland the seaports only have increased normally, the rest of the county showing a very slight increase or none. The conclusion we arrive at, therefore, is, that over the whole of rural England there has been a continuous flow of population to the great towns, owing to the natural increase of the population not find-

ing the means of existence elsewhere. Now, for the migration from these districts which increased much below the normal rate, we may, I think, fairly add three-quarters of a million, making, with the $1\frac{1}{2}$ million in the areas of absolute decrease, a total of nearly *two millions of people*, who in ten years only have been forced by the struggle for existence to leave the country for the towns!

Here we have the true dimensions of the evil to be grappled with, and we see that it is co-extensive with rural England. Yet now, the landlords, who have themselves directly caused the evil by systematically refusing to let land in "small farms" or "labourers' holdings," would have us believe that it is to be adequately met by a "Limited Company," having established which they may contentedly repose upon their vast ancestral estates, from which "small farmers," and "peasant holdings" are rigidly and systematically banished! To such a scheme in the face of such a great national crisis, the only fitting parallel is Mrs. Partington attempting to keep out the Atlantic with her mop!

Let us now turn to another subject. One of the most interesting occurrences of the present year was the *Industrial Remuneration Conference* in January last. Although the matters discussed were very largely mere aide issues, yet some great questions affecting social economy were brought forward, among which the Land Question occupied a prominent place, and it was evident that Land Nationalisation was beginning to be discussed among the working classes, though its essential principles and overwhelming importance are not yet well understood.

Among the more important papers—because anything coming from the writer is sure to receive attention—was one by Mr. Frederic Harrison, on "Remedies for Social Distress." Owing to the limitation of time there was no opportunity of replying to this paper, and I had intended to do so in detail in my present Address; but I find that this would occupy far too much time, and I shall, therefore, confine myself to a few remarks on two points only, one a matter of principle, the other mainly a question of fact.

In arguing against the nationalisation of the land and the more equable distribution of capital which it would certainly bring about, Mr. Harrison maintains that there is "*a universal tendency of organised industry, rural or urban, towards the massing and not the dispersion of capital;*" and that "*increased concentration of capital is an indispensable condition of modern successful industry.*" And he concludes thus:—"In the face of this universal law of modern industry, a law the more conspicuous the more free and virgin be the field of industry, how idle would it be to look for any regeneration of the industrial system to a natural dispersion of capital or land! In the teeth of universal tendencies such as these it is rather unnatural to struggle for the revival of the equable distribution of capital and land which marks the ruder types of society."

Now, such general propositions as this as to "*universal tendencies and law*"

are utterly valueless, unless you can first prove that they exist and have arisen under a social system *founded on justice and freedom*, and no such proof has been attempted. To illustrate what I mean, let us suppose Mr. Harrison to have been a Roman of the Augustan period. What would then have been his argument as to universal "social tendencies and laws?" Arguing with an advocate of free labour and enterprise, as against a system of slavery, he might probably have said:—"The universal tendency of modern progress is to divide men into *freemen* and *slaves*. Under this system alone is civilisation possible. Without slavery you cannot have a highly-cultivated, leisured class, able to produce those works of literature, art, and construction which are the marks of true civilisation. All history tells us the same story. Wherever you have civilisation you have slavery as its essential foundation. Look at the old civilisations of Egypt, India, Assyria, and Greece, all alike dependent on the existence of a small, cultured class, the possessors of myriads of slaves. To this system we owe all the grand monuments and works of art which these countries have produced, and whose ruins still exist. To this system we owe the splendours of Rome, the mistress of the world, and all that noble literature and art and refinement which has never yet been equalled." And he might have concluded almost in the very words he has used to-day—"In the teeth of universal tendencies such as these it is rather unnatural to struggle for a revival of the universal personal freedom and equality of condition which marks the ruder types of society."

The one argument is just as good, or as bad, as the other. Both, in fact, are equally bad, because they both rest upon the assumption that men have not equal rights to participate in the free gifts of nature to man. When one portion of society possess the LAND, with all the powers and natural forces which it contains, and the other, and far larger portion, cannot even work or live, cannot obtain a particle of food or clothing, except on such conditions as the landholders collectively impose, they are—as Mr. George has so well shown—as truly slaves as were those who worked for Roman nobles or Southern planters. A system which has grown up under these conditions, and which is founded upon them, cannot set itself up as a guide as to what are the "*universal laws and tendencies*" of unfettered human industry.

In some respects, even, the modern slave is worse off than his predecessor in the ancient world, for he is the slave of machinery and capital, and to serve the purposes of his master is forced to live in huge cities far removed from the health-giving influences and spontaneous gifts of nature, and thus when, as so often happens, the capitalist has no immediate need for his labour, he must starve or live as a pauper. Much is asserted of the *economy* of this division of labour and production on the most gigantic scale, but it is not *true economy*, inasmuch as its results are to produce inordinate wealth for the few, incessant labour with widespread poverty and disease for the many. True economy is that which not only produces wealth freely but distributes it fairly: true economy must tend to the equalisation of both

wealth and labour: true economy will not force men to be the slaves of machinery day after day, with no opportunity for that relaxation produced by change of labour, and that mental and physical invigoration which result from spending some portion of their time in tilling the soil the fruits of which they are themselves to gather. It is not true economy to place men in such a position that when work for an employer fails they are utterly unable to work for themselves. All this is false economy; and yet this is the system which Mr. Harrison tells us is founded upon "*universal law and tendency*"!

And when he descends from the heights of rhetoric and attempts to support his argument by an appeal to facts he is not accurate. He says: "*The ancient controversies as to the great and little culture of land have now ended in this: that for the largest production of cereals and stock and for the highest scientific farming the big-scale culture at least is indispensable.*" This no doubt is what is repeated over and over again by men who claim to be authorities, but it is simply untrue, as I will prove to you by incontrovertible evidence. Lord Carrington has recently stated that his 800 allotment tenants in Buckinghamshire get a nett produce from the land of £40 an acre, while the *most* that a farmer can make out of the same land is £7 an acre. Here is big and small farming compared by the landlord, and his facts are supported by independent official evidence. It was proved before the Women's and Children's Employment Commission in 1888 that cottagers obtained an average return of £16 an acre above the farm rent. The Rev. Mr. Stubbs shows that his allotments at Granborough, in Buckinghamshire, cultivated by common labourers, produced 60 per cent. more wheat than the farmers' average, and 11 per cent. more than the average of the highest scientific farming. Thus a million labourers working for themselves would produce far more wheat than the same land does when cultivated by the most scientific farmers. Here is an actual fact, carefully recorded, worth a whole volume of assertions that the thing cannot be. And as to stock, Mr. Little, the Assistant Commissioner to the Royal Commission on Agriculture, in his account of Penstrase Moor in Cornwall—barren land entirely reclaimed by the labour of peasants and miners—shows that those little peasant holdings produce more than double the number of cattle and pigs per 100 acres than either the County of Cornwall or the Truro Union in which they are situated. Here, then, whether tested by the value of the total produce, by the quantity of wheat, or by the number of live stock, we see that small holdings beat large farms, not by a small margin, but by 50 or 100 up to 500 per cent.; while the moral and social advantages are so great that even if the produce were only the same or even less, the small culture system should be preferred. We see, therefore, that in the one case in which we can test it by an appeal to facts, the general statement as to the superior economy of large as against small-scale industry is

shown to be absolutely untrue; and it is highly probable that when applied to other industries than agriculture it will be found equally untrue, because we have yet to see the value of diversity of occupation, of utilising spare time now wasted, and of that magic power of property which enables a man working for himself in his own house or shop to do half as much again as when working for a master, with little pleasure and no direct interest either in the quantity or the quality of his work.

We now come to the next point—the question of fact. Mr. Harrison maintains, and reiterates over and over again, that LAND, as it now exists, is a manufactured article—that “*an ordinary farm is as much artificial as a house or a factory.*” There is, he says, “*hardly an acre of cultivated land in England which has not been made cultivated by a great outlay of labour and capital. It has really been as much built up as a railway or a dock.*” And thence he argues that even if the people of England have a right to the land of England, they have only a right to it as it was originally. “*To seize it,*” he says, “*after centuries of labour have been expended in utterly changing its very face and nature would be monstrously unjust.*” And further on he argues that the whole labour expended on reclaiming the land is so great that it often represents more than its present value; and concludes thus:—“*Mr. George might as well claim the coats off our backs, on the ground that God made the sheep, as the farms which have been made by human capital and skill.*” And very much more in the same brilliant, but I think superficial, style.

Now, in all this there are two underlying fallacies: 1. The improvement to the land by culture is not, on the whole, nearly so great as is alleged, since in many cases it has been deteriorated and impoverished instead of being improved; and 2. The bulk of the improvement that has been made has been made by successive generations of tenant-cultivators, as an *incident of cultivation*, and the result, whatever it may be, is the heritage of the nation, not of the landlords, who have in most cases done *nothing*.

To take the last point first, Mr. Harrison argues as if the whole process of reclamation from forest or moorland, from marsh or mountain side, had been done by, or at the cost of, the landlords. But by far the larger part of the land now under cultivation has been so for many centuries, and was certainly brought under cultivation by successive generations of actual cultivators. This is proved by the fact that in 1557 wheat was exported from this country, which, taking into account the system of agriculture then pursued, the small crops raised, and the estimated population of England, shows that the amount of arable land was then nearly as great as now, if not greater.* Of course we

* In the 16th Century the population of England is estimated to have been about four and a half millions, and the country then produced all the wheat, barley, and other food which it consumed. The consumption of wheat is now reckoned at about 8 bushels per head: but at a time when there was no rice or potatoes, and when the people were mostly countrymen, living much in the open air and in robust health, we may fairly put the consumption of corn, especially as it was of an inferior quality, at 12 bushels per head. This gives a total consumption of 45 million bushels of wheat. The average crop at this time was about 13 bushels an acre, from

are speaking only of the *land itself*. Many farmhouses and buildings have been erected by landlords, and some other permanent improvements made by them, but neither we nor Mr. George have ever even proposed to take these away from their owners. The land itself, however, in so far as its value has been increased, has been improved bit by bit, by successive generations of *tenants* from Saxon times downwards, and we claim that the people of England, not the landlords only, are the true inheritors of that improvement.

But Mr. Harrison is equally in error in his estimate of the enormous amount of this increased value. On the contrary, it is very doubtful if the land of England, as a whole, is so inherently valuable now as it was three or four hundred years ago. There are two reasons for this opinion. In the first place, population was formerly distributed pretty uniformly over the whole country, and as there was then no system of sewerage (by which the fertilising refuse of men and animals are now carried away to the sea) almost the whole of the manurial products were returned to the land, and thus, with a regular system of fallows, its fertility was kept up. Now, on the contrary, almost all the vegetable and animal produce of the country is consumed in great cities far away from the land which produces it, and the manure is not returned to the land. Hence a progressive deterioration, only partially checked by the use of artificial manures.* Again, we find, almost all over England, extensive tracts of poor pasture land which, by the ridges on its surface, show that it has formerly been ploughed. Much of this was probably once natural pasture, which, when on a good subsoil, is the most fertile of all land. During the periods when wheat was dear under the old régime of the Corn Laws, this fine old pasture was everywhere broken up, and the top soil, rich in Linnæus and vegetable fibre which had accumulated by thousands of years of grazing, gave for a few years immense crops of grain. Then, when its fertility diminished, fresh land was broken up and the other was allowed to go back into pasture. But its natural fertility had been irretrievably ruined. It now bears large crops of thistles and other noxious weeds, and is in many cases not worth half or a third of what it was before it was broken up. This was the work of the landlords, who got high rents for this corn-producing land; and if this, and the thousands of acres of chalk and limestone downs which have been similarly broken up and deteriorated, are taken into account, I think it

which we must deduct 3 bushels an acre for the seed sown, leaving 10 bushels an acre net produce, and this would have required 5,400,000 acres of land to grow it. To this we have to add one third as much for fallows every three years, bringing up the amount to over seven million acres, besides the land cultivated in barley, oats, peas, beans, and other crops. Now, in 1850, the amount of land in all these crops together was under seven million acres, so that it is quite clear that the reclamation and cultivation of the land of England dates back to very early times.

* It may be said that the larger crops of to-day show the improvement of the soil; but this is not so. They only show the improved quality of the seed and the improved methods of agricultural ure. With had agriculture the fine wheat lands of South Australia often produce less than ten bushels an acre, and those of California only fourteen bushels, and this with the immense advantage of our greatly improved selected grain. The thirteen bushels produced in the Middle Ages in England, with the poor quality of wheat which alone then existed, is quite compatible with a very fertile soil and fairly good husbandry.

very probable that instead of the landlords having improved the land, they have, by their greed for high rents, distinctly deteriorated it; and for this deterioration the people of England may perhaps present their *bill* when accounts come to be settled between them both.

Even the English language bears witness against Mr. Harrison's contention, for what word do we use when we want to express the best and richest undeteriorated land? We call it "virgin soil"—soil in a state of nature. How often do we hear of the difficulties of our farmers competing by means of the exhausted soil of England against the "virgin soil" of America! Yet, according to Mr. Harrison, this "virgin soil" is worthless, and only becomes good for anything after centuries of cultivation! Not only the English language, but history and experience alike bear testimony against this stupendous fallacy.

There are numerous other statements and arguments in Mr. Harrison's paper which appear to me to be equally unsound, but I have no time now to enter upon them. But I thought it essential to say a few words on this theory of "land being a manufactured article," because it was the main point in a lecture delivered by Mr. Harrison at Newcastle-on-Tyne last year, and, as I was informed by a person who heard it, produced much impression owing to the authoritative manner in which the proposition was laid down.

And this brings me to a somewhat personal matter. In a lecture on the Land Question at Newton Hall in February, 1884, Mr. Harrison is reported to have said that—"he thought that Mr. Wallace knew as little about the English Land Question and the management of English estates as Mr. George, and his studies in the Eastern Archipelago had not assisted him."

Now, as my practice—in this as in all other enquiries on which I have been engaged—is never to give my personal opinions as of any value, but always to set forth or refer to the facts and arguments which have led me to form the opinion, the above-quoted belief as to my "knowledge" is of little real importance. The question really is, are the facts we allege true, and are the conclusions we draw from those facts sound? But there are many people who will not, or cannot, follow out a train of reasoning founded on an elaborate statement of facts: they prefer relying on authority, and of course they like to know on what grounds any particular person is to be considered an authority. For that reason and that reason only, I beg leave to give you a short autobiographical sketch of my personal relations with the land and the land question.

I left school at the age of 14, and my real education then commenced. I joined an elder brother who was a *land-surveyor*, with considerable knowledge also of engineering and architecture. With him I spent seven years, in various parts of England and Wales, constantly engaged professionally with *land*. We lived almost the whole of this time in small towns or villages, in farmhouses or labourers cottages. We were engaged in surveying for the Tithe Commutation,

for the Enclosure Commissioners, or for private estate-owners. We assisted in the process of valuation for the Tithe Commutation, and for Enclosures of Commons. Living thus almost constantly on the land and among farmers and country people, I soon took a great interest in agriculture. I studied the works of Sir Humphrey Davy and Baron Liebig, at that time the great authorities on agricultural chemistry. When living in village inns I was often present at the meetings of the Farmers' Clubs, and heard agricultural matters discussed, and I really believe that at that period of my life I could have passed a very fair examination in theoretical and practical agriculture. Soon after I came of age, my brother died, and succeeded him in a small connection as Surveyor and Architect, which occupied me till I went abroad five years later.

Thus, for the twelve most impressionable and most active years of my life I was living in the closest possible relation to the land and its cultivators, and I obtained a knowledge of peasant life and an interest in agriculture which has been a permanent acquisition to me. After returning home from abroad in 1852 I lived a few years in London, but since then have always resided in the country, and having acquired from Herbert Spencer the great principle that private property in land was absolutely wrong, I ever kept the subject in my mind, seeking out a mode by which this wrong might be practically and equitably abolished. About eight or ten years ago I began to see my way, and as soon as I had finished the various scientific works which were the result of my twelve years of tropical exploration, I put my ideas in order and wrote the article "How to Nationalise the Land," which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* in Nov., 1880, and which I believe led to the formation of this Society.

I trust you will excuse the apparent egotism of this narration, but it may perhaps be useful by showing that my whole life has been closely connected with the land, that I have had great opportunities for acquiring knowledge both of it and of those who cultivate it, and that the views I now hold and advocate are not, as Mr. Harrison thinks, the result of a hasty and superficial literary study, but are, to some extent, the outcome of the practical experience of a lifetime.

"Every man is born with a natural right to a share in the soil of his native country."
Rt. Hon. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, M.P.

"The true proprietor of land is not even the existing Nation—it is the race, past, present, and future: the earth lends itself to all, and to each, passing from hand to hand, and from age to age, but gives itself to none."

ROMAIN DRELAUNE.

R E P O R T .

*Presented to the Members of the Society at its
Fourth Annual Meeting.*

In consequence of the prolonged illness of the Treasurer, Mr. A. C. Swinton, who till lately also discharged the duties of Hon. Sec., and the serious shortcomings and recent dismissal of the salaried officer who should have continued the work of the Society, the accession of new members during the year has not been so large as we could have wished, while the same unfortunate circumstances have rendered it impossible for us to prepare a formal balance-sheet in time for this meeting. But, notwithstanding the loss of time necessarily involved in these untoward events, we have reason to be satisfied with the result of what has been done, and with the marked progress which the Society's principles are steadily making in the public mind.

While we cordially acknowledge the influence of Mr. Henry George in giving a most important impetus to the question of Land Nationalisation throughout these islands, we do not lose sight of the fact that his remedial method has in some measure distracted attention from the distinctive features of this Society's programme. The mass of the people who have suffered, and are suffering, such severe ills through the existence of landlordism are at present, perhaps, too much incensed to carefully consider the question of the equitable treatment of those who—unconsciously in the main—have done them such grievous wrong. Nevertheless, we have such unbounded faith in the inherent fairness of the English people as to feel confident that, when the time comes to settle this momentous question, they will cordially assent to temper justice with mercy. Then, we venture to think, the ethical and practical value of this Society's principles will be manifest.

LECTURES.

This section of the Society's operations has been carried on with vigour and over a wider area than heretofore.

Seventeen lectures have been delivered under our auspices since the last

annual meeting, less than eleven months since. Miss Helen Taylor has again rendered most important assistance by lecturing at Earlestown, Hackney, Liverpool, Norwich, and Peckham. Prof. F. W. Newman lectured at Street in Somersetshire: Mr. W. Jameson at Croydon and Walworth; and Mr. Halstead at Harrogate twice. Lectures have also been delivered at Oldham, Sheffield, Wigan, Camberwell, Rotherhithe, and Poplar, and the doctrines of the Society have been promulgated at numerous meetings besides.

BRANCHES.

As the result of Miss Helen Taylor's lecture at Liverpool (delivered under the auspices of the City Reform Club), a branch has been opened there which is now in fair working order. An equally gratifying result has attended Miss Taylor's lectures at Peckham and Homerton. A branch has also been established at Wigan, while the Sheffield and Oldham Radical Associations, and the Norwich Democratic Association have affiliated with us. We have reason to believe that branches will shortly be formed at Manchester, Wrexham, and Poplar. The importance of multiplying these centres of propagandism cannot be over-estimated, and we especially plead for our members' aid thereto.

LITERATURE.

The circulation of the Society's literature has been largely increased. Advantage has been taken of numerous political indoor and outdoor meetings to disseminate our publications, notably in the cases of the Reform Demonstration in Hyde Park, the Mass Meeting at the Royal Exchange, and the great gathering of agricultural labourers at Ham Hill in Somersetshire, on Easter Monday last.

We have added to our literature a reprint of a sermon delivered at Adelaide (South Australia) by the Rev. W. R. Fletcher, entitled "The Gospel of Land Nationalisation": a reprint (from the *Daily News*) of an important article by Prof. J. Thorold Rogers, M.P., on "The Agricultural Question," and a large poster, giving facts, in the form of a manifesto, and intended for circulation among political clubs and working men's societies. A circular has also been addressed to the clergy, urging upon them the necessity of Land Nationalisation as a primary means to promote and secure the moral and physical health of the people. Every available opportunity has been used to disseminate our principles by the diffusion of our literature, as we believe that to be the most effective mode of educating public opinion.

PARLIAMENTARY AND PUBLIC ACTION.

With reference to Smith's Trust Estate Bill in relation to the Scilly Islands, which Bill came before the House of Commons on the 24th June, 1884, the Members of Parliament who spoke for and against the measure were written to respecting it. Correspondence has taken place on the subject of extensive enclosures of common lands at Hayes and Keston in Kent between Mr. Swinton, the Commons Preservation Society, and Mr. J. Bryce, M.P., but no action could be taken.

The intolerable oppression of the Skye Crofters has enlisted our warmest sympathy and a resolution expressing it was passed, and transmitted through Mr. Stuart Glennie.

At the Industrial Remuneration Conference, held in January last, under the Presidency of Sir Chas. Dilke, M.P., two papers were presented and read on behalf of the Society, one by Prof. F. W. Newman, dealing with our general principles; the other by our President, showing how that part of our programme which would give facility and protection to peasant holders might have immediate application. The determination with which Land Nationalisation was advocated at the Conference by the Delegates of the various Industrial interests there represented was both significant and cheering, as demonstrating the deep interest taken in our great movement by the Democracy.

On the other hand, it would seem by the recent formation of the "National Land Co., Limited," by so many persons with titles to their names, that our movement has elicited some concession from the Oligarchy, with the object, however ludicrously futile, of checking Land Nationalisation.

PRESS CORRESPONDENCE.

An organised system of correspondence with the Press was undertaken in the early part of the year. Letters of an explanatory or controversial character have been written by the President, Professor F. W. Newman, the officers of the Society, and by several members of the Executive, and these have appeared in various Metropolitan and Provincial Journals. Indeed, we record with much satisfaction the general fairness with which the Press has opened its columns, not to the Society alone, but to the numerous other voluntary writers who are actively engaged as missionaries in our cause. We would call especial attention to this section of work, and emphasise the necessity for its greater development. Many who have no other opportunity of promoting the cause might materially aid our efforts by an occasional letter to the press. This would provoke discussion and thereby manifest the truth.

LAND NATIONALISATION ABROAD.

At our last annual meeting it was stated that Land Nationalisation had been strenuously advocated in New Zealand. We have now the pleasure of stating that the movement has extended also to New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria, and Queensland, where societies have been formed, and seem to be flourishing. In Queensland a Land Bill was actually passed last October, founded on the great principle of leasing, instead of alienating, the Crown lands, with measures for the reduction of great estates and the prevention of their future aggregation; and also for the encouragement of small farmers throughout the colony. In South Australia the movement appears to be even more thorough, though it has not yet resulted in legislation. The South Australian Land Nationalisation Society has for its objects—1. To stop the further sale of all Crown lands; 2. To restore to the State by purchase the ownership of land already sold; 3. To provide for the leasing of all lands on such terms as shall ensure to the State a fair rental, and to the tenant full security for his improvements and for the results of his industry. The Society referred to has issued a manifesto, of which 15,000 copies have been circulated, containing a full and admirable exposition of the true principles of Land Nationalisation, with proposals very similar to our own. Surely there cannot be a better justification of the soundness of our principles than the fact that they have been adopted in almost all the Australian colonies as affording the only remedy for the intolerable evils which have arisen

there through permitting the people's land to become the private possession of the wealthy.

OUR PROGRAMME.

Referring to this Society's programme, the Executive hopes ere long to submit a simplified application of its principles in a suggested Land Nationalisation Bill. Such a Bill has been drawn and printed by Mr. F. A. Binney, a solicitor, of Manchester, well known as the author of several admirable publications on Social Reform, and we hope to be able to concur sufficiently with a modified reprint of the proposed Bill for the Society to issue it. As there seems good reason to believe that some of our members may enter Parliament at the next General Election, the value of such a Bill is obvious, as it is most desirable that Land Nationalisation should be brought within the range of practical politics during the very first session of the new Parliament, if not by Bill, by resolution of the House on the main principle.

In conclusion, we would add that everything tends to a far more rapid acknowledgment of our principles than could have been anticipated when the Society was formed. The intolerable social condition of great masses of our fellow-creatures, - as exemplified by the recent Report on the Housing of the Poor, - is a subject pressing more and more heavily on the minds of all right-thinking men and women. Day by day the conviction is growing in the public mind that Land Monopoly is the main cause of this state of things; and as that conviction must spread and strengthen, the recent extension of the Franchise will soon give the necessary power to Nationalise the Land. Remembering this, and that support could not be given to a better cause, we most earnestly invite all who agree with us in principle to join in our mission of justice. We do not expect agreement with the details of our tentative programme. We simply ask effective concurrence with the object of this Society: "To equitably restore to the Nation its Land, so that all may have equal facilities to use and enjoy the Land, and equally benefit by the revenue derived from it."

Crown 8vo, pp xiv.—244, Original Edition, Cloth, price 5s. Cheap Edition, paper cover, 8d., by post 11d.; limp cloth, 1s. 6d., by post 1s. 9d.

Land Nationalisation;

ITS NECESSITY AND ITS AIMS.

Being a comparison of the System of Landlord and Tenant with that of Occupying Ownership in their Influence on the Well-being of the People.

BY

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D.

Author of "The Malay Archipelago," "Island Life," &c., &c.

Land Nationalisation Society Tracts.

	<i>s. d.</i>
I.—The Land Difficulty:—How shall we deal with it! Per 100	1 0
II.—The Land for the People	1 0
III.—How Land Nationalisation will benefit Householders, Labourers, and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	2 0
IV.—The Times and Land Nationalisation (J. A. Parker)	1 0
V.—Land Tenure Reform (Professor F. W. Newman)	1 0
VI.—The Why and the How of Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace) ...	12 0
VII.—The Land as National Property (Professor F. W. Newman)	4 0
VIII.—How to Experiment in Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace) ...	1 0
IX.—The Great Land Suit (H. Hutchinson)	6
X.—Running Notes on the Pamphlet by Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., entitled "National Progress and Poverty" Per 100	1 6
XI.—The Agricultural Question (by Jas. E. Thorold Rogers, M.P.) ...	1 0
XII.—The Gospel of Land Nationalisation (by the Rev. W. R. Fletcher, M.A.)	1 0
Programmes of the Society	1 0
Land and Family in China	2 0
Landlords' Rights and Englishmen's Wrongs	6 0
Papers for the People per doz.	3 0

ADDRESS

BY

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D.,

PRESIDENT OF

THE LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

AT THE FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOCIETY,

MAY 13TH, 1885.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

Although, as a Society, we may not have made very great progress during the past year, yet our cause is none the less advancing with giant strides, and we may I think, lay claim to having done good work in helping it on. In a question which is so vast and which involves such momentous issues it is not to be wondered at that there is a great diversity of opinion, and that people in general are somewhat confused by the vague and discordant teachings of the public press. While our doctrines are far too radical for the ordinary politician, a considerable body of our Socialist friends think we do not go far enough; but we have confidence in the position we have taken up, and we already see indications that both parties are drawing nearer towards us. It is, I think, a most encouraging sign that the dogma of "free trade in land," which till quite recently was put forth as the one and only needful land reform, is now almost universally admitted to be quite insufficient, and it is avowed that something more is required in order to remedy the terrible state of things brought about by unrestricted land-monopoly. The disastrous overcrowding of towns and depopulation of the rural districts is now sought to be

remedied by the establishment of joint-stock societies, to set up "industrial villages" and create a body of "peasant proprietors." These proposals invariably receive the warm support of all parties, including landlords, and none of our political teachers seem to have any misgivings as to the success of this mode of renovating our social system on commercial principles. But they have very imperfect knowledge if they think that such measures will suffice, while the causes which year by year compel the rural population to leave their native villages and flock into the towns remain still in action. On this important subject I propose to make a few remarks in connection with the most recent, and in many ways the most noteworthy, of these proposals, "*The Small Farm and Labourers' Land Company*," as to the merit of which the Press has been almost unanimous and has blown the trumpet in its praise accordingly.

This company is essentially a landlord's movement, since I find among its founders and supporters the names of sixteen great landholders, and a large number of the junior branches of noble and landlord families. The sixteen great landlords—from Dukes downwards—who attended at the meeting at which the Society was founded, or wrote expressing their warm approval of it, hold between them more than half a million acres of land. The speakers who represented them at the meeting all expressed their sense of the vast importance of small farms and peasant-holdings. The country was being ruined for the want of them; and, accordingly these holders of half-a-million acres proposed that the public should subscribe money and buy other people's land (when and where it happened to be for sale), and establish the small farms and peasant-holdings in regions quite away from the sacred half-million acres owned by themselves! It never seems to have occurred to them, or to anyone present, that no "Company" was needed, that not a penny need be raised, that secretaries and directors and chairmen (with their respective salaries) were quite unnecessary, if the owners of the half-million of acres, then present, would agree together that each and all of them would divide their own estates into "small farms," would themselves allow "labourers" to have "holdings" would permit population freely to grow on *their* lands, letting everyone in fact, who wanted land for personal occupation, have it on a permanent tenure at the same rents as the farmers now pay for it. It only half of the 500,000 acres were so used, it would supply 5,000 small farms at an average of 25 acres, and 62,500 labourers' holding at an average of 2 acres—about 67,000 additional families settled on the land, or a population of over a quarter of a million. How long will it be before the "Society" "Limited" will do so much as this? Will it be able to do as much in 10 years, or 20 years, or even 50 years—if it should continue to exist so long? I feel pretty confident that it will not; while what it does do will be far less beneficial, because, instead of allowing population to flow

naturally over the land, people themselves deciding where they can best get a living upon it, they will be forced to live only on the particular farms and estates that may be purchased by this or similar companies, while the rest of England, Scotland, and Ireland remains subject to the very same influences which have depopulated and continue to depopulate their rural lands.

Now, is it not a most suggestive fact that not one of the landlords present promised to do anything of the kind, but by their silence made it pretty clear that they intended, as heretofore, to keep their own estates quite free from such low things as "small farms" and "labourers' holdings." One landlord indeed, Sir R. Lloyd-Lindsay, offered the Company an estate of 400 acres, which he had just purchased in Berkshire at £10 an acre, "on any terms they might suggest"; but he was careful to add that it was not in the division of the county which he inhabited. This was apparently stated in order not to set the bad example of allowing poor people to have land in the neighbourhood of a great landlord's own domain—a thing evidently most repulsive to the landlord mind! One of the noble speakers referred to the fact that they would have "to face the expense of transfer" and to the necessity of having many small owners together in order that they could hire horses, with many other difficulties which are altogether imaginary, or would be obviated if they would simply let people have land *where they require it and on a secure tenure*. One—and so far as I can hear, only *one*—landlord in all England has done this—Lord Tollemache. On his estates in Cheshire and Suffolk he has numerous small farms, and no very large ones; he allows every labourer to have enough land to keep a cow and he allows *anybody*—mechanics, or retired tradesmen—to purchase or lease land to build and live upon with ample space for gardens, and a field or two in addition at a fair rent wherever they desire it. And the result is, that there is a little oasis of comfort and contentment in the midst of the wilderness of misery and discontent produced by landlordism. Here there is no agricultural distress, the farms are eagerly sought after—the tenure of them being practically permanent at fair rents—the labouring population are well off and contented, and the farmers find that these independent and well-to-do labourers are the best of workmen, and as the correspondent of the *Daily News*, says, "are loud in praise of the system." Strange to say, Lord Tollemache is described as a Tory of the old school, but he evidently realises as a fact, what others only state as a theory, that property is a trust, that the people have a *right* to have land to live and work upon, and that to allow them freely to have it is not only a great boon to them and to society, but is equally beneficial to the landlord himself. All honour to him for having so consistently acted upon these convictions! but what are we to think of those landlords who, having had this example before them for half-a-century, even now make no attempt to follow it, but

come before the public as promoters of the "*Small Farm and Labourers' Land Company (Limited)*," a Company formed to throw dust in the eyes of the public, to find purchasers for otherwise unsaleable farms, and to keep the objectionable "small farmers" and "labourers" as far removed as possible from their own estates.

In order to show you the magnitude of the evils which this previous Company is supposed to be adequate to remedy, I will give you a few facts as to rural depopulation which are not generally known, as they have been allowed to remain buried in the Census Reports.

There are in England and Wales 2,175 registration sub-districts, each containing four or five parishes, and the population of these is given for the last two censuses, showing their increase or diminution. Thinking that this would afford the means of determining over what area the exodus of the rural population to the towns has extended, I have drawn out a table showing the proportion of each county in which the population has actually diminished during the ten years 1871-81. This table shows us that, with the exception of those countries which form residential suburbs to London, and a few others which are thickly covered with manufacturing towns, the depopulation extends to every part of England, and apparently to almost the whole of the agricultural districts. The amount of diminution of population in the Counties of England and Wales, and extending over more than half the area, is 308,341. But this by no means shows the amount of migration from these districts. For during the same ten years the population of the whole country increased nearly 15 per cent., and rural populations increase naturally much more rapidly than those of towns. The births in the country are about three per cent. more, the deaths about twelve per cent. less: so that we cannot put the normal increase of the rural populations at less than 17 per cent. But the population of the decreasing areas in 1871 was

	4,876,600
Normal increase at 17 per cent.	828,900
Population ought to have been	5,704,500
But the actual population by the census is	5,397,000
Difference	1,237,500

We thus see that the real exodus of the people from these particular districts has been nearly 1½ million. But even this is not all: for, besides these areas where the population has actually decreased there must be a large additional area where they have increased *less than the normal rate of 17 per cent.*, and this implies migration for a still wider area. Taking for example a few typical counties, I find that in Sussex which shows but a small absolute decrease, the whole country except a few towns and their suburban districts have increased much below the

normal rate, implying migration of the surplus rural population to the towns. In Hampshire the same occurs, only Portsmouth, Southampton, and Christchurch having increased up to or beyond the normal rate. In Buckinghamshire, nor a single sub-district has increased normally. In Norfolk the same. In Leicestershire only the towns and some of their suburban districts have increased normally. In Derbyshire only 9 out of 25 sub-districts have increased up to the normal standard. In Cumberland the seaports only have increased normally, the rest of the country showing a very slight increase or none. The conclusion we arrive at therefore is, that over the whole of rural England there has been a continuous flow of population to the great towns, owing to the natural increase of the population not finding the means of existence elsewhere. Now, for the migration from these districts which increased much below the normal rate, we may, I think, fairly add three-quarters of a million, making, with the $1\frac{1}{2}$ million in the areas of absolute decrease, a total of nearly *two millions of people*, who in ten years only have been forced by the struggle for existence to leave the country for the towns!

Here we have the true dimensions of the evil to be grappled with, and we see that it is co-extensive with rural England. Yet now, the landlords, who have themselves directly caused the evil by systematically refusing to let land in "small farms" or "labourers' holdings," would have us believe that it is to be adequately met by a "Limited Company," having established which they may contentedly repose upon their vast ancestral estates, from which "small farmers," and "peasant holdings" are rigidly and systematically banished! To such a scheme in the face of such a great national crisis, the only fitting parallel is Mrs. Partington, attempting to keep out the Atlantic with her mop!

Let us now turn to another subject. One of the most interesting occurrences of the present year was the *Industrial Remuneration Conference* in January last. Although the matters discussed were very largely mere side issues, yet some great questions affecting social economy were brought forward, among which the Land Question occupied a prominent place, and it was evident that Land Nationalisation is beginning to be discussed among the working classes, though its essential principles and overwhelming importance are not yet well understood.

Among the more important papers—because anything coming from the writer is sure to receive attention—one was by Mr. Frederick Harrison, on "Remedies for Social Distress." Owing to the limitation of time there was no opportunity of replying to this paper, and I had therefore intended to do so in detail in my present Address: but I find that this would occupy far too much time, and I shall therefore confine myself to a few remarks on two points only, one a matter of principle, the other mainly a question of fact.

In arguing against the nationalisation of the land and the more equable distribution of capital which it would certainly bring about, Mr. Harrison maintains that there is "*a universal tendency of organised industry, rural or urban, towards the massing and not the dispersion of capital;*" and that "*increased concentration of capital is an indispensable condition of modern successful industry.*" And he concludes thus:—"In the face of this universal law of modern industry a law the more conspicuous the more free and virgin be the field of industry, how idle would it be to look for any regeneration of the industrial system to a natural dispersion of capital or land! In the teeth of universal tendencies such as these it is rather unnatural to struggle for the revival of the equable distribution of capital and land which marks the ruder types of society."

Now, such general propositions as this as to "*universal tendencies and laws*" are utterly valueless, unless you can first prove that they exist and have arisen under a social system founded on justice and freedom, and no such proof has been attempted. To illustrate what I mean, let us suppose Mr. Harrison to have been a Roman of the Augustan period. What would then have been his argument as to universal "*social tendencies and laws*?" Arguing with an advocate of free labour and enterprise, as against a system of slavery, he might probably have said:—"The universal tendency of modern progress is to divide men into *freemen and slaves*. Under this system alone is civilisation possible. Without slavery you cannot have a highly-cultivated, leisured class, able to produce those works of literature, art, and construction which are the marks of true civilisation. All history tells us the same story. Wherever you have civilisation you have slavery as its essential foundation. Look at the old civilisations of Egypt, India, Assyria, and Greece, all alike dependent on the existence of a small, cultured class, the possessors of myriads of slaves. To this system we owe all the grand monuments and works of art which these countries have produced, and whose ruins still exist. To this system we owe the splendours of Rome, the mistress of the world, and all that noble literature, art, and refinement which have never yet been equalled." And he might have concluded almost in the very words he has used to-day—"In the teeth of universal tendencies such as these it is rather unnatural to struggle for a revival of the universal personal freedom and equality of condition which mark the ruder types of society."

The one argument is just as good, or as bad, as the other. Both, in fact, are equally bad, because they both rest upon the assumption that men have *not* equal rights to participate in the free gifts of nature to man. When one portion of society possesses the LAND with all the powers and natural forces which it contains, and the other, and far larger portion, cannot even work or live, cannot even obtain a particle of food or clothing, except on such conditions as the landholders

collectively impose, they are—as Mr. George has so well shown—as truly slaves as were those who worked for Roman nobles or Southern planters. A system which has grown up under these conditions, and which is founded upon them, cannot set itself up as a guide as to what are the “*universal laws and tendencies*” of unfettered human industry.

In some respects, even, the modern slave is worse off than his predecessor, in the ancient world, for he is the slave of machinery and capital, and to serve the purposes of his masters is forced to live in huge cities far removed from the health-giving influences and spontaneous gifts of nature, and thus when, as so often happens, the capitalist has no immediate need for his labour, he must starve or live as a pauper. Much is asserted of the *economy* of this division of labour and production on the most gigantic scale, but it is not *true economy*, inasmuch as its results are to produce inordinate wealth for the few, incessant labour with widespread poverty and disease for the many. True economy is that which not only produces wealth freely but distributes it fairly: true economy must tend to the equalisation of both wealth and labour: true economy will not force men to be the slaves of machinery day after day, with no opportunity for that relaxation produced by change of labour, and that mental and physical invigoration which results from spending some portion of their time in tilling the soil, the fruits of which they are themselves to gather. It is not true economy to place men in such a position that when work for an employer fails, they are utterly unable to work for themselves. All this is false economy: and yet this is the system which Mr. Harrison tells us is founded upon “*universal law and tendency*”!

And when he descends from the heights of rhetoric and attempts to support his argument by an appeal to facts he is not accurate. He says: “*The ancient controversies as to the great and little culture of land have now ended in this: that for the largest production of cereals and stock and for the highest scientific farming the big-scale culture at least is indispensable.*” This no doubt is what is repeated over and over again by men who claim to be authorities, but it is simply untrue, as I will prove to you by incontrovertible evidence. Lord Carrington has recently stated that his 800 allotment tenants in Buckinghamshire get a nett produce from the land of £40 an acre, while the most that a farmer can make out of the same land is £7 an acre. Here are big and small farming compared by the landlord, and his facts are supported by independent official evidence. It was proved before the Women’s and Children’s Employment Commission in 1908 that cottagers obtained an average return of £16 an acre above the farm rent. The Rev. Mr. Stubbs shows that his allotments at Granborough, in Buckinghamshire, cultivated by common labourers, produced 60 per cent. more wheat than the farmers’ average, and 11 per cent. more than the average of the highest scientific farming. Thus a million labourers working for themselves would produce far more wheat than the same land does when cultivated by the most scientific farmers. Here is an actual fact, carefully recorded, worth a whole

volume of assertions that the thing cannot be. And as to stock, Mr. Little, the Assistant Commissioner to the Royal Commission on Agriculture, in his account of Penstrase Moor in Cornwall—barren land entirely reclaimed by the labour of peasants and miners—shows that those little peasant holdings produce more than double the number of cattle and pigs per 100 acres than either the County of Cornwall or the Truro Union in which they are situated. Here, then whether tested by the value of the total produce, by the quantity of wheat, or by the number of live stock, we see that small holdings beat large farms, not by a small margin, but 50 or 100 up to 500 per cent. ; while the moral and social advantages are so great that even if the produce were only the same or even less, the small culture system should be preferred. We see, therefore, that in the one case in which we can test it by an appeal to facts, the general statement as to the superior economy of large as against small-scale industry is shown to be absolutely untrue ; and it is highly probable that when applied to other industries than agriculture it will be found equally untrue, because we have yet to see the value of diversity of occupation, of utilising spare time now wasted, and of that magic power of property which enables a man working for himself in his own house or shop to do half as much again as when working for a master, with little pleasure and no direct interest either in the quantity or the quality of his work.

We now come to the next point—the question of fact. Mr. Harrison maintains and reiterates over and over again, that LAND, as it now exists, is a manufactured article—that “*an ordinary farm is as much artificial as a house or a factory.*” There is, he says, “*hardly an acre of cultivated land in England which has not been made cultivated by a great outlay of labour and capital. It has really been as much built up as a railway or a dock.*” And thence he argues that even if the people of England have a right to the land of England, they have only a right to it as it was originally. “*To seize it,*” he says, “*after centuries of labour have been expended in utterly changing its very face and nature would be monstrously unjust.*” And further on he argues that the whole labour expended on reclaiming land is so great that it often represents more than its present value ; and concludes thus:—“*Mr. George might as well claim the coats off our backs, on the ground that God made the sheep, as the farms which have been made by human capital and skill.*” And very much more in the same brilliant, but I think superficial, style.

Now, in all this there are two underlying fallacies : 1. The improvement to the land by culture is not, on the whole, nearly so great as is alleged, since in many cases it has been deteriorated and impoverished instead of being improved ; and 2. The bulk of the improvement that has been made has been made by successive generations of tenant-cultivators, as an incident of cultivation, and the result, whatever it may be, is the heritage of the nation, not of the landlord, who have in most cases done *nothing*.

To take the last point first, Mr. Harrison argues as if the whole process of

reclamation from forest or moorland, from marsh or mountain-side, had been done by, or at the cost of, the landlords. But by far the larger part of the land now under cultivation has been so for many centuries, and was certainly brought under cultivation by successive generations of actual cultivators. This is proved by the fact that in 1557 wheat was *exported* from this country, which, taking into account the system of agriculture then pursued, the small crops raised, and the estimated population of England, shows that the amount of arable land was then nearly as great as now, if not greater.* Of course we are speaking only of the *land itself*. Many farmhouses and buildings have been erected by landlords, and some other permanent improvements made by them, but neither we nor Mr. George have ever even proposed to take these away from their owners. The land itself, however, in so far as its value has been increased, has been improved bit by bit, by successive generations of *tenants* from Saxon times downwards, and we claim that the people of England, not the landlords only, are the true inheritors of that improvement.

But Mr. Harrison is equally in error in his estimate of the enormous amount of this increased value. On the contrary, it is very doubtful if the land of England, as a whole, is so inherently valuable now as it was three or four hundred years ago. There are two reasons for this opinion. In the first place, population was formerly distributed pretty uniformly over the whole country, and as there was then no system of sewerage (by which the fertilising refuse of man and animals are now carried away to the sea,) almost the whole of the manurial products were returned to the land, and thus, with a regular system of fallows, its fertility was kept up. Now, on the contrary, almost all the vegetable and animal produce of the country is consumed in great cities far away from the land which produces it, and the manure is not returned to the land. Hence a progressive deterioration, only partially checked by the use of artificial manures.† Again, we find almost all over England, extensive tracts of poor pasture land which, by the ridges on its surface, has evidently been formerly ploughed. Much of this was probably once natural

* In the 16th Century the population of England is estimated to have been about four and a half millions, and the country then produced all the wheat, barley, and other food which it consumed. The consumption of wheat is now reckoned at about 8 bushels per head, but at a time when there was no rice or potatoes, and when the people were mostly countrymen, living much in the open air and in robust health we may fairly put the consumption of corn, especially as it was of an inferior quality, at 12 bushels per head. This gives a total consumption of 45 million bushels of wheat. The average crop at that time was about 13 bushels an acre, from which we must deduct 3 bushels an acre for the seed sown, leaving 10 bushels an acre of produce, and this would have required 5,400,000 acres of land to grow it. That is, we had to till one third as much for fallows every three years, bringing up the amount to *over seven million acres*, besides the land cultivated in barley, oats, peas, beans, and other crops. Now, in 1850, the amount of land in *all these crops together was under seven million acres*, so that it is quite clear that the reclamation and cultivation of the land of England dates back to very early times.

† It may be said that the larger crops of to-day show the improvement of the soil; but this is not so. They only show the improved quality of the seed-land and the improved methods of agriculture. With bad agriculture the fine wheat lands of South Australia often produce less than ten bushels an acre, and those of California only fourteen bushels, and this with the immense advantage of our greatly improved selected grain. The thirteen bushels produced in the Middle Ages in England with the poor quality of wheat which alone then existed, is quite compatible with a very fertile soil and fairly good husbandry.

pasture, which, when on a good subsoil, is the most fertile of all land. During the periods when wheat was dear, under the old *regime* of the Corn Laws, this fine old pasture was everywhere broken up, and the top soil, rich in humus and vegetable fibre which had accumulated by thousands of years of grazing, gave for a few years immense crops of grain. Then, when its fertility diminished, fresh land was broken up and the other was allowed to go back into pasture. But its natural fertility had been irretrievably ruined. It now bears large crops of thistles and other noxious weeds, and is in many cases not worth half or a third of what it was before it was broken up. This was the work of the landlords, who got high rents for this corn-producing land; and if this and the thousands of acres of chalk and limestone downs which have been similarly broken up and deteriorated, are taken into account, I think it very probable that instead of the landlords having improved the land, they have, by their greed for high rents, distinctly deteriorated it. For this deterioration the people of England may perhaps present their *bill* when accounts come to be settled between the landlords and the nation.

Even the English language bears witness against Mr. Harrison's contention, for what word do we use when we want to express the best and richest undeteriorated land? We call it "virgin soil"—soil in a state of nature. How often do we hear of the difficulties of our farmers competing by means of the exhausted soil of England against, the "virgin soil" of America! Yet, according to Mr. Harrison, this "virgin soil" is worthless, and only becomes good for anything after centuries of cultivation! Not only the English language, but history and experience alike bear testimony against this stupendous fallacy.

There are numerous other statements and arguments in Mr. Harrison's paper which appear to me to be equally un-sound, but I have no time now to enter upon them. But I thought it essential to say a few words on this theory of "land being a manufactured article," because it was the main point in a lecture delivered by Mr. Harrison at Newcastle-on-Tyne last year, and, as I was informed by a person who heard it, produced much impression owing to the authoritative manner in which the proposition was laid down.

And this brings me to a somewhat personal matter. In a lecture on the Land Question at Newton Hall in February, 1884, Mr. Harrison is reported to have said that—"he thought that Mr. Wallace knew as little about the English Land Question and the management of English estates as Mr. George, and his studies in the Eastern Archipelago had not assisted him."

Now, as my practice—in this as in all other enquires on which I have been engaged—is never to give my personal opinions as of any value, but always to set forth or refer to the facts and argument which have led me to form the opinion, the above-quoted belief as to my "knowledge" is of little real importance. The question really is, are the facts we allege true, and are the conclusions we draw from those facts sound? But there are many people who would not, or cannot,

follow out a train of reasoning founded on an elaborate statement of facts; they prefer relying on authority, and of course they like to know on what grounds any particular person is to be considered an authority. For that reason and that reason only, I beg leave to give you a short autobiographical sketch of my personal relations with the land and the land question.

I left school at the age of 11, and my real education then commenced. I joined an elder brother who was a *land-surveyor*, with considerable knowledge also of engineering and architecture. With him I spent seven years, in various parts of England and Wales, constantly engaged, professionally, with *land*. We lived almost the whole of this time in small towns or villages, in farmhouses or labourers cottages. We were engaged in surveying for the Tithe Commutation, for the Enclosure Commissioners, or for private estate-owners. We assisted in the process of Valuation for the Tithe Commutation, and for Enclosures of Commons. Living thus almost constantly on the land and among farmers and country people, I soon took a great interest in agriculture. I studied the works of Sir Humphrey Davy and Baron Liebig, at that time the great authorities on agricultural chemistry. When living in village inns I was often present at the meetings of the Farmers' Clubs, and heard agricultural matters discussed, and I really believe at that period of my life I could have passed a very fair examination in the theoretical and practical agriculture. Soon after I came of age, my brother died, and I succeeded him in a small connection as Surveyor and Architect, which occupied me till I went abroad five years later.

Thus, for the twelve most impressionable and most active years of my life I was living in the closest possible relation to the land and its cultivators, and I then obtained a knowledge of peasant life and an interest in agriculture which has been a permanent acquisition to me. After returning home from abroad in 1862 I lived a few years in London, but since then have always resided in the country, and having acquired from Herbert Spencer the great principle that private property in land is absolutely wrong, I ever kept the subject in my mind, seeking out a mode, by which this wrong might be practically and equitably abolished. About eight or ten years ago I began to see my way, and as soon as I had finished the various scientific works which were the result of my twelve years of tropical exploration, I put my ideas in order and wrote the article, "How to Nationalise the Land," which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* in Nov., 1880, and which I believe led to the formation of this Society.

I trust you will excuse the apparent egotism of this narration, but it may perhaps be useful by showing that my whole life has been closely connected with the land, that I have had great opportunities for acquiring knowledge both of it and of those who cultivate it, and that the views I now hold and advocate are not, as Mr. Harrison thinks, the result of a hasty and superficial literary study, but are, to some extent, the outcome of the practical experience of a lifetime.

Crown 8vo. pp. xiv.—244, Original Edition Cloth, price 5s. Cheap Edition, paper Cover, 8d., by post 11d.: limp cloth, 1s. 6d., by post 1s. 9d.

LAND NATIONALISATION;

ITS NECESSITY AND ITS AIMS.

Being a comparison of the system of Landlord and Tenant with that of Occupying Ownership in their Influence on the Well-being of the People.

BY

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D.

Author of "The Malay Archipelago," "Island Life," &c., &c.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY TRACTS.

	s.	d.
I.—The Land Difficulty :—How shall we deal with it? ...	Per 100	1 0
II.—The Land for the People	"	1 0
III.—How Land Nationalisation will benefit Householders Labourers and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	"	2 0
IV.—The Times and Land Nationalisation (J. A. Parker) ...	"	1 0
V.—Land Tenure Reform (Professor F. W. Newman)	"	1 0
VI.—The Why and the How of Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace) ...	12	0
VII.—The Land as National Property (Professor F. W. Newman) ...	4	0
VIII.—How to Experiment in Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace) ...	1	0
IX.—The Great Land Suit (H. Hutchinson)... ..	6	0
X.—Running Notes on the Pamphlet by Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P. entitled "National Progress and Poverty" (Professor F. W. Newman) Per 100	1	6
XI.—The Agricultural Question (by Jas. E. Thorold Rogers, M.P.) ...	1	0
XII.—The Gospel of Land Nationalisation (by the Rev. W. R. Fletcher M.A.)	1	0
Programmes of the Society	1	0
Land and Family in China	2	0
Landlords' Rights and Englishman's Wrongs (A. McDonnell)	6	0
Papers for the People	per doz.	3 0

REPORT
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION
SOCIETY.

1886-7.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

- To affirm that the STATE holds the LAND in trust for each generation.**
 - To restore to all their natural right to use and enjoy their native land.**
 - To obtain for the NATION the revenue derived from its LAND.**
-

PRINTED FOR THE LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY, AND PUBLISHED BY THEM AT THE OFFICE, 57, CHARING CROSS, LONDON, S.W.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

COUNCIL.

President—

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, L.L.D., F.R.G.S., Frith Hill, Godalming.

Vice-Presidents—

DESMOND G. FITZGERALD.
E. D. GIRDLESTONE, B.A., Oxon.
A. C. SWINTON,

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN.
MISS HELEN TAYLOR
WILLIAM VOLCKMAN.

Treasurer—

FRANCIS L. SOPER F.L.S.

Hon. Secretary—

WILLIAM JAMESON.

Hon. Assistant Secretary—

C. A. WINDUST.

Rev. J. D. ALFORD.
F. GILMORE, BARNETT.
H. H. HOOD BARRS, LL.B.
F. A. BINNEY (Manchester).
WM. BROCKIE (Sunderland).
D. BRODIE, M.D.
J. A. BROWN (Paisley).
Mrs. BRYANT, D.Sc.
S. M. BURROUGHS.
E. T. CRAIG. (of Kalamazoo).
DAVID CRICHTON.
JOHN CROWN (Sunderland).
T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D.
K. S. DICK, M.D.
P. R. DOMONEY, M. Simpton S.B.
Rev. T. G. DYER.
*T. H. ELLIOTT.
A. HALSTEAD (Hartogate).
E. HATZFELD.
H. HUTCHINSON.
SPENCER JACKSON.
Rev. E. VAN JONES, Ph. D. (Mostyn).
*GEORGE J. KNIGHT.
B. LUCRAFT, M.L.S.B.
CHARLES MACKAY, L.L.D.

Mrs. A. BLUNDEN MARTINO.
*H. G. MCKERLY.
R. OWEN.
J. A. PARKER.
CHAS. PEACH.
Rev. W. H. RATCLIFF, M.A.
W. REEVES.
*A. J. REYNOLDS.
*W. REYNOLDS.
EDGAR ROBINSON. (Isle of Man).
J. McG. ROSS (Alness).
Rev. T. TRAVERS SHERLOCK, M.A.
(Smethwick).
A. P. SNOGRASS.
T. W. TAUNTON.
Mrs. W. TEBB.
J. TURLE, M.D.
J. F. WALKER, (Birmingham).
J. WHYTE, (Inverness).
*CHARLES WICKSTEED. (Kettering).
*Rev. PHILIP H. WICKSTEED.
GEO. O. WIGHT (Sunderland).
S. D. WILLIAMS, (Malvern).
J. WOODMANSEE.

Those marked with an * and the Officers constitute the Executive Committee.

OFFICE:—57, Charing Cross, S.W.

June 8th, 1887.

SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

HELD AT ESSEX HALL, ESSEX STREET, STRAND, JUNE 8TH, 1887.

MISS HELEN TAYLOR IN THE CHAIR.

REPORT.

PRESENTED TO AND ADOPTED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY.

While at previous Annual Meetings of this Society, no further advance of "Practical Politicians" in the attack upon land monopoly could be recorded than the advocacy of imperfect measures of a local character, such as *Leasehold Enfranchisement*, the *Allotment and Small Holdings' Bill*, the *Crofter's Act*, and Mr. Gladstone's *Irish Land Bill*, the Executive have great pleasure in announcing that, during the past twelve months, the cause of Land Nationalisation, pure and simple, has in several notable directions made most distinct progress. This feature may be conveniently noticed as introductory to an account of work done by this Society.

(1).—The Royal Commission on Trade and Industry, whose Report was issued early in the current year, arrived at a conclusion, briefly expressed in the terms: "Something must be done." But although Lord Salisbury almost contemptuously refused to accept our President, Dr. A. R. Wallace, and Mr. W. Saunders, as members of that commission, one influential member of it, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, M.P., attached a memorandum to the Report, that amply justifies the contention of this Society, namely, that trade depression is the result of land monopoly. At the close of an exhaustive series of observations on the evidence of witnesses, Mr. O'Connor states:—

"I come to the general conclusion that so large a proportion of the proceeds of industry in the United Kingdom goes now to the owners of the country, that the remainder is not sufficient to secure adequate remuneration to the industrial classes, either in the shape of wages to the operatives, or reasonable profit to the organisers of labour—the employers, or capitalists. This seems to be quite sufficient to account for such depression as exists, and the obvious remedy is to be found in securing an increased proportion to the industrials and a smaller share to the non-industrials."

Mr. O'Connor does not specify the method by which this change is to be effected, but failing this, he has, by tracing trade depression to its true source, not only given unexpected value to the proceedings of a Royal Commission from which two experts in the question of Land Nationalisation were deliberately excluded; but has, the Executive venture to think, materially advanced this Society's position with sober and business-like men.

(2).—The Trades' Union Congress which met at Hull, in September, was remarkable for, among other things, the out-spoken declaration of its President, Mr. F. Maddison, in his opening address, in favour of Land Nationalisation. On

a succeeding day the Land Question was discussed, when a resolution urging State-assisted emigration on the one hand, and the acquisition of proprietary rights in the land by our agricultural population on the other, was rejected, and an amendment condemning State-aided emigration, and demanding the *most drastic* reform of the land laws, was carried by a majority of 87 to 11. It is the opinion of the Executive that this Society's programme very fairly complies with the terms of that amendment, and they hope that at the next meeting of the Trades' Union Congress, Land Nationalisation may be debated as a distinct issue.

(3).—But not the least noteworthy instance of independent approximation to our views, is the fact that, perhaps the most influential newspaper in the country, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, has declared in unmistakable terms, and on several occasions, in favour of Land Nationalisation for Ireland. These declarations have all the more weight, since the Editor, the guiding spirit of the new journalism, has, as is well-known, made himself personally acquainted with the condition of Ireland. A quotation from a leading article in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of February last, may suitably conclude the record of development in public opinion.

"Do not let them (the Government) imagine that any conversion of 6,000 big landlords into 600,000 little ones will solve the difficulty in Ireland. Such a scheme will settle nothing. The only solution that offers even a prospect of permanence is that by which the fee simple purchased by the State's credit is retained in the hands of the State or its local representative."

The Society's operations have been carried on during the past financial year under circumstance of some difficulty. Its President, Dr. A. R. Wallace, has been absent in America, and its late Treasurer, Mr. A. C. Swinton, to whose energy the Society mainly owes its existence, was obliged, under doctor's orders, to slacken his efforts. That Mr. Swinton is now in better health is a matter for congratulation, which the Executive feel they should fittingly mention in this report.

Notwithstanding these disadvantages, a highly satisfactory record of work can be presented.

LECTURES AND ADDRESSES.

The number of Lectures and Addresses delivered has been nearly three times more than that of any previous year, namely, sixty-three in all. Of these, Miss Helen Taylor has delivered 12, viz. at Sheffield (twice), Preston, Hammersmith, Darwen, Beckham, Carnbryn, Chepstow, Abercarne, Paisley, Walsall, Sunderland, and Manchester, (the latter in co-operation with the Manchester Land Restoration League). The Rev. T. G. Dyke, 7, at Margate and neighbouring districts, and at Watford, and Canning Town. The Rev. Dr. E. Pan Jones, 30; at various places in the Principality, referred to in his sub-report which follows. Mr. Jameson, 12; at Stratford, Fenge, Richmond, Old Kent Road, Marylebone, Silvertown, and various other places and clubs round London. Mr. J. McG. Ross, 1; at Bonar Bridge. Mr. Chas. Wicksteed, 1; at Liverpool.

Parentetically it may be stated here that numerous requests for literature from all parts of the country have been made, with especial view to debates to be opened, or papers read, on the subject of Land Nationalisation, by the various correspondents.

Of the Lectures or Addresses given several call for special remark. Those delivered by Miss Helen Taylor at Paisley and Walsall, were followed by collections on behalf of the Society's funds, noteworthy examples which the Executive gratefully acknowledge. Urgent requests for a second visit from these, and indeed nearly every place visited by Miss Taylor, have been received. A correspondent at Walsall described the lecture as the "talk of the town." These are fair indications of the spirit of enthusiasm our cause is evoking.

Again, the Rev. T. G. Dyke read a paper on Land Nationalisation last autumn, at a Conference of Primitive Wesleyan Ministers. A reply to this, "Objections

to Land Nationalisation," was to be prepared for a succeeding meeting held in April. With respect to this meeting, Mr. Dyke has written to say: "the Rev. J. Dinnick, of Watford, was appointed to write a paper on 'Objections to Land Nationalisation,' but his paper was late coming to hand, and in its absence the subject was raised by the Rev. J. Ashworth, and discussed for a long time. I replied to all the objections raised, and if the matter had been submitted to a vote of the meeting, I do not think that more than one would have voted against the proposal of our Society. The most amusing part of the business was that as the discussion closed, Mr. Dinnick's paper was handed in, and read, when amidst much laughter, it was found that the writer had become a thorough convert to Land Nationalisation, and could find no objection which may not be righteously overcome."

The importance of the facts recorded in Mr. Dyke's letter cannot be over-rated, since the influence of the body to which he belongs, among our rural population especially, is universally acknowledged.

LOCAL ORGANISATION.

The experiment of appointing Hon. District Secretaries has in several directions proved a marked success. The Rev. Dr. E. Pan Jones, in Wales, the Rev. T. G. Dyke, at Margate, and Mr. J. McG. Ross, in Ross-shire, have especially justified by their energetic service this method of local action. There is urgent need, however, for the appointment of a travelling agent of the Society, to keep it in constant touch with its local representatives, to arrange for lectures, and to organise Branches. This step however cannot be safely contemplated without a considerable addition to the Society's income.

REPORT FROM WALES.

The land agitation in Wales, I am happy to state, has gained much favor in the eyes of the people during the last twelve months. Numerous invitations to hold meetings are continually coming to hand, the people are everywhere ready and willing to defray all expenses incurred thereby. The Tithe agitation has been drawn across our path, and the people seem comfortable. That agitation has been long before the public, has paid agents everywhere, and plenty of money at command, so that the land agitation could not compete with it. Besides, the bulk of the Welsh do not care about reading English, and we have no Welsh literature to put into their hands; the consequence is that progress is slow; besides, no Welsh M.P. has so far declared in our favor.

Our strongest opponents, I am afraid, will be the farmers. All they aim at is a reduction of rent, then let them grab for a farm a league long. The Land Bill which is about to be brought into the House this week has no drop of a blessing in it for the poor man.

Our want now is literature to leave behind us in a district, so that the people may judge for themselves. I append a list of the places where meetings were held during the twelve months:—

1 Llanfysyll	9 Dolyddelen	16 Abergynolwyn	24 Gibeon
2 Clydach	10 Wannariwydd	17 Rhydymain	25 Pffynonbedr
3 Seven Sisters	11 Whitland	18 Arthog	26 Bury Port
4 Glyn Neuth	12 Llangynig St.	19 Machynlleth	27 Corris
5 New Trelegar	Clears	20 Crugbyr	28 Dinas Mawddly
6 Bargoed	13 Aberdare	21 Llanuwchllyn	29 Glynarthen
7 Aercwmbay	14 Porth	22 Pencadair	30 Panycoyner
8 Llanberis	15 Bridgend	23 Pelybont	31 Bharagarn

The three meetings at the places bracketed were a mixture of Home Rule and Land. Mr. Abraham, M.P., was present and spoke at two, and Mr. A. J. Williams, M.P., spoke at the other.

Mr. Williams objected to the resolution on the land question, but when it was put to the meeting it was carried *non con.*

Miss Helen Taylor was invited by the Liberal Association to Monmouthshire. She held three meetings there which I failed to attend. Mr. Michael Davitt visited South Wales also, and held three meetings there, though not directly on the land question, but the reception given him there was enough to show how the wind blew.

E. P. JONES.

LITERATURE.

The Society's tracts and pamphlets have been widely distributed during the past twelve months. Many enquiries have resulted from the experiment of advertising our literature in the Financial Reform Almanack and other publications. Yet, little attention has hitherto been directed to the Society's somewhat long list of tracts by the Press, and it is with a peculiar feeling of thankfulness that

the Executive observed the statement in a newspaper, "That the literature of the Society is high class, and it cannot be too widely circulated among law reformers, whether they adopt the contentions of the Society or not."

Before leaving England, Dr. Wallace wrote a tract, "Note on Compensation to Landlords." This together with a leaflet "Land Nationalisation versus Land Monopoly," has been added to the Society's list. Several reprints have been or are being made, and a tract on Mining Royalties will shortly be written.

REVISION OF PROGRAMME AND RULES.

Acting on the recommendation made by our President at the last Annual Meeting the General Council carefully considered, at a series of meetings, the question of altering the Society's programme in respect to the proposed method of compensation. Opportunity was further taken to revise the Society's constitution and rules. The results of their deliberation were submitted to a Special General Meeting of members held on the 9th of February, when it was resolved *nem. con.*

(1).— "That this meeting approves of as practicable the method of compensation by means of State Land Bonds redeemable at par."

(2).— That the General Council be empowered to make such verbal alterations in the Society's programme as the acceptance of the above resolution may render necessary.

(3).— That the revised constitution and rules as submitted by General Council be accepted and confirmed by this meeting.

The Executive are fully convinced that the above changes have materially strengthened the position of the Society.

Of the Revised Constitution and Rules, the first is, in the opinion of the Executive, of most importance. It removes a doubt existing in the minds of many persons, whether the acceptance of the Society's programme was a *sine qua non* of membership. In a progressive movement such an acceptance is practically impossible, and the altered rule makes it evident that adherence to the *principle* of Land Nationalisation, with equitable compensation, is the chief point; the question of method being a secondary, though by no means unimportant, consideration.

PARLIAMENTARY AND PUBLIC ACTION.

The chief event of the Society's year in this respect, has been its association with the important Celtic Conference at Bonar Bridge, held in October last. As this conference proposed to consider the Land question among other things, the Executive were invited to send a representative. They did more than this, they sent a Celt. Dr. E. Pan Jones was able to comply with the Executive's request to attend that conference as the Society's delegate, and also to appear in the Highlands as a brother from Wales. His advocacy of our cause, together with that of Mr. J. McG. Ross, our District Hon. Secretary in the Highlands, contributed to a very satisfactory result. The following resolution was unanimously carried:—

"That this conference, believing the existing land system to be the chief cause of the unhappy condition of our rural population, as well as of the overcrowding, misery, and crime in our large towns, demands that the land of the nation be applied for the use and benefit of the people of the nation, and hereby appoints the following gentlemen to prepare a Bill giving effect to this resolution, namely:— Dr. Clark, M.P.; A. Sutherland, M.P.; D. H. Macfarlane, Dr. Macdonald, M.P.; C. Fraser-Mackintosh, M.P.; Peter Esslemont, M.P.; W. A. Hunter, M.P.; J. W. Barclay, M.P.; Mr. Findlater; Dr. Pan Jones; Mr. J. McG. Ross, Alass, Mr. W. Saunders, London; S. Mason, M.P.; Joseph Arch, C. H. Anderson, Q.C., M.P.; C. A. V. Conybeare, M.P.; Mr. Macleannan Besolis; Mr. Stuart-Glenne; Mr. D. Murray, Mr. J. G. Weir; J. Kowlands, M.P.; D. Cameron, Oban; Mr. Alex. Mackenzie, Inverness; with Mr. Findlater and Dr. Macdonald, as conveners of the committee."

The Society has since been invited to frame a Bill in conformity with the above resolution, or to suggest amendments to the Crofter's Act, giving it the character of a Land Nationalisation measure. This matter has been delayed by the pressing demands of Executive duties; but it is our hope to report satisfactory progress at the next Annual meeting.

On the introduction of the clumsy land legislation of the present Government, our General Council unanimously passed the following resolution:—

"That in the opinion of this Council, the land bills now before the House of Lords are not such as will afford any relief to Irish tenants, or effect a satisfactory solution of the land question; and this Council is of opinion that no dealing with the land, either in Ireland or Great Britain, can be a liberating one, that does not bring it under the direct and unrestricted control of the Nation, so that it may be administered in the interest of the Nation, and the requirements of all classes of the people impartially provided for."

LAND NATIONALISATION ABROAD.

Under date of February 8th, our President writes from Washington as follows:—

"The Americans are less advanced on the question than we are, owing partly to the large numbers who have made or hope to make money by land speculation, and partly to the confusion occasioned by George's illogical taxation scheme. Land monopoly in towns produces no same effect here as with us, and all land around towns and cities is even dearer than in England. This is very injurious, because here all unoccupied building land is held at full selling values, *as in the Glasgow Land Restoration Society wants to be done with us*, and the result is merely to make land dearer, to throw it into the hands of big capitalists who can afford to pay the tax and wait, and then make it *more difficult* than with us for a poor man to have a plot of land beyond the 15 or 20 feet wide for a small house. It is an experimental failure of the taxation plan."

The report of the first Annual Meeting of the South Australian Land Nationalisation Society states that its year's work has been highly successful. Accompanying the report is an account of a lecture delivered at the meeting by Mr. F. McM. Glynn, B.A. This lecture is interesting for its statement of the enormously rapid growth of Land Monopoly in all the Australasian Colonies. As this has happened under a system of ideal "free trade in land, the fact is respectfully commended to the attention of the Free Land League."

As a further item of Colonial news, may be mentioned the receipt of a letter, only a week or two back from the Land Nationalisation Association of New South Wales, announcing its recent formation, and asking for some practical hints as to the best methods of organisation.

The Executive finally have very great satisfaction in stating that a Land Nationalisation Bill has been introduced by the New Zealand Government, of which Sir Robert Stout is Premier. Sir Robert Stout is or was until recently Hon. Secretary of the Land Nationalisation Society of New Zealand.

It is believed that after the publication of this report friends of Land Nationalisation will be induced to come forward liberally with personal and pecuniary help, so that the principles we are advocating may be deeply rooted in the minds of the younger politicians of to-day, who will have to give (we hope before long) legislative effect to them.

The Executive earnestly appeal to all thinkers on the Land Question to place themselves in direct communication with this Society.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure from 1st June, 1886, to 31st May, 1887.

1886.	Dr.	£ s. d.	Cr.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
June 1st,	To Balance in Hand	58 14 7	By Printing	15 17 6	
	Subscriptions and Donations	129 1 9	Lectures and Meetings	16 1 3	
	Contributions from Meeting at Paisley	2 13 0	Clerical Assistance	22 10 0	
	Ditto ditto Walsall	1 2 6	Office Rent and Expenses	12 2 6	
	Literature sold	4 8 4	Advertising	13 0 0	
	Furniture sold	12 8 0	Postage of Parcels and Letters	20 10 8	
			Stationery	3 3 9½	
			Literature bought	5 5 ½	
			Incidental Expenses	13 16 6½	
			Balance in hands of—		
			Treasurer	79 13 0	
			Secretary	5 7 9	
			Mr. Swinton	0 19 3	
		<u>£208 8 2</u>		<u>86 0 0</u>	
					<u>£208 8 2</u>

London, 16th, June, 1887.

Examined and found correct.

(Signed)

JOHN RONALD SHEARER.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Andrews, J.	0	2	6	Martino, Mrs. A. Blunden	1	1	0
Baker, W. L.	0	2	6	Massey, C. C.	5	0	0
Barclay, Miss I.	0	2	6	Merck, Edward	0	2	0
Barnett, F. Gilmore	2	2	0	Miller, John (2 years)	0	3	6
Barrett, Miss Rosa M.	0	5	0	Miller, R.	5	0	0
Bell, Alfred S. S.	0	2	6	Moberly, H. G.	1	0	0
Bidlake, Miss L.	0	10	0	Monteith, J. A.	0	2	6
Bishop, A.	0	5	0	Moseley —	0	2	0
Blackwell, Dr. Elizabeth	1	1	0	Newman, Professor F. W.	2	2	0
Bloomfield, A. C.	0	2	6	O'Leary, J. W.	0	10	0
Brandreth, H. J.	0	2	0	Owen, R.	0	10	0
Brooks —	0	1	0	Pagliardini, T.	0	10	0
Clarke, Rev. J.	0	10	0	Pernet, George	0	2	6
Cotton, Mrs. S. A. (2 years)	2	2	0	Reynolds, A. (2 years)	1	0	0
Craig, E. T.	0	1	6	Reynolds, A. J. (2 years)	1	0	0
Coverney, Miss Kate	0	5	0	Reynolds, C. (2 years)	1	0	0
Crichton, D. (2 years)	0	7	6	Reynolds, G. (2 years)	1	10	0
Cooper, H. G. (2 years)	0	5	0	Reynolds, W. (2 years)	1	0	0
Crown, John	0	5	0	Robinson, E.	1	0	0
(D.F.N.) A Friend	25	0	0	Robinson, J. J.	1	1	0
Domoney, P. R.	0	5	0	Ross, J. Mc. G.	1	0	0
Desquesnes, B.	0	4	0	Smith, John (2 years)	0	2	0
Dougherty, J.	0	2	6	Soper, F. L.	5	5	0
Dodd, T. R.	0	6	0	Southard, Frank	0	1	0
Dyke, Rev. T. G. (2 years)	1	0	0	Swinton, A. C.	10	0	0
Earle, Col. J. M.	2	2	0	Swinburne, J.	1	0	0
Elliott, T. H.	0	10	0	Taylor, Miss Helen	25	5	0
Field, W.	0	5	0	Taunton, T. W.	0	2	6
Fitzgerald, D. G.	1	1	0	Tebb, Mrs.	2	2	0
Freeman, F.	0	5	0	Thomas, J. E.	0	1	0
Fry, J.	0	10	0	Tomlinson —	0	1	0
Girdlestone, E. D.	1	1	0	Trotter, J. S.	0	2	0
Gooch, Fredk.	0	2	6	Trounson, J. W.	0	2	6
Greig, J. B. (2 years)	1	0	0	Walker, J.	0	1	0
Halstead, A.	0	5	0	Walker, J. F.	2	2	0
Hamilton, Mrs.	0	2	9	Webster, Rev. Alex.	0	2	6
Henly, T. L.	0	10	0	Wight, G. O.	0	10	0
Holloway, Edwin	0	2	6	Williams, Howard	0	5	0
Hull, E. J.	0	10	0	Winder, F. A.	0	2	6
Hull, W. J.	0	10	0	Woo Immansee, J.	0	2	0
Jameser Wm.	1	1	0	Worley, F. (2 years)	1	0	0
Jones, Rev. E. Pan, Ph.D.	0	10	6	Per G. O. Wight (Sunder-			
Jones, Richard	0	2	6	land) —			
Kemp, George	1	1	0	Bell, S.	0	5	0
Kilminster, Chas.	0	10	6	Christal, T.	0	10	0
Kitchener, H. W.	0	2	0	Crown, J.	0	10	0
Kitson, W.	0	5	0	Gowland, G. H.	0	5	0
Knight, Geo. J.	0	5	0	Johnston, T.	0	10	0
LeQueune, A. C. (2 years)	0	3	6	Ness, Jas.	0	10	0
Le, H. W.	0	1	0				
Lindsay, Miss E.	0	7	6				
Lowe, J.	0	1	0				
McIntyre, Miss J. A.	0	2	6				
Mackenzie, M. (2 years)	4	2	0				
Marfleet, Chas.	0	2	6				

PUBLIC MEETING.

THE Meeting of Members was followed by a Public Meeting, at which Miss Helen Taylor also presided.

The proceedings were opened by the Hon.-Secretary, Mr. William Jameson, reading several letters of apology from gentlemen for non-attendance. Dr. Macdonald, M.P., said that, having to take the chair at a Society of which he was president, he was unable to come, but expressed a hope that the meeting would be a great success. Mr. Charles Fenwick, M.P., said that the state of his health prevented him attending to more than his Parliamentary duties. Mr. Cunninghame Graham, M.P., also excused himself on the ground that he would be in Scotland on the day of the meeting; but as a landlord himself, he wished the Society every success in their crusade against abuses. Mr. A. C. Swinton, a Vice-President of the Society, expressed his sympathy by sending a donation of two guineas to the funds; and Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, sent a contribution of £1, with good wishes for the success of the meeting. Mrs. Bryant, D.Sc., also wrote regretting her unavoidable absence.

The President, Miss Helen Taylor, on rising, was received with loud applause. She said that, in the course of the past year, the events that have taken place have justified the work and the existence of this Society. We might indeed quote the saying that, "the stars in their courses fight for us": the progress of the seasons, the changes of nature, show that the system against which we are fighting, is a system which cannot stand a rainy day.—(Hear, hear.) In the course of the past year, the wealthy landlords of England have found themselves compelled to make an almost unprecedented reduction in their rent to their tenants. (Hear, hear.) It has amounted in many cases to five-and-twenty, and in others to fifty per cent.;—a plain acknowledgment of one of two things: either that the land system under which we live is only a fair-weather system; that the system of landlord and tenant, private property in land, and free competition for the occupation of that land, is a system which can only flourish under favourable circumstances such as nature never gives—(a voice, "Normal circumstances.")—or else it is a confession, that under our legal system the owners of property are able to enforce a rack-rent. For if the circumstances are, as one of our friends in the Hall says, perfectly "normal," if nature does give sufficient help, even in the worst season, and if farmers can be flourishing and successful even under those circumstances, then we ask, why must the great proprietors

this year give reductions of five-and-twenty or fifty per cent., unless they have been asking too much in times before?—(Hear, hear, and applause.) It has been said by many, that we are now passing through one of those phases of distress which, in the changes of the seasons, must come, sometimes, over every agricultural system. But let us turn to another agricultural system, in a neighbouring land: not that system which this Society upholds, yet a better and a more healthy one than prevails here. Turn to the neighbouring country of France. Probably history does not record so heavy a burden laid upon any country as the indemnity which France had to pay to Germany after the late war. To pay that unheard of amount, it was necessary to impose the heaviest taxation. France has had to contend against that taxation. France, in its fairest provinces, the richest, and those which produce the most from an agricultural point of view, has had to pass through not one crisis only, such as we are having here, but during the last five-and-twenty years the fairest provinces of France have lost many of their most profitable items of culture. Part of the South of France supplied formerly the whole of Germany and England with the most valuable dyes for their cotton manufactures. From the South of France came the indelible dyes used in Switzerland and Germany to dye the cotton used by the population of those countries, and the dyes for the cotton by the export of which to the East England was enriched. Suddenly the aniline dyes were discovered, and in the course of a few years, the madder dyes ceased to be produced in the South of France. Almost at the same time a disease broke out among the silkworms, and deprived the South of France of that production of silk which had made it one of the richest districts in the world. And as if these were not sufficient losses, a third, a devastating disease among the vines showed itself, and no sooner had they got rid of the first vine-disease, the oïdium, and begun to flourish in spite of it, than a fresh disease, the phylloxera, broke out; and there were many who, having when the madder-dye failed invested their money in vineyards, were ruined in the course of a few years. Yet, weighted with the loss of all these various crops, weighted with the heavy taxation to pay an indemnity heavier than was previously known in history, the people of France, poorer than the people of England, are not suffering as we are. France is poorer, but the poor are not suffering as our poor suffer. They are suffering, in great measure, because they, too, have not got the sound and wholesome system of state-ownership of the land.—(Hear, hear.) But they are suffering less than we are here, because, although they have not one half of that which Mr. Wallace, the President and founder of the Land Nationalisation Society recommends, namely, the state-ownership of land, they have the other half which our President, from his large and extended knowledge, holds to be

equally important, they have small occupations of land. But how stands it with us? How does the logic of events, how do facts, confirm the wisdom of our English system of landholding? Compare the state of England to-day—as we are all being told to do this year—with the state of England fifty years ago. Between that time and this we have had free trade; we have had cheap bread; we have carried out the systems of so-called political economists; we have enlarged the political liberties of the country; and we have increased its wealth until it has become the richest nation in the world. Our commerce is unequalled; our manufactures still hold the first place. With political liberty; with the spread of the influence of the press; with the improvement of education; with free trade and cheap bread; what, with all these, is the upshot of an analysis of the last fifty years? It is that with every advantage, while the wealth of this country is increasing, its misery, its squalor, its starvation is increasing in a larger proportion. The poor of England toil, only that the surplus product of their toil may go to increase the pomp and power of their landlords—(Applause)—and it will be entered in the records of history, that while in the last fifty years, the trade, the education, the political liberty, the wealth, and the foreign power of England has increased by leaps and bounds in an unprecedented degree, yet during that same time the British Empire has become a scene of famine-fever to a degree unknown in the history of the world.

Let us turn for a short time to a little country where the circumstances are very different. Let us turn to the little kingdom of Greece, a kingdom which does not count as many millions of population as the capital city of this kingdom; a country so ill fitted for cultivation, that you may travel from one end of it to the other and not find a plain surface which will give an hour's gallop upon a horse; a country of barren lime-stone rock, the olive and orange trees of which were burnt and destroyed by the Turks before they were forced to abandon the country; a country so poor that when the Turks were forced to leave it, they thought they had succeeded in depopulating it of all its native inhabitants, as some English people say they would like to do with Ireland. Yet go on horse and on foot, fording the rivers of a country too poor to build bridges; penetrate to its remotest corners, and from one end of it to the other you will not find one man, woman, or child who knows what hunger is. And why? Because, with all the drawbacks of bad Government—Foreign Government—that country has what our Society desires to see, its taxation mainly levied from the land. The result is, that that poor and barren country paying rent to the nation in the form of land-tax, everyone holding a little land, but all paying their rent to the State, Greece, under the most adverse circumstances of history, of political and physical conditions, yet

does not know starvation, while wealthy, free, and prosperous England is a bye-word for the starvation among its people.—(Loud applause.)

I have thus gone into the conditions of two neighbouring countries, because I have wished to point out that the lessons of fact and of history confirm the teachings of a *prima* philosophy and morality. When we say that the land, which no man made, no man has a right to own: and when we say that the land, which is necessary for the existence of all, cannot justly be monopolised by any, we are laying down two great principles, and I ask you here present to say whether the abstract truths to which they point are not amply carried out in the experience of neighbouring nations and our own. (Applause.)—There are those among us in England who put aside the teachings of morality, of history, of the Christian religion, as well as the teachings of political economy and of logic, and who tell us that what we are suffering from in England, is not private property in land—it is that we have not carried the principle of private property in land to its fullest and ultimate conclusion. And therefore (say they), “Do away with primogeniture, do away with the old historical tenure of land.” (Cries for that old historical tenure recognises the rights of the nation.—(Applause.) Conservatives at least are bound to be land-nationalisers, for the old constitutional laws of England recognise no such thing as private property in land. It is the property of the Crown, as the representative of the people; and it would be a happy thing if in this year of Jubilee, Her Majesty would, in regard to the land, carry out the original Jewish meaning of the word.—(Applause.) I do not think there is a Republican among us—I am a pretty strong Republican myself—(laughter)—I do not think there is a Republican who would not rather trust the Crown with the land than the aristocracy.—(Applause). But what have certain pseudo-liberals found out as a device to improve our ancient tenure? Why, that we are to pass Acts of Parliament to give free trade in land! That is something like giving free trade in theft: and indeed, if the law of competition is the only just law, there seems no good reason why thieves should not claim free trade as well as other people. But what would be the consequence if free trade in land, and the abolition of primogeniture, and of the right of entail were to be carried at once? There are those who fear that this would have the result (as has been said in the public press) of multiplying the owners of land, and so strengthening the power of private property in land. But the page of history does not lead to any such inference. France, when she confiscated the estates of her great nobles, and sold the land out and out to all who chose to buy it, had this advantage, that the wealthy classes had at that time fled the country, and were not there to offer such prices as the poor could not afford to give. And yet look at

France of to-day, and ask those well acquainted with the country and they will tell us at once that the land of France would be in the hands of a few proprietors were it not for the law of succession which divides the property of the parents among the children. Those, therefore, who propose to lay the whole of the land open to the keen competition of the rich classes of Society, when they tell us that this would increase the number of proprietors in England and enable the poor each to have a piece of land, are speaking of what they have not studied and do not thoroughly understand. The effect of the free sale of land would be that the great capitalists of the world would crowd hither, and give us such examples of oppression and extortion as the Highlands of Scotland have afforded in recent days.—(Hear, hear, and applause.) Free trade in land might, indeed, be to the interest of Socialism; because the result would be to remove the distinction between landed and other property, and it might thus hasten a social revolution by abolishing the existing distinction between them.

If we are right in our contention for the restoration of the land of England to the people of England, and the obligation to pay the rent of the land to the state, and the duty of the state to guarantee, if necessary, at least a homestead to every family in the country; if this is, as we believe, the only wholesome and possible solution of the present difficulties, then we are all bound to make this Land Nationalisation movement one of our first objects in politics. There are but few other movements of equal importance; and among those few are the two which would most contribute to the Nationalisation of the land. One of these two is giving the right of voting for our law makers in Parliament to the mothers of the nation. (Applause.) For by the very law of nature women are the natural guardians of the home; and the wealthy men of England could never have robbed the poor men of their right in the land of their birth, if the poor men had not consented to robbing women of their right in the Parliament of their country. And perhaps the only other thing of equal importance in politics is the holding up of a high standard of personal honour, purity, and integrity of life. This is needed for the prompt attainment of effectual reform of our land system, as for every other reform; for all great movements in England when they have become the object of popular enthusiasm are not kept back by direct means; our rulers dare not deny directly what the mass of the people are determined to have; reforms are kept back by the bribery of the electorate, and the deception of the public press. Immoral means, bribery and falsehood, are brought to the support of theft of the public funds and misappropriation of the land of the nation and they will be brought again and again until the mass of the nation is determined that its representatives shall be honest men and women.

In the meantime, the economic failure of the system of private

property in land, is working for its abolition, as in the case of the Anti-Slavery movement in America. Slavery broke down there because the slave-owners could not cultivate the rich lands of the South at a profit by slave labour, while the free cultivators could cultivate the poor lands of the North at a profit by free labour. In like manner private property in land in this Nation is destined to come to an end sooner or later, because under this system, England is fast losing its commercial superiority over other nations, where a better, although not a perfect, system of land tenure prevails. But it depends upon us, it depends upon our zeal, our earnestness, our self-sacrifice, our enthusiasm, how soon England shall learn as a nation a more perfect system of land-holding. If we relax our efforts it may come to pass that England may learn the lesson of Land Nationalisation too late; other nations may get the start of us, and the ground thus lost England may never be able to make up again. As lovers of our country, as lovers of justice, and as lovers of our fellow countrymen and women, who are starving to-day in this wealthy city of London, let us not relax our efforts until we have brought our fellow citizens to feel as we feel the truth and the justice of the great principle of the Land for the people.—(Loud and prolonged applause.)

Professor F. W. Newman moved the first resolution as follows, viz.:—“*That private property in land gives to individuals that which rightly belongs to the whole people; that the rent of the land should be used to meet the expenses of Government rather than for the profit of the few; and further, that Nationalisation of the land alone can secure to the people the impartial use of their native soil.*” The Professor said that after the full and able speech they had heard from the President,—he could not say Chairman—(A laugh)—he begged to make a little digression from the resolution, in order to express the gratification he felt, as an old man, to see ladies present at that meeting (applause). The resolution stated that private property in land gave to individuals what ought to belong to the whole public. During the period when the Hungarian exiles were in England, he had the pleasure of knowing Kossuth and Pulszky. The latter wrote to him from Hungary a few years ago, and he believed he would now speak far more strongly than he did then. He had a very large estate in Hungary, and he said to him (the Professor), “We landlords in Hungary are not so well off as your landlords in England, for in England you make the farmers take all the risk of the weather; but here (in Hungary) we are compelled to take all the risk upon ourselves.” He (Professor Newman) now perceived from the newspapers, that the floods round about the estate were likely to be injurious to its proprietor again. His hearers would fully appreciate the point of the contrast. He had never heard of anyone who could argue against the Land Nationalisation

Society upon any sound principle. Opponents propounded a doctrine of despair: that God's providence had decreed poverty to peasants, bad seasons to farmers; therefore we must expect great calamities to fall upon us from time to time. No man was a statesman who adopted this doctrine—(hear, hear). Much rather they should say, if they were even disposed to believe that things naturally worked, not for the benefit of the many but of the few, still it was the only rational view of the statesman that all public arrangements should be made for the benefit of the many (applause). Continental statesmen had said that the first interest of Government was to supply the lowest people with food. There was no knowing what an illfed people might do. Despots saw what an enormous danger there was in this; and we cannot argue in any other way, than that the land ought to be for the benefit of the millions. The time had gone by, when the landlord had great duties imposed upon him, and had only a limited revenue allowed to him for his remuneration. What a contrast there was now! How had this been brought about? By stealth, gradually, after the landlords had entire power over legislation. It began in the time of Henry VIII., and had gone on since up to the present day. There were many able workmen, anxious to get work, who could not get it. It was all very well to say, "What high wages we pay!" but in many cases, people could not get work at all, because of the land tenure. But one need not argue this out from the platform, when we have plenty of literature on the subject. He quite agreed that our greatest danger is from those who talked about free trade in land. Land was precisely the article in which there ought *not* to be free trade—(hear, hear). He had a conversation with the late Mr. Richard Cobden, at the time of the Corn Law Agitation, who then distinctly avowed that by FREE TRADE, all that he meant was, *the absence of differential duties*. Cobden never imagined that trade in everything ought to be free. It was as absurd to talk of free trade in land as of free trade in gunpowder—(laughter and a voice: or dynamite). And the same with regard to human flesh—he might as well say that there should be free trade in slavery. It was something like the suggestion of Dean Swift in regard to Ireland, that babies should be put upon the table as food—(Laughter). This was Swift's sarcastic way of suggesting how the difficulties of Ireland might be solved.—Land was precisely the thing which ought never to be free. Then, the resolution went on to say that the rent of the land ought to be applied to the purposes of Government. Well, he confessed that he wanted the word Government explained. By Government, he meant the improvement of our own people. If, on the other hand, Government meant the shooting of the people in the Soudan, and other places, then he did not want the Government to have money in its hands which it could use for

such purposes.—(Hear, hear, and applause). With that understanding, the resolution appeared perfectly reasonable. He thought the land ought to be applied to the profit of the many rather than of the few. Clearly, when a landlord could say, "I am a churchman, and I don't like to have farmers who are not churchmen," and then declined to admit any other cultivators, they could hardly be proud of their native country. If the land was in this case to belong to an individual, he would assume an authority which was never dreamed of by the Parliament, or by the Sovereign himself. Nothing could be more instructive in the matter than the allusion that had been made to the American, who went to Scotland, bought up the land, and then would not allow a little lamb to stray over his domain.—("Shame.") With that before their minds, if they did not wish to allow this principle to grow, they ought to approve of the resolution. They might have heard a story which was within his memory: A person brought an action against a seller of pills, because the pills did not do him any good. He was asked, "How many pills did you take?" and he replied, "Sixty boxes,"—(Laughter). The defence put up was that he had not taken enough.—(Great laughter). And this was what their friends—who were claiming free trade in land—were doing. He hoped that all present, would do everything in their power, and exert themselves to carry out the principles of the resolution, (applause).

Mr. Geo. J. Knight said he had the greatest pleasure in seconding the resolution. It seemed to him that the Land Nationalisation Question had not been put fully before the working classes, particularly in London; he believed that in London they were suffering more from the land and rent questions than any Irishman. Let them look at their streets and the high rents that were demanded for the houses when the old leases or holdings fell in. There were cases in London recently reported before the Town Holdings Commission, where people had been called upon to pay fourteen or fifteen times the rent they had been previously paying, and not only that, but they had to pay perhaps £1400 or £1500 as a fine in addition in order to get renewal of a lease, while not a fraction was paid by the landlord, consequently an increased charge was put upon everything produced. He believed if men fully considered the principle of that organisation and that it might be used as a powerful lever to aid them in the matter of a reduction of rents, they would heartily support this Land Nationalisation Society.—(Applause). He thought there was no doubt that people understood that every public improvement was hindered by circumstances arising out of the tenure and the holdings of land. Every day they saw the great difficulties placed in the way of all social improvements, they seemed in fact to be fettered by the landlord on every hand.—(Hear, hear). The workman spent more

for the rent of his workshop, his dwelling, or the place where he might carry on his business, than he did for the entire food and clothing for himself, his wife and the education of all his children. Many middle-class tradesmen, clerks and professional men who had to pay handsome rents, in order to obtain or retain their incomes, were unable to pay for the education of their children, and so had to send them to a Board School, and practically to become paupers, in order to get their little ones educated.—(Cries of "No, no"). Well he, (Mr. Knight) considered it a form of pauperism. The amount of payment by the parent was not in proportion to the education the children received. They got an education which generally cost the ratepayers a much larger sum, still, he was not going to say that education was not doing a great deal of good. He believed the School Board would do a great deal to make the rising generation understand this Land Nationalisation Question. There was a feeling among the working men, that they ought to have what they had earned; but they went on from one end of the year to the other, working and spending all their lives, merely to keep the landlords riding by in their carriages taxing and restricting their enterprise.—(Applause). In commercial enterprises they would find a manufacturer who could afford to place his manufactory out of the Metropolitan area, and who was not compelled to live within it, was not taxed to anything like the extent, and could compete very powerfully with the man who had to carry on his manufactures near large towns. This was in consequence of the extra rent that had to be paid for the premises in which the business was carried on. These things were beginning to be understood. He could not see that the working men were going to jump into all these things at once, but he was sure that the coming generation who were now getting an education in the various Board and other common Schools, would realise the idea that God created the land, not for the few, not for the benefit of a few landlords, but for the proper use and benefit of all.—(Applause). This was a fact which ought to be impressed upon the rising generation, and then he believed the principle of Land Nationalisation, would ultimately enforce itself upon the people.—(Applause). It did not follow that they should all be farmers; or that every one should insist upon having his "three acres and a cow," but it did follow that they should have a right at some time or another, to some portion of the soil that gave them birth.—(Loud applause). This principle was not yet fully appreciated, and until the people come to realise it, he felt that the work of the Land Nationalisation Society will not have been properly done.—(Renewed applause).

Mr. Charles Wicksteed, in supporting the resolution, said he had lived in the country, and had been connected with farmers and agricultural labourers for a great many years; while, in connection

with the Liberal organizations in Northamptonshire, he had given a good many lectures: and he could only say, if men who understood the subject could go into the villages and shew the labourers the vital importance of their right to hire land under such just and equitable conditions as would enable them to cultivate it with the same absolute security as they would have if it were their own; he knew that the labourers would be land nationalists to a man almost. If any of them would go with him to any of these country meetings, which were attended by, perhaps, some 200 earnest men, they would not find a hand held up against their resolutions. At the Liberal Association of Kettering, they passed a resolution that the best way to celebrate the Jubilee was to restore all the land stolen, since Her Majesty's accession to the throne: and that was carried unanimously.—(Applause.) And, on no occasion, when this sort of resolution had been put up, had there been any opposition. He had devoted a great deal of time to looking into the question, of how the theory of man's equal right to the land could be worked out in practice; and he had thought of the thing until he had come to the conclusion that it was not only right, that it was not only practical, but that it was the most practical solution of the problem.—(Applause.) Some persons who had probably never devoted ten consecutive minutes of their invaluable time to the subject—(a laugh)—said, that it was of no use, and that it would not work. He (Mr. Wickstead) had a different opinion.—(Applause.) That it had never been done in civilized societies, but only in barbarous and simple, so far from going against the theory, was encouraging, for had it been tried, it would also have failed, as all civilization had so far ended in shameful and disgraceful failure; and there they were, living examples of that fact to day. (Laughter and hear, hear.) It was not so much a question with them as politicians, whether or not they have been progressing, but whether they had been moving fast enough. Numbers of those present were men of business. They might go into large businesses all over the country every day, and see that some who had been leading firms were receding into insignificance, and he wished to ask them how it was. They said, "Look at these improvements, look at those, look at all that has been done in the last twenty years." It was not that they had not progressed: it was that they had not progressed fast enough. Outside people had been progressing much more rapidly, and left them behind. And this was the solemn moral that he had to point out to them, namely, that changes in the economic conditions of society brought to the front qualities faster than we were dealing with them. Although we were doing splendid things, there were gigantic problems throwing their shadow and gloom over us, which we have not yet touched. It is time there was a revolution. Let them cease

nibbling at the question. Let them go to the truth of the thing and have faith in righteousness. Let them not tarry halfway between. It was most gratifying to him to see such a large audience there that night. Their Society, he took it—and he spoke as a member—simply went in, in the first place, to nationalize the land. He would go in for confiscation—(A voice: It is not “confiscation”—it is “restitution.”)—if that were the only or best way of regaining the land—but they had to do with realities, they had to take things as they were, and to consider how best they could reach their object. Some of them thought it was best not to knock their heads against a stone wall instead of going round it. They all knew the complicated state of things which this land system had created, and they thought that some sort of fair compensation would be the speediest and the fairest way of obtaining the land: and they knew that in fighting for the land, they were fighting for the management of the first sources of existence. He thought if they could have land boards, paying off the landowners by degrees, they would be able to regain the land for the people, besides giving the landlords some compensation, instead of resorting to the extreme measure of confiscation.

Professor Newman interposing, said, that rather than using the word compensation, he had preferred adopting with regard to the landlords, the term “merciful consideration.” (Laughter and applause).

Mr. Wicksteed said, he quite agreed that the landlords were entitled to consideration. He had proposed, in a little work he had written, that the landlords should have bonds given them, instead of the land, and that these bonds should be gradually paid off. A great deal of land in towns however, and a little in the country could be obtained by a simpler method. For example, suppose a man to have spent £600 in building a house, on a piece of land that had cost him £200, and that he was rated at £40 a year, paying in all 5s. in the pound or £10 a year, which would be 5 per cent. on £200. The community could in this case take the land, charging the owner ground rent for it, but exempt him from rates. The owner would no doubt feel aggrieved, but he would not be a poorer man; he would simply have to pay ground rent inclusive of rates, and be deprived of legal right of pocketing the “unearned increment” in future. Wherever he (Mr. Wicksteed) went, he preached the doctrine of three acres and a cow; if labourers could only get two acres of cow pasture, and three of garden land, they would be able by making shoes, or doing other work, to live very comfortably. He was saying this to a farmer and his wife, whom he was anxious to convince, and the reply he received was “why, Mr. Wicksteed, you will be making the labourers better off than we are ourselves.” “Well,” he replied, “that is just what I want. If the labourers

are well off, we should all be well off, for if the worst comes to the worst, then we can go and work for them."—(Hear, hear and laughter).

Mr. Hodges moved an amendment to the effect that private property in land secured the use of land to all classes.

The amendment was not seconded: and on the original resolution being put, it was carried with only one dissentient.

Mr. F. L. Soper (Treasurer of the Society), who was received with applause, moved the second resolution, as follows:—
"That this meeting of the Land Nationalisation Society expresses its deep sympathy with the unfortunate farmers of Ireland and crofters of Scotland in their long continued suffering from the extremest evils of landlordism, which evils can alone be removed by restoring the land to national control." The speaker said the resolution had been placed in his hands quite unexpectedly, owing to the absence of several gentlemen whom they had hoped to see present; and therefore he had to ask their indulgence in regard to any remarks that he might have to make. He said he was born upon the land; but no one born upon the land could exercise his industry upon it without the gracious and condescending permission of some one who called himself the owner of the land. In London and other large towns we never come in contact with the landlord himself, but an agent is employed to do his dirty work for him. These agents have sufficient interest in the matter to do the best they can for their employers, which means the worst possible for tenants—(Hear, hear.) But the landlords themselves, who had been born into the position, were not personally responsible for the present state of things. They found themselves in the position and, not unnaturally, used it for their own advantage. We may speak of Landlordism, however, as a power, without reference to the persons holding it. When a man bought land he bought not only an income, of which we have no wish to deprive him, but also a power over the land, or rather over the people who dwelt upon it. And what was this power? It was a power which enabled the landlord to say who should exist upon the land, and who should not be permitted to earn a living upon it—(Applause). The landlord could dictate his own terms; demand what rent he pleased; take all that a man earned above what was necessary to keep him from starvation; require him to improve the property; make additions to buildings—(Hear, hear); all which the landlord would take to himself after a certain time. Towards these Improvements, the landlord contributed nothing. And what was this, but confiscation?—(Hear, hear.)—In England a population of thirty-six millions, had to live upon the land. The land was theirs; it was their birth-right. Legally, it was theirs. It was national property. It was originally confided to landlords subject to very grave responsi-

bilities. Originally, landlords had to provide for the defence of the country,—which means, in modern times, the support of the Army and Navy. They had to preserve order, or pay for the police, and administer justice. But these responsibilities the landlords had shirked; while they profited by the money, or rent paid by their vassals in lieu of service. It was not desired to deprive landlords of the income they had acquired, but to abolish the despotic power they exercised over the people. It was unnatural and a cruel wrong that the lives and destinies of the people should be dependant upon the arbitrary will of a few persons styling themselves landlords. In this country, some eighty to a hundred millions were paid annually to landlords by the people for permission to live upon their own land. If this land had not been wrongfully alienated, it would now have belonged to the people, and the rent derived from it would have sufficed to meet all the national expenditure, the national debt included. This was what they wanted to gain. They could not do this all at once. They did not propose to confiscate a single penny of income. The nett income which the landlords now enjoyed, they were perfectly willing to leave in their hands till purchased. But they were not going to pay for the shackles which they had made for the people—(Hear, hear and applause). With regard to the crofters in Scotland, and the small farmers of Ireland, they had seen how this system worked. The poor Irishman or the Scotchman took a piece of land hardly fit to put his spade into, and out of which it was barely possible to get a living until he had worked hard upon it. And, directly he had done this, directly the tenant had improved the land, the landlord said, “You must now pay me so much a year”—(Shame!). At first the rent was merely nominal, perhaps commencing with payment of 1s. a year, but this was soon increased to 5s., then to 10s., and then, possibly, to a sovereign. Consequently, many of the poor men in Scotland and Ireland found it impossible to get a living out of it, and however hard they worked, were never any better off. It was the Nationalisation of the land only, which would remedy these evils. The land must be under the direct and unrestricted control of the nation. Arrangements could then be made for its distribution, so as to give every man an equal opportunity of acquiring it. The rent should be fixed, not by arbitrary authority, but by competition, so that land might find its market value, fixed by economic law of supply and demand. He advocated a just and economic rent; and that this system should be applied alike to England, Scotland and Ireland. He believed that if this were done, Ireland might yet become a prosperous and contented country—(Loud applause.)

Mr. Craig, of Ralahine, said he had been in the South of Ireland, and was conversant with the people. Owing to the treatment

they experienced, they became rebels. They turned up the grass-land, they ruined the cattle and they were starving, so that serious results followed. He (Mr. Craig) wanted to show them the possibility of managing the land without these violent measures on the part of the Whiteboys, and the Terry Aits, and others who were enraged. The Magistrates could not manage them: the Priests gave them up; and when the Lord Lieutenant went with an army, he was met with perfect silence, and nothing was done. The landlords asked for advice, and he (Mr. Craig) endeavoured to give it. It took, however, many years to accomplish the object he had in view, in securing the labourer a cottage and half an acre on the farm where employed. When he first went on the estate, he found the people in a state of insubordination. His life was threatened, his grave was prepared, and he was howled at as a Saxon. But ultimately they were persuaded that he had no idea of betraying them: and he told them that if they would come and labour, they would have the control of the estate. They shot the steward, because they considered him a tyrant under the landlord. He (Mr. Craig) told them that at the end of the year, after they had paid £900 a year rent and interest on the capital and stock, they should share in the profits. The people could not understand this at first, but gradually he gained their confidence, and the Whiteboys, the Terry Aits and all their following became a most industrious people—(Applause.) The Irish people were a devoted people to those to whom they gave their confidence: and, by giving them justice, he managed them with perfect ease in the South of Ireland. The Bodyke evictions were a disgrace to the Government; and, as the result of similar action, what had been the result during the last 50 years? The population had been largely depleted. Within that period, some 4,000,000 had left Ireland to go to America and the Colonies—the greater Ireland—to exhibit their industry and thrift. The result might be a terrible shock to their political system. When he was in Ireland in 1831, there was a population of 8,000,000: now there were not 5,000,000. This, of itself, was a condemnation of the results of landlordism in Ireland—(Applause.)

Mr. Jameson, Hon. Secretary, in supporting the resolution, said his interest in this deep problem of the association of the land with the very life of the community, was first aroused by personal and practical acquaintance with the evils of landlordism among a Crofters population. About ten years ago, he went to the Shetland Islands to visit some relatives. Happening to look into Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," before going, he found it stated that there was a peculiar form of rent levied in Shetland—not levied on the land as tillage, but upon the earnings of the people as fishermen. He found that this statement by Adam Smith was true. He found that as a matter of fact, the greater part of their rent consisted

of their earnings, while risking their lives upon the deep sea. Even now, the fisher folk of Shetland said that they were worse off than the Irish people. Men, women, and children worked, morning, noon, and night, in order to put money into the pockets of those, who were, in many cases, absentees, and who had not, in any conceivable form, done anything to create this rent for the use of the sea, yet which our laws permitted them to levy.—(Applause). It was because he had seen the worst phases of our land system, among a most industrious people who had never been accused of violence or disorder, that he had ventured to speak in support of this resolution—(Applause.)

Mr. Winks suggested that some more pointed allusion should be made in the resolution, expressing abhorrence at the recent proceeding in connection with the Bodyke evictions.

The wording of the resolution was then amended, and put to the meeting in the following form, when it was declared to be carried unanimously:—*That this meeting of the Land Nationalisation Society expresses its deep sympathy with the unfortunate farmers of Ireland, and crofters of Scotland in their long continued suffering from the extremest evils of landlordism, and its abhorrence of the cruel evictions in Ireland, all which evils could be removed by restoring the land to national land.*

Mr. G. J. Knight proposed a vote of thanks to the President, remarking that Miss Taylor had shown fair play throughout.

The Rev. Philip H. Wicksteed, in seconding the motion, said he could not resist the temptation of saying a few words in special reference to the remarks of Miss Taylor on the moral bearings of this question of Land Nationalisation. The present Professor of Political Economy at Cambridge, Mr. Marshall, in the course of some remarks upon the proposals of Mr. George, had expressed his regret that the nation had ever lost its hold on the land, and Mr. Arnold Toynbee had said that it was an iniquitous mistake to let the land go into private possession. Ricardo, again, distinctly stated that rent was not like other things. It was not a transaction by which each party gained, but a transaction in which the whole of the gain was on one side, and the whole of the sacrifice on the other.—(Hear, hear.) The whole gist of the matter they had to deal with was to adopt Miss Taylor's principle, of doing the straight thing in politics. When it was admitted that an iniquitous mistake had been made, they should never be content till they had undone it. When the nature of the mistake was understood, it would become still more iniquitous, for it would be a consciously and constantly renewed wrong. The only reason why people did not shrink from doing this wrong, was that they were so much accustomed to doing it, that they did not feel it a shock; and the mission of this Society was to rouse the sluggish conscience of the nation,—(Applause.) They did not argue from the abstract point of view.

This was admitted. See then, what a grand principle was involved. See what would follow upon making people do right because it was right. They were fighting the battle, not merely from a political or an economic point of view. They were fighting a moral battle; and he felt that, in the end, victory was certain.—(Applause.) The question was not only the greatest economic, but the greatest moral one that could be fought. There were great difficulties in the way; but with right on their side, he felt that they would eventually be overcome.—(Loud applause.) Feeling this—feeling, as he had said, that an iniquitous mistake had been made; and feeling that the Society was doing its best to rectify the evil, he had the greatest possible pleasure, not only in seconding the proposition, for a vote of thanks to Miss Taylor, but in upholding the principles which she so nobly and so ably advocated.—(Loud and prolonged applause.)

Mr. Soper, in supporting the resolution, said that, usually, in the case of a hive of bees, the Queen was kept in stately idleness by the working bees; but in the Land Nationalisation hive, the case was different. Their Queen was pre-eminently the great working bee. Miss Taylor not only contributed largely to the funds of the Society, but did a great deal of work in the form of lectures and organization, and moreover paid all her expenses when going about in the interest of the Society, so that they really did not know the extent of their indebtedness to her.—(Loud applause).

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

Miss Taylor in reply, said that, as Mr. Wicksteed had put it, this Land Question is a question of morals.—(Applause). It is the question whether time can consecrate wrong. Believing in the ultimate triumph of right as the law of the universe, I believe that time does not consecrate wrong, but that it will arouse a spirit which will sweep away that wrong which we are banded together to abolish. Upon the question of compensation, I myself feel very strongly, that the income from the land is derived from the labour of the people, and belongs of right to them. Yet I have been touched to the depths of my heart, when speaking in the mining districts to poor ragged women, with half starved faces, and heard them say with pity that it would be hard on the landlords, if they had to give up their wealth. Such is the kindness of heart and the sympathy that comes of labour and suffering! There is not a member of the Land Nationalisation Society who does not desire to do thorough justice to every individual member of the community, rich and poor; what we say, is that the land belongs to the people; that the people need it, and it must not be kept from them. If we simply took the land back from the landlords we could pay from the rents the whole of the taxes, rates, and interest of the national debt, and still have

enough left to pension off the landlords on a starvation income of, say, a thousand a year each. (Great laughter and hear, hear.) We are prepared as Professor Newman has said to give the landlords "the most indulgent consideration"; but we make our stand on this:—we will not starve the majority of the nation in order to minister to the luxuries of the few—(Loud and prolonged applause).

Subscriptions received since May 31st, 1887.

			£	s.	d.				£	s.	d.
Mackay, Duncan..	..	0	1	0	Austing, G. P.	1	0	0	
Reid, Robt.	..	1	0	0	Williams, J. D.	5	0	0	
Swinton, A. C.	..	2	2	0	Robinson, J. J.	0	10	6	
Blackwell, Dr. Eliz.	..	1	0	0	Lucraft, Geo.	0	2	6	
Newman, Prof.	..	1	0	0	Wicksteed, Rev. P. H.	0	2	6	
Windust, C. A.	..	1	1	0	Farrow, G. J.	0	1	0	
Robinson, Edgar..	..	1	0	0							

Contributions are earnestly solicited to enable the Society to extend its operations in town and country.

Remittances should be made payable to the Treasurer, Mr. F. L. Soper, and addressed to him at the office of the Society, 57, Charing Cross, S.W.

Clubs or Societies desiring Lectures and Addresses on Land Nationalisation with a view to discuss the subject, are invited to address the Hon. Secretary.

CONSTITUTION AND RULES OF THE LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

I.—MEMBERSHIP.—Any person approving the principle of Nationalising the Land by equitable and constitutional means, may become a member of the Society, by subscribing annually to its funds. A Donation of five guineas confers Life Membership.

II.—MANAGEMENT.—The management of the affairs of the Society, shall be vested in a General Council, an Executive Committee and Officers.

III.—ELECTION.—The General Council and the Officers (who must also be Members of the Council) shall be elected by the Members at the Annual General Meeting. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Officers and not more than twelve Members, elected by the General Council from their own body. Vacancies, whether in the Officers, General Council or the Executive Committee, occurring between the Annual Meetings may be filled up by the General Council, who may also add to their own number.

IV.—ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.—A General Meeting of the Members shall be held annually, as soon after the end of April as practicable, when a report of the proceedings of the Society, and a Statement of Accounts for the past year, shall be presented by the Executive Committee for adoption. Twenty-one clear days before the Annual Meeting, the Secretary shall forward to each Member, with notice of the Meeting, a list of Members to be proposed as Officers and General Council. In the event of a doubtful or disputed election, a ballot shall forthwith be taken, by the direction of the Chairman or at the request of ten Members present.

V.—SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.—A Special General Meeting may be called by the direction of the President, the General Council, the Executive Committee, or at the written request of not less than ten Members, addressed to the Secretary, who shall then give twenty-one clear days' notice of such Meeting, with particulars of the business to be brought before the Meeting, and no other business shall be transacted at such Special General Meeting than that for which it shall have been convened.

VI.—MEETINGS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—The Executive Committee shall meet at such times and places as they may think expedient, three clear days' notice being given of each meeting. At such meetings all the affairs of the Society may be conducted, except those specially reserved for, or referred to the General Council, or General Meeting of Members by either of those bodies. Five Members shall form a quorum.

VII.—MEETINGS OF GENERAL COUNCIL.—The General Council may be convened at not less than twelve clear days' notice, by direction of the President or Executive Committee, or at the written request of five of its own Members, or at such times as the Council itself may fix. The business of the Meeting to be specified in the notice thereof. Seven Members shall form a quorum.

VIII.—BRANCH ASSOCIATIONS.—Societies may be admitted as Branches of the Land Nationalisation Society. The Executive shall have power to make and vary, from time to time, regulations for the formation or admission of such Branch Societies.

IX.—POWER OF DISASSOCIATION.—The General Council, by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the voting Members present, at a Meeting specially convened for the purpose, may disassociate from the Society, any Branch or affiliated Society, or any Member, official or not official, whose connection therewith they may deem sufficiently prejudicial to its interests.

X.—ALTERATION OF CONSTITUTION OR RULES.—No alteration or alterations, of the Society's Constitution or Rules shall take place, unless by vote of two-thirds of the Members present at a General Meeting convened for the purpose, twenty-one clear days' notice being given.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

Office: 57, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

Literature Depot: 5, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

OBJECTS:

To affirm that the STATE holds the LAND in trust for each generation.

To restore to all their natural right to use and enjoy their native land.

To obtain for the NATION the revenue derived from its LAND.

President—ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S.

Treasurer—FRANCIS L. SOPER, F.L.S., 7, Cholmesley Villas, Highgate, N.

Hon. Secretary—WILLIAM JAMESON.

Hon. Assistant Secretary—C. A. WINDUST.

Crown 8vo. p.p. xiv.—244. Original Edition Cloth, price 5s. Cheap Edition, Paper Cover, 8d., by post, 11d. Limp Cloth 1s. 6d., by post 1s. 8d.

LAND NATIONALISATION:

ITS NECESSITIES AND ITS AIMS.

Being a comparison of the system of Landlord and Tenant with that of Occupying Ownership in their influence on the Well-being of the People. By

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D.,

Author of the "Malay Archipelago," "Island Life," &c. &c.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY TRACTS.

		s.	d.
I.—The Land Difficulty:—How shall we deal with it?	per 100	1	0
II.—The Land for the People	"	1	0
III.—How Land Nationalisation will benefit Householders, Labourers, and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	"	2	0
VI.—The Why and How of Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	8	0
VII.—The Land as National Property (Professor F. W. Newman)	"	4	0
VIII.—How to experiment in Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	1	0
IX.—The Great Land Suit (H. Hutchinson)	"	6	0
X.—Running Notes on the Pamphlet by Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., entitled "National Progress and Poverty" (Professor F. W. Newman)	per 100	1	6
XI.—The Agricultural Question (Jas. E. Thorold Rogers)	"	1	0
XII.—The Gospel of Land Nationalisation (Rev. W. R. Fletcher, M.A.)	"	1	0
XIII.—Six Points of the People's Land Charter	per 1000	2	0
XIV.—"Resolution" (to be proposed in New House of Commons) affirming the fundamental principle of Permanent State Sovereignty over Land. Authorities quoted	"	2	0
XV.—State Tenants <i>versus</i> Freeholders (A. R. Wallace)	per 100	2	0
XVI.—Note on Compensation to Landlords (A. R. Wallace)	"	2	0
XVII.—Land Nationalisation <i>versus</i> Land Monopoly: Protest to our Fellow-citizens (Professor F. W. Newman)	per 1000	2	0
Programmes of the Society	per 100	1	0
Land and Tenancy in China	"	2	0
Landlord's Rights and Englishmen's Wrongs (A. McDonnell)	"	8	0
"Our Land" (F. L. Soper)	per doz.	3	0
Landlordism, what it is, what it does, and what should be done with it (F. L. Soper)	"	2	0
"Our root of evils," a tract for to day (Vindex)	per 100	8	0

SHAW & SPARKS, Printers, Dockhead, London, S.E.

REPORT
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION
SOCIETY

1887-8.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

- To affirm that the **STATE** holds the **LAND** in trust for each generation.
- To restore to all their natural right to use and enjoy their native land.
- To obtain for the **NATION** the revenue derived from its **LAND**.
-

PRINTED FOR THE LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY, AND PUBLISHED BY THEM AT THE OFFICE, 57, CHANCERY CROSS, LONDON, S.W.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

COUNCIL.

President—

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., Frith Hill, Godalming.

Vice-Presidents—

DESMOND G. FITZGERALD.
E. D. GIRDLESTONE, B.A., Oxon,
A. C. SWINTON,

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN,
MISS HELEN TAYLOR,
WILLIAM VOLCKMAN.

Treasurer—

FRANCIS L. SOPER, F.L.S.

Hon. Secretary—

WILLIAM JAMESON.

Rev. J. D. ALFORD.
CLEMENT M. BAILHACHE, B.A. (New-
port, Mor.)
F. GILMORE BARNETT.
H. H. HOOD BARRS, LL.B.
F. A. BINNEY (Manchester).
REV. OSWALD BIRCHALL, M.A.
REV. J. W. BLACK, M.A.
WM. BROCKIE (Sunderland).
D. BRODIE, M.D.
MRS. BRYANT, D.Sc.
S. M. BURROUGHS.
T. J. COBDEN-SANDERSON.
*E. T. CRAIG (of Kalahine).
DAVID CRICHTON.
JOHN CROWN (Sunderland).
T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D.
HENRY DEACON.
Rev. T. C. DYKE.
P. R. DOMONEY, M. S'mpton S.B.
*T. H. ELLIOTT.
*F. W. FLEAR.
GEO. GERRIE (Aberdeen).
J. T. STUART GLENNIE.
A. HALSTEAD (Hartogate).
SPENCER JACKSON.
Rev. E. PAN JONES, Ph. D. (Mostyn).
*GEORGE J. KNIGHT.
B. LUCRAFT, M.L.S.B.
CHARLES MACKAY, LL.D.

*J. R. McILRAITH, M.A., LL.B.
Mrs. A. BLUNDEN MARTINO.
*H. G. MOBERLY.
A. J. OGILVY (Tasmania).
R. OWEN.
J. A. PARKER.
CHAS. PEACH.
Rev. W. H. RATCLIFF, M.A.
*A. J. REYNOLDS.
*W. REYNOLDS.
EDGAR ROBINSON (Isle of Man).
J. MCG. ROSS (Allness).
J. SOWRY (Lynn).
Rev. T. TRAVERS SHERLOCK, M.A.
(Smethwick).
T. W. TAUNTON.
Mrs. W. TEBB.
T. R. THRELFALL.
J. TURLE, M.D.
J. F. WALKER (Birmingham).
J. WHYTE (Inverness).
*CHARLES WICKSTEED (Kettering).
Rev. PHILIP H. WICKSTEED.
GEO. O. WIGHT (Sunderland).
Rev. C. FLEMING WILLIAMS.
S. D. WILLIAMS (Malvern).
LT.-COL. A. T. WINTLE, late R.A.
J. MARTIN WOOD.
*J. WOODMANSEE.

Those marked with an * and the Officers constitute the Executive Committee.

OFFICE:—57, Charing Cross, S.W.

May 8th, 1888.

SEVENTH ANNUAL MEETING

OF THE

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

HELD AT THE WESTMINSTER PALACE HOTEL, MAY 8TH, 1888.

A. R. WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

REPORT.

PRESENTED TO AND ADOPTED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY.

IN their last Report, the Executive called attention to the fact, that a very marked development in public opinion on the question of Land Nationalisation had taken place during the previous twelve months. It is satisfactory to record, that in the period since, there has been a quickening of interest in our movement even more noteworthy. Not only are Political Associations beginning to include Land Nationalisation as an item in their programme, but Parliamentary Candidates are voluntarily advocating that reform. To the Taxation of Ground Values, it may fairly be said that the whole Liberal and Radical party now stands committed, apparently in blissful ignorance of the fact, that they have taken a step which must, ere long, lead them to the consideration of the wider and more fundamental principles of this Society. In another direction, the Government itself has sanctioned the removal of landlord control from the land. The Allotments Act of last session, miserably feeble though it is in construction and scope, admits the *principle* that landlords may be *compulsorily* expropriated for the benefit of the users of the soil.

The Society has felt the influence of this general advance of public opinion, in an increased total of members and subscriptions as compared with last year. 157 members, have subscribed £185 12s. 4d. The balance stands at £114 17s. 8d. The Executive now submit for your approval, an account of work done during the financial year.

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, ETC.

Miss Helen Taylor has given 31 Lectures or Addresses on the Land Question, in various parts of England; Yorkshire, Durham, Northumberland, Lancashire, Monmouthshire, Hampshire, Surrey, and London; of which 15 were more especially on behalf of the Land Nationalisation Society, viz.—at Peckham, Trelleck, Chepstow, Tydee, Bedwas, Cwmbran, Risca, Crumlin, Liswerry, Magor, Yarmouth, Newport, Sunderland, Prudhoe, and Hull. Mr. W. Jameson has given 14; at Bethnal Green, Mile End, Woolwich, St. Pancras, Old Ford, Paddington, Manor Park, Clapton, Camberwell, East Greenwich, Brentford, Harrow Road, Peckham, and Barking. Mr. F. L. Soper, 1, at Hendon. Mr. Chas. Wicksteed, 4; at Lynn, Prudhoe, Chester le Street and Throckley. Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, M.A. 1, at Acton.

The enthusiasm with which many of these Lectures were received, and the unanimous adoption of Resolutions in favour of Land Nationalisation whenever submitted, are facts which we commend to the notice of those somewhat torpid politicians who still regard Land Nationalisers as a set of visionaries.

In addition to the above Meetings, a *Conversazione* was held at Essex Hall, in November last, to welcome the Society's President, Dr. Wallace, on his return from a ten months' visit to America. This gathering was very influentially attended; not only by the Society's friends and supporters, but by many others less advanced in their views on the Land Question. Dr. Wallace's account of his observations of the American Land System produced a marked effect. He showed that Land Monopoly exists in the United States to an enormous extent, in spite of what is called "Free Trade in Land," and also in spite of the taxation of Ground Values; and he drew the lesson, that reforms of a similar kind will really do nothing whatever for us, in the direction of alleviating or abolishing the evils of Landlordism. And these are not the conclusions of our President alone. Mr. Halley Stewart, M.P. for Spalding, in a letter recently received, says—"I thank you for Dr. Wallace's address on Land Lessons from America. My own little experience in the United States quite coincides with his."

LITERATURE.

Reprints of several of the Society's Pamphlets and Tracts have been made, and the following have been added to its list:—"The Year of Jubilee," by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, M.A.; "Land Lessons from America," (which is a report of the address referred to above); "Land Nationalisation," by Miss Helen Taylor, (reprinted from the *Liberal and Radical Almanack*); "The Landlord Tribute of England," by Mr. F. L. Soper, (reprinted from the *Star*). A "Resolution" leaflet, for use at public meetings, has also been printed. The Society's literature generally has been largely and widely circulated during the year.

THE PRESS.

The Executive gratefully acknowledge the consideration of the London and Provincial Press during the past year. In addition to a large number of official letters inserted, attention has been directed to the Society's literature and action by the press to a much greater degree than in any previous year. A series of four articles on "Land Tenure Reform," by the Hon. Secretary, appeared in the *Liberal and Radical* during the months of July and August. An article entitled "Down with the Ground Landlords," also by the Hon. Secretary, appeared in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and the *Pall Mall Budget*, during November. The world-wide circulation of the latter journal gives especial importance to its reception of the Society's views. In practical proof of this, it may be mentioned that a letter was received from an American reader of the *Budget*, making enquiries about the Society.

Lengthy and important letters by Professor Newman, and Mr. Charles Wicksteed were inserted in the *Echo* and *Daily News* respectively. An article in the *Star*, by our Treasurer, has already been referred to in the list of new pamphlets. It is satisfactory to note that these various communications were in each case immediately followed by additions to the Society's membership.

A further proof of the growth of Press interest in our question is the number of independent articles that have appeared, attacking various phases of landlordism. Of these it may be useful to mention: "The Landlord of the Future," *Pall Mall Gazette* (Sept. 1887); "The Clanricarde of Covent Garden," *Star* (April 7th); and "The Great Landlords of London," *Sunday Times* (April 8th and following issues). Nor are English newspapers alone interested. A lengthy article entitled "La Nationalisation du Sol," appeared in *Le Courrier De L'Europe* (Feb. 4th), containing a very appreciative notice of the work of this Society. As foreign opinion carries weight here, a quotation from this article will doubtless be interesting, especially to our less sanguine supporters: "Thanks to the force of ideas and to the means of propagandism at our disposal now-a-days, it is possible that, in spite of all the opposing interests, this colossal reform (Land Nationalisation) will be accomplished ere the century closes."

PARLIAMENTARY AND PUBLIC ACTION.

Under this heading, reference was made last year to a proposal that we should draft a Bill for dealing with the area comprised within the Crofters' Act, on the principles of Land Nationalisation. The Executive have very great pleasure in stating that Mr. J. Mc G. Ross, of Aness, Ross-shire, a member of the Society's Council, who has had many years experience in Local Government, has recently drafted such a Bill. It has been carefully considered by the president and the Executive, and alterations suggested

have been cordially accepted by Mr. Ross. At the present stage, it is impossible to enter more fully into this subject, but the Executive hope, before long, to place the results of Mr. Ross's labours in the hands of the members of the Society.

The Executive regret that they were unable to co-operate with the United Committee for the taxation of ground rents and values, formed last August, because of their very strong opinion that such taxation would ultimately fall upon the occupier, so long as private property in land is permitted.

LAND NATIONALISATION ABROAD.

From Canada, we learn of the formation of a Land Nationalisation Society at Toronto, called the Anti-Poverty Society, of which the Society's early friend, Mr. W. A. Douglass, is Treasurer.

From New Zealand we get, through the *Daily News* of December 29th, and Jan. 31st, some particulars of the Land Nationalisation Bill for that Colony, to which a brief reference was made last year. Land is to be acquired by means of Land Bonds (as proposed by this Society). It is to be *let* to the occupier, not sold to him. Sub-letting is forbidden. Pauperism is attacked by a Village Homestead Special Settlement Scheme, enabling the poorest of men to obtain the use of land. In brief it may be said that the Bill is saturated with the ideas of the Land Nationalisation Society.

We note with pleasure that the Tasmanian Land Nationalisation Society is making steady progress.

From New South Wales comes very cheering news. The Land Nationalisation Association of New South Wales, formed on the 26th of Jan., 1887, had, within a twelvemonth, some thousands of adherents throughout the colony. Our correspondent, the Hon. Secretary of the Association, (Mr. C. J. Price), says further: "We found that 513 people owned 17,351,000 acres, and if that sort of thing went on, we should have a position compared with which Ireland and Scotland would be a paradise."

The practical conclusion to which this record of progress points is, that Land Nationalisation has during the seven years of this Society's existence, become a force in the political life of the English speaking race that cannot be much longer withstood by those interests that thrive on Land Monopoly. The Executive appeal to all earnest and patriotic men and women to give, at least their thoughtful, unbiassed consideration to the views of political duty which the Land Nationalisation Society endeavours to spread.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

Statement of Receipts and Expenditure from 1st June, 1887, to 30th April, 1888.

1887.	DR.	£	s.	d.	CR.	£	s.	d.	
June 1st.	To Balance in hand	86	0	By Printing	51	1	8
	Subscriptions and Donations	185	12	Lectures and Meetings	23	4	0
	Literature sold	3	6	Clerical Assistance	27	10	0
	Furniture sold	4	10	Rent	15	0	0
					Advertising	7	12	4
					Postage of Letters and Parcels	29	9	5½
					Stationery	2	9	5¼
					Literature bought...	3	7	0½
					Incidental Expenses	4	17	3½
					Balance in hand of Treasurer 112 1 2				
					Do. do. Secretary 2 16 6				
							114	17	8
							<hr/>		
							£279	8	11

Examined and found correct.

(Signed) H. G. COOPER,
HERBERT S. MOBERLY.

5th June, 1888.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
A Friend	0	4	0	W. Cochrane ..	0	1	0
A Sympathiser	50	0	0	J. Hutton	0	1	0
Andrews, J.	0	5	0	F. Bainbridge... ..	0	1	0
Austing, G. P.	1	0	0	R. Philipson... ..	0	1	0
Bailbache, Clement M., B.A.	1	1	0	N. Carter	0	1	0
Balnforth, K.	0	1	0	Featherstone, Miss E. ...	0	3	0
Barclay, Miss L.	0	2	6	Fitzgerald, D. G.	2	0	0
Barnett, Chas.	0	1	0	Flear F. W.	0	10	0
Bayle, Alex'r.	0	5	0	Freeman, F.	0	5	0
Bell, Alfred S. S.	0	2	6	Ganney, H.	0	1	0
Bell, Thos.	0	5	0	Gerrie, Geo.	0	5	0
Bidlake, Miss L.	0	5	0	Giddings, John	0	2	6
Birchall, Rev. Oswald	0	10	0	Girdlestone, E. D., B.A.	1	1	0
Bishop, A.	0	10	0	Godwin, F.	0	1	0
Black, Rev. J. W.	0	1	0	Gooch, Fredk.	0	2	6
Blackwell, Dr. Elizabeth	1	10	0	"H. Darbshire"... ..	10	0	0
Bloomfield, A. C.	0	2	6	Harris, Henry	0	1	0
Boxer, E.	0	1	0	Hole, J. (2 years)	1	0	0
Bramley, J. E.	0	1	0	Hull, John	0	10	6
Briggs, T. E.	0	3	0	Hull, J. E.	0	10	6
Broadbent, Thos.	0	0	6	Hull, J. W.	0	10	6
Brockie, W.	0	10	0	Hull, Miss H.	0	2	6
Brodie, D. M.D.	1	0	0	Jackson, Spencer	3	3	0
Brown, J. A.	1	0	0	Jackson, W. H.	0	5	0
Brown, H. C.	0	5	0	Jameson, W.	1	1	0
Brown, Jas.	0	5	0	Jameson, Mrs. W.	0	2	6
Brown, Thos.	0	10	0	Kitchener, H. W.	0	2	6
Brownlee, J. M.	0	1	0	Knight, G. J.	0	5	0
Burrows, Geo.	0	1	0	Lucraft, B.	0	2	6
Bryant, Mrs. S. D. Sc.	1	1	0	Mellraith, J. R., M.A. ...	0	2	6
Cooper, H. G.	0	2	6	Mackay, Duncan	0	1	0
Cotton, Mrs. S. A.	1	1	0	Mackenzie, M.	2	0	0
Couper, R. M.	0	3	0	Marfleet, Chas.	0	2	6
Coverney, Miss K.	0	5	0	Martino, Mrs. A. Blunden	0	10	0
Cox, Henry	0	1	0	Melladew, T.	0	2	6
Crichton, David... ..	0	5	0	Merck, Edward	0	2	0
Cunnington, J. R.	0	5	0	Millar, John	0	2	6
"D. N. F." (a Friend)... ..	30	0	0	Miller, R.	5	0	0
Dagley, W. T.	0	2	6	Moberly, H. G.	1	0	0
Davison, Jas.	0	5	0	Monteith, J. A.	0	2	6
Day, Wm.	0	5	0	Mousley, G.	0	2	6
Deacon, Henry	0	10	6	Murray, O.	0	5	0
Dick, R. S.	0	10	0	Newling, E. F.	0	2	6
Erwood, S. A.	0	5	0	Newman, Professor F.W.	3	2	0
Elliott, T. H.	0	10	0	Ogilvy, A. J.	1	0	0
Farrow, G. J.	0	1	0	Ower, W. R.	0	5	0
Farrow, T.	0	1	0	Pagliardini, T.	0	10	0
Per do. B. Bromley	0	1	0	Layne, Alex. W.	0	10	6
R. Barnes	0	1	0	Phillips, Isidore H.	0	1	0
R. Butterfield..	0	1	0	Phillips, Saml. E., F.C.S.	0	5	0
G. Gilliam	0	1	0				
F. Wall	0	1	0				
J. Farrow	0	1	0				
				Carried forward	£134	4	6

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS—*Continued.*

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Brought forward	134	4	6				
Pontis, Mrs. H. ...	0	2	6	Taylor, Miss Helen, pro-			
Pradhoe Liberal Assn ...	0	2	6	ceeds of Lecture on			
Pyott, Jas. ...	0	2	6	Nationalisation of Land	10	10	0
Ramage, Rev. P. ...	0	1	0	for Sunday Lecture			
Reeves, William ...	0	12	6	Society, Newcastle-on-			
Reid, R. ...	1	0	0	Tyne ...			
Reynolds, A. ...	0	10	0	Theobald, W. ...	0	2	6
Reynolds, A. J. ...	0	10	0	Threlfall, T. R. ...	0	2	6
Reynolds, C. ...	0	10	0	Tinsley, J. S. ...	0	1	0
Reynolds, F. ...	0	5	0	Trotter, H. J. ...	0	2	6
Reynolds, G. ...	1	0	0	Trotter, J. C. ...	0	2	6
Reynolds, W. ...	0	10	0	Trounson, J. W. ...	0	2	6
Robinson, E. ...	1	0	0	Turle, J., M.D. ...	0	5	0
Robinson, J. J. ...	0	15	6	Underwood, H. T. ...	0	5	0
Russell, W. R. ...	0	2	0	Unwin, W., M.A. ...	1	0	0
Salis, Madame M. F. (2				Walker, R. J. ...	0	2	6
years) ...	0	5	0	Watts, A. A. ...	0	2	0
Samuel, T. G. ...	0	1	0	Webster, Alexr. ...	0	2	6
Sanderson, T. J. Cobden	2	2	0	Westlake, E. ...	0	5	4
Scott, Rev. Thos. W. ...	0	10	0	Wicksteed, Rev. P. H., M.A.	0	2	6
Shinner, W. J. ...	0	5	0	Wilkinson, S. H. ...	0	5	0
Smith, John ...	0	1	0	Williams, Rev. C. Fleming	0	2	6
Soper, F. L. ...	5	5	0	Williams, Howard ...	0	5	0
Soul, E. M. ...	0	1	0	Williams, S. D. ...	5	0	0
Soutter, W. J. ...	0	1	0	Windust, C. A. ...	1	1	0
Sowry, J. ...	0	10	0	Winterton, J. ...	0	1	0
Stuart, Glennie J. T. ...	0	2	6	Wintle, A. T., Lt.-Col. R.A.	1	0	0
Swinburne, J. ...	1	0	0	Wood, J. Martin ...	0	1	0
Swinton, A. C. ...	12	2	0	Worley, Francis ...	0	10	0
Swinton, A. C. (secundus)	0	2	6				
Taunton, T. W. ...	0	2	6				
					£185	12	4

Received since April 30th and carried to next Account.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Linde, Theod. ...	0	1	0	Unwin, William ...	1	0	0
Dougheaty, Jas. ...	0	2	6	Downing, P. R. ...	0	2	6
Lindsay, Miss ...	0	5	0	Windust, C. A. ...	1	1	0
Lindsay, T. E. ...	0	2	6	Pagliardini, Tito ...	0	10	0
Ogilvy, A. J. ...	10	0	0	Swinton, A. C. (secundus)	0	2	6
Baker, W. L. ...	0	2	6				

PUBLIC MEETING.

The Meeting of Members was followed by a public meeting, at which Dr. Wallace also presided.

The Hon. Secretary read or referred to letters of regret for non-attendance from Mrs. S. Bryant, D.Sc., Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland, M.P., Mr. Thos. E. Ellis, M.P., Mr. R. C. Graham, M.P., Mr. Bowden Rowlands, Q.C., M.P., Professor Stuart, M.P., Mr. Halley Stewart, M.P., Mr. J. W. S. Callie, (Secretary Financial Reform Association,) Rev. H. Price Hughes, (who said, "there can be no doubt that you are dealing with a problem which lies at the very root of human misery in this country,") Mr. Andrew Reid, Mr. Wm. Saunders, Mr. A. C. Swinton, Mr. T. R. Threlfall, (Sec. National Labour Electoral Association,) and the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, M.A.

The President, who, on rising was received with loud applause, said:—

The Report of the Executive has referred to the growth of public opinion on the question of Land Nationalisation, which seems to be very satisfactory. Everywhere it is being realised that our Land system is a terrible failure, involving the failure and breakdown of our boasted civilisation. For surely the first test of a civilised community should be,—not the amount of luxury of the few, but the well-being of the whole,—not the existence of hundreds of millionaires, but the absence of misery and starvation among the people. Yet we have a constantly increasing amount of misery and starvation in our midst, and every year about *one-sixth* of all the deaths in this city are those of persons who die in a state of pauperism in public institutions,—and this in addition to the thousands who die of misery and want in the cellars and garrets of this the wealthiest city in the world.

We have heard much of the improvement in the condition of the working classes during the last 50 years,—but along with an improvement in the condition of some portion of these classes—the skilled mechanics—there has been a deterioration in a more numerous class—the unskilled labourers and women-workers. It is about 50 years ago since Hood's famous "Song of the Shirt" startled the world with its revelation of hopeless misery. But what would Hood have said if he could hear the revelations *now* being made—of shirts made at 1d. each, the worker by continuous

hard work making *twelve shirts* a day, and earning 6s. a week, and with the rent of an attic at least double what it was in his time!

Five years ago we had the "Bitter Cry" excitement, and a Commission of Enquiry, and a huge Report. Then another Commission on Depression of Trade and another Report,—and now another Commission or Committee on the "Sweating System,"—to be followed no doubt by another Report, which like the preceding Reports will be simply so much waste paper.

The reason why Commissions and Reports do no good is because our politicians and our philanthropists will never search for *real* causes, will never go to the *root* of the matter; which is, in one word, Landlordism—that system of land monopoly which treats the land of the country as a means of profit for landlord and farmer—that profit being got with the minimum of labour on the land.

An attempt is now being made to put the public on a wrong scent by imputing all the misery of our city workers to the competition of foreigners. I do not say this has no effect; it is no doubt an aggravating cause, and so long as we cannot keep our own people from starving it should be stopped; but it is as nothing compared with the real fundamental cause—the driving of the rural population from the country to the great towns. Year after year the farmers, under the pressure of the exorbitant rents of the period of commercial prosperity which culminated in 1872, are becoming first impoverished, then bankrupt, and landlords are turning their arable land into pasture so as to get the maximum of profit with the minimum of outlay and risk,—and thus a constant stream of labourers, and with them village mechanics and shopkeepers, are forced to migrate to the towns.

The consequence is that we have at this moment two-thirds of our whole population—more than 20 million people—concentrated in the great cities and towns, while millions of acres of our land all over the country are less populated and less effectively cultivated than 50 years ago. Yet when this fact was brought before them last week by Mr. Bradlaugh, our legislators—men who profess to be our representatives—walked out of the House of Commons till there being only 15 members present the debate collapsed in a count out!

In the course of the debate we had the usual statement that the land was uncultivated because it could not be cultivated at a profit. No doubt, the landlord, having ruined the farmers by making them pay exorbitant rents, cannot find tenants for his farms,—but this very same land could be cultivated at a profit by labourers and their families, even paying the same rent as the farmers paid, if they had the land in such quantities as they required, and with absolute security of tenure. That they can and do thus cultivate:

it and live comfortably on it has been shown again and again, though the fact is always denied in parliament. The Reports of the Agricultural Commission prove it—the landlord apologist, the Hon. Mr. Broderick, proves it in his book on “English Land and English Landlords,”—I myself have collected ample evidence of it in my books on “Land Nationalisation” and “Bad Times,”—as has Mr. Impcy in his “Three Acres and a Cow,” and his “Housed Beggars.” In this last pamphlet he shows that on a farm taken by a Working Men’s Allotment Association, in Northamptonshire, *forty men* are employed where only *four men* were employed by the farmer, the result being that wheat produced 45 bushels an acre, nearly double the farmer’s average! And this land is cultivated, not by men who have been farm labourers only but by small tradesmen, greengrocers, dairymen, mechanics, &c., showing that men brought up in the country in the midst of agriculture have both a love of it and a knowledge of it sufficient to enable them to cultivate land at a profit.

Now if we could take a census of the unemployed and struggling workers in London and other great cities, we should find that perhaps one third, perhaps half, of them were country born, and would go back to their native villages if they had a fair chance. Once throw the land open to workers, giving them the choice of a place to live in with absolute security of tenure, and not only would the immigration to our cities be stopped, but an outflow would begin from them to the country which would have the most beneficial effects both on the production of food, the decrease of poverty, and the progress of trade. Now this I hold to be the great purpose and use of Land Nationalisation: to get the people back on to the land, to check the growth of great cities, and to produce on our own soil the many millions sterling worth of eggs, poultry, butter, cheese, bacon, and fruit now imported, but which we can easily grow ourselves. Even the importation of wheat would be greatly diminished, for when labourers grow wheat by choice, as they very frequently do, we may be sure that it pays them to grow it, the reason being that *they* grow from forty to fifty bushels an acre, while the farmer, under a landlord, grows from twenty to thirty only.

Many people are too much disposed to look at the *money side* of the Nationalisation question, and cry out for taxation to get back some of the landlord’s unearned increment. No doubt the question of right and equity is a very tempting one, but for *practical results* it is as nothing compared with the question of *freedom* in using the land, and its occupation as much as possible by the *actual men who cultivate it*. If we could at once banish all landlords and have all the tenant-farmers paying fair but moderate rents to the Government, the beneficial results would, I believe,

not compare with a system of free choice of land by working occupiers at fair rents and permanent tenure, even with those rents paid to the present landlords.

In the former case taxes would be reduced, but there would be nothing to prevent the continued growth of our cities with thousands every year added to those who depend on wage-labour, and whose competition keeps wages ever down to starvation point. The farmer would still employ as few labourers as possible — would still use the land for *his profit*, not for the profit of the men who *really do the work*. Machinery would still benefit *him* and injure the labourer; and on the whole the country would be very little benefited, except perhaps that capitalists and manufacturers being relieved of taxation would be more prosperous, and succeed in becoming millionaires rather quicker than they do now!

On the other hand if labourers of all kinds had free access to land on the most favourable terms and conditions, they would get almost all they could get by the most thorough Land Nationalisation, since it would not matter to them to whom they paid their rents. Population would then spread naturally over the whole country, which would gradually become cultivated like a garden; and it would then be found that the larger part if not the whole of the food of the country could be produced within the country; pauperism would be soon almost unknown (as under similar conditions it is unknown in Japan), while men, no longer forbidden to employ themselves, would no longer compete for work at starvation wages, and thus wages would rise considerably, and no man would need to be out of work.

Some of you may perhaps think that this is a strange view for a Land Nationaliser to take; but you will remember that in our earliest programme we adopted the principle of free selection of plots of land for personal occupation; and although this has been criticised, opposed, and ridiculed without mercy, I now hold more strongly than ever, after eight years experience and consideration, that it is really a vital point, and is more than any other feature of land reform calculated to act directly, and most efficiently in checking the ever-flowing tide of pauperism and misery which is at once our sorrow and our disgrace. In all my writings on this question I have laid most stress on the *evil power* of landlordism in preventing men from applying their labour directly to their native soil; and though no one can be more impressed than I am with the fundamental error and wrong of permitting private property in land, I am equally convinced that it is *not* the money question that is the most important.

It is also I think clear that while so huge and radical a reform as complete Land Nationalisation is still very far off, whatever steps have yet been taken, are distinctly in the direction I am now

advocating. The Crofter's Bill and the Allotments Bill, have both sanctioned the principle that land may be compulsorily taken for cultivation by labourers, at fair and fixed rents. Let us work on these lines, extending the powers of local bodies to take land till every labourer can have what he requires, and till all towns and villages can secure possession of the land that immediately surrounds them,—as proposed in the admirable new Crofter's Bill drawn up by Mr. Ross,—and we shall be on the sure and certain road to ultimate Land Nationalisation.

Those who have not seen this Draft Bill which Mr. Ross has submitted to us may be interested to know its main provisions,

These are :—

- (1) A Local Land Board in each Parish—freely chosen.
- (2) A Land Commission in Edinburgh.
- (3) Land required by Crofters may be taken by the Local Land Board—the Land Commission fixing the price; improvements by tenants for 40 years previous not to be valued in estimating the price.
- (4) The Money required, to be advanced by the Treasury on security of the Rates and Land fund, to be paid off, principal and Interest, in 49 years.
- (5) Local Land Boards to have power to acquire all ground-rents of the houses in their parish on same terms.

Thus each Parish will have the power of *Nationalising* the land of its own Parish, and such land is never to be alienated.

The Bill is carefully worked out in all details according to Scottish local law and custom, but these are the essential parts of it, and they certainly offer a most simple and unaggressive mode of effecting Land Nationalisation in detail;—while if we stand out for having it wholesale—for the whole kingdom at once—probably no man now living will ever see it in operation. I sincerely trust that Mr. Ross' Bill will be brought before Parliament year by year till it is carried; and then we may introduce one for England on the same general lines.

I have been very much pleased with a pamphlet on "The Land" which has been sent me by the Author, Mr. A. J. Ogilvy, of Tasmania, because I find that he has reached exactly the same conclusions as myself. He maintains, and I perfectly agree with him, that the fundamental reform we require is to have the land entirely worked by the men who occupy it. Large farmers, as regards the well-being of the people and the nation, are no better than large landlords, inasmuch as they use other men's labour for their individual profit, and whether they are tenants of landlords or under the State, or owners of the land they farm, makes no difference; it is always their interest to keep down wages and to do this they must prevent the labourers from having land.

Mr. Ogilvy, gives a striking picture of the results of land-monopoly in Tasmania. There, as here, we have enormous areas of land half cultivated or uncultivated,—capital vainly seeking profitable employment,—and men competing for work and thus keeping wages down to a minimum. Yet people there are so blind as to cry out for more labour and more capital, and not to see that the one thing wanted is free access to the Land.

I think on the whole we may congratulate ourselves on the progress of our cause. We are no longer treated with contemptuous ridicule by the press; and the public are beginning to realise that we are not robbers or confiscators, but that our proposals are perfectly fair and honest, and are such as many landlords would be willing to accept. It is important that the principle of fair payment for all land taken, estimated according to the actual net revenue it produces to the landlord, should be made widely known as that which we now suggest. This principle is embodied in Mr. Ross' Crofter Bill, and its discussion in Parliament will do much good in showing that it is really possible to pay for the land and yet benefit the people. The growth of land values in every nation that is increasing in population and wealth is an absolute certainty. That increase—that "unearned increment"—we have given to landlords in the past, but we certainly do not intend to give it to them for all future time. Moreover, although as regards the whole country the increase is a certainty, it is by no means a certainty within any limited time, as regards each particular field or estate, and therefore it cannot be estimated as part of the present value of any particular estate.

Our own proposal is, to pay the landlords in "land-bonds" bearing, say, 3 per cent interest, subject to being paid off at par after a named period. But either this method or that adopted by Mr. Ross of a repayment of principal and interest in 49 years, may be adopted, the result in both cases being the same,—that the increased rents of land when let to cultivators in small portions, added to the unearned increment on all land near centres of population, will easily pay off the whole amount in one or two generations, leaving the land in the possession of the community and its revenues available for public purposes, and sufficient to extinguish almost all local and imperial taxation.

I would suggest, therefore, that the leaflet on "Compensation to landlords" should for the future be attached to every publication issued by the Society, and that it should be printed at the end of all future publications, since it will greatly assist in removing the ignorance and prejudice now so prevalent as to our real proposals.

It is with the greatest satisfaction I learn that New Zealand, and I believe some of the Australian Colonies, have actually

legislated to prevent the further alienation of the public lands. We have, I think, some gentlemen from the Colonies here among us who will be able to tell us exactly what has been done, and what is the next probable step in the direction of Land Nationalisation.

With these few remarks, for the scantiness of which I must apologise on the ground of ill-health, I will now conclude, again congratulating the Society on the good work it has done and on the steady, if rather slow, growth of sound ideas on the greatest question of the day— Land Nationalisation !

Dr. Macdonald, M.P., in moving a vote of thanks to Dr. Wallace for his address, said: He agreed with the address just delivered, though he would not follow their President into all the points touched upon. He could add, with respect to the "East End Sweating," that he knew the case of a poor seamstress who received the paltry pittance of 2s. 2d. a dozen shirts and had to wait four hours before she got paid. With regard to the Crofters, those who were supporting the movement on their behalf knew that they were making them small landlords. (Hear, hear, and applause.) He quite agreed with Dr. Wallace as to big farms. The big farmer was just as much an enemy of the small man as the landlord, and he did, perhaps, more than the landlord in preventing our having small cultivators. In his Scottish country, this was well illustrated. The farmer was being "sucked dry"; the landlord stuck to him like a leach till he had to go into the Bankruptcy Court. There was little doubt that what was going on now would help very much towards Land Nationalisation. As to the great cities, they were wearing the life out of the people,—(applause)—and unless the places of these were to be supplied and supplemented by country folk—both men and women—we should be in a very poor plight indeed, from the physical deterioration of the town-population. (Applause.)

Mr. Ogilvy (Tasmania), in seconding the resolution, said that in that country there was a continual cry for more labour and more capital to develop the physical resources of the country. If more labour were introduced it would simply bring down wages—so it was said. He believed in the nationalisation of the land. Unfortunately, the people in the Colonies did not see it, as a rule. There was, however, a small band of faithful and energetic reformers who demanded it. The Colonists, somehow or other, had got it into their heads that there must be some one to own the land as an individual; and they think it is the interest of the man in possession to do his best for the land. It paid better to put sheep on the land, and keep the people off.

Mr. Cremer, M.P., who supported the motion, said the movement was progressing. Men were formerly regarded as

lunatics who cried out for the nationalisation of the land, but now, as their President showed them, more attention was paid to the question. Some might remember the futile efforts of Mr. Sharman Crawford in the House of Commons 25 years ago. He brought forward an annual motion for tenant-right in Ireland, and they were very much indebted to Irishmen for the wonderful change which has taken place in public opinion on the subject. (Applause.) Mr. Gladstone's measure to interfere with what was considered the sacred right of the landlord to fix the price of his land introduced a principle which was revolutionary in its best sense. (Hear, hear.) There was the question of leasehold enfranchisement and improvements. That one man should be able to say to another, "You may bring bricks, mortar, capital, and skill, and build here on my land, and for the privilege I accord you I will allow you to remain here so long, but at the end, say, of fifty years your bricks, mortar, &c., and the results of your capital, skill, and labour shall belong to me" was monstrous. (Applause.) The advocates of leasehold enfranchisement must tack on something, recognising the principle that no one had a property in land, but that it must be used for the benefit of the community. Unless they did that he should oppose the Enfranchisement Bill. The change taking place in public opinion was illustrated by the Allotments Bill of last year. It was an illusory kind of thing, but it did not deserve wholesale condemnation, because it contained an important principle—a small kernel which he thought might be enlarged in future, and on this account he would do nothing to endanger its passage in the House of Commons—there was the principle that if the landlord neglected his duty, the land should revert to the State. He supported the views of Mr. J. S. Mill, and had a conversation with him on the subject when reference was made to proprietary rights. He said, "But what I cannot understand is, that if the State should ever resume proprietary right, it should ever let it go back again—why should it not remain the owner?" Mr. Mill said, "I quite admit that is the only equitable arrangement to be made, but I don't think public opinion is sufficiently advanced to take a step of that kind." But we have now evidence that public opinion has advanced, for now the principle has been introduced into a Bill carried by the Tory Government last Session. This provided that the Government had the right of taking the land from the present owners on equitable compensation, and then, when they had so acquired it, they were to remain possessors of that land. This was an important step towards the municipalisation of the land. (Applause.) They were not to sell it to labourers, but they were to let it, and it was on account of that very important principle that he refused, either by voice or vote, to reject that measure in the House of

Commons. On the whole there was abundant cause for congratulation. (Applause.)

The Hon. Mr. Gregory (United States), said he was proud to join a movement supported by one whose contributions to science had won the admiration of the scientists in America. He had listened with a great deal of interest to the observations of their President. There was very little land in America held by landlords in the sense in which the term was used over here: that is, men who owned land, simply to let it for a revenue. Generally, throughout the States, every farmer owned the land he occupied and tilled, and those farmers were, in general, small—he meant the average of farmers in his own State, that of Illinois. During the last decade, the average size of farms was 4 acres only, although there was in the State one farm of 25,000 acres, and another of 41,000 acres, which was occupied and tilled as a farm by the owner of it, with the aid of almost an army of men, but the practice or mode of acquiring and disposing of the land was entirely different. They began by buying and selling land. The Government sold lands to the people, and the people sold lands to one another; and, further, every American had it imbedded in his belief till it was almost a "second nature," that land is a commodity like every other commodity. They had another doctrine preached amongst them latterly, and there was coming to be a change of opinion; and he believed the American economists generally—he had hitherto been in the habit of looking at the question entirely from the point of view of an economist—were coming to see that the holding of lands, as it may ultimately come to take place, will end in great accumulations of land in the hands of great landlords who will let them as a source of revenue, but that did not yet occur except in a few sporadic cases very widely scattered. He never knew but one case of immense landlordism, a large tract of land given by the Government in the first settlement of the State of New York, to the so-called "patroon" or patron, who let it to tenants to cultivate. He agreed that the cities are not the real test of the political opinion of the country. They were safe as long as they had a large number of men on the land who would stand by the country and not be led by demagogues. In the United States, young men of the farms became the best students at the Universities, scientists, professional men, and so on. The men of leading influence and power in the States were farmers' sons. In true political economy, and the true national interests, the occupation of farmers by intelligent men, not subordinated to great landlords like serfs, was a matter of infinite importance to the civilisation and growth of the country itself (Cheers). There was no fact more widely known and firmly believed in America than this, that out of the very many farmers.

he had described as owning and occupying their own farms, came all their leading men, members of their Congress, professional men, and Presidents in the States. He did not believe there was any movement which had so much to do with the safety, liberty, and prosperity of the English people, as the one which was before this meeting and this Society (Cheers).

The Hon. Secretary was about to put the motion to the meeting when Dr. Wallace interposed, and said that he could not consent to any expression of thanks that did not include a reference to those who were responsible for carrying on the work of the Society; he wished to mention especially Miss Helen Taylor, who had done probably more for the Society and the movement than any other single member of the Society. Especially also, he wished to mention Mr. William Jameson, their Secretary, who had conscientiously gone out of his way to lecture for them, and had done an immense deal of good by the excellent letters he had written in the newspapers (Applause). With the vote, he, of course, coupled their excellent Treasurer, Mr. Soper, and all those who had lectured and otherwise assisted the Society.

The motion amended in accordance with the President's suggestion was then put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Mr. Charles Wicksteed moved:—That the restoration of the land to the people as national property, and the management of it under elective Local Government, are necessary steps towards the prosperity of the Country and the just distribution of the national earnings.

It had been asked where are we to begin? He had to observe that we had too great a love of national patchwork to enter on the task in a thorough spirit, and consequently we do it piece-meal. At any rate the land must not be managed by an expensive body in London; the people must manage it themselves. He had advocated the establishment of land boards all over the country, with small districts of land, over which they would have control, which they will let, manage, and from which they will collect rents. The State could give the same rights to these boards which were now given to individuals. It would be just the same if a man could go to the State and be able to say, "I want some State land. I want to pay so much per acre, and I want to execute certain works upon it. Where is that land, and what is there to pay for it?" The State should say "Very well:—This is the piece of land:—We will put up a notice that this State land will be offered for sale, to see whether any one will offer more than you do, and if not, you shall have the land; if they do, then you must go on to the next lot. When once in possession of the land, you shall have it for all time, (just as hitherto it has come into possession by transmission and tedious transfer). As long as you pay ground rent, which shall be variable, you shall not be disturbed,

except for public purposes, and then you shall be compensated." (Applause). The change would be as simple as it could possibly be. The individual who became the landowner under the State must be willing to pay as much for the land as other people in that district would be willing to pay. Being once in possession, no one else would have a chance of competition, till the owner wished to give it up (Applause).

Miss Helen Taylor : Ladies and Gentlemen.—We are all experiencing the truth of the common saying, that every new idea is met by the statement that it is not true, and then, shortly afterwards, those who disputed that truth, turn round upon those who announced it, and say, "We always knew that it was true, but it is not new" (Laughter and Applause). We have got, I think, to that stage, in this great question of the restoration of the land to the people who were born upon it (Hear, hear), and on all hands—all sides—perhaps, however, not on all sides—perhaps more among the Tories than among the Liberals—we find a disposition to accept this great doctrine, that the land is the property of the nation; but out of our success comes a danger and we must beware that we do not make ourselves responsible for schemes which are kept before the public only nominally to carry out the principle we have been advocating. The great danger of reform, in this country especially, has been that when a great principle taught by genius, and then forced upon the mass of the nation by energy and self-sacrifice, no sooner do the politicians find out that the nation has been taught, than they say: "These philosophising—these philanthropic people, have been sowing the seed—it is coming up, and it is time that we should reap the harvest." (A voice: True!). They do reap the harvest! That is what has taken place in this country for 50 years past. Don't let us forget the enthusiasm of the English Nation at the passing of the Reform Bill, more than 50 years ago. Then, at the abolition of the taxes on corn, and so on—and with all the reforms, one by one—the nation, the mass of the people, have found out that what the earnest and energetic men have urged has nominally passed through Parliament and that the people are no better off (Hear, hear), and if we are not taught by this great lesson of experience, the same thing will happen upon this land question (Hear, hear). Little steps of progress will be carried through; the people will find they are merely illusory and deceptive; and the public will turn round and say "You nationalizers have no more kept the promises you made than all the other reformers." For my own part, it seems a striking proof of the common sense of the people of London and of England that things are taken in such a quiet way, now that there is an over-whelming Tory majority. Tory majorities arise out of the dissatisfaction of the nation at the dissensions of the

Liberals (Cheers). I don't mean to say that the Tories don't deceive, too; only there is this difference: people expect it of them (laughter and applause), so we are not disappointed. Now, take this great measure of the Allotment Act. That has gone forth as a great measure for the labourers, and so it ought to be; but go down into the provinces—the agricultural districts of England—and how do you find it working with the landlords and farmers who administer this act? What do they do? They choose the worst land, so exhausted, owing to the extortions of the landlords upon the farmers, that nobody can make it profitable; and as a result it is let out to the labourers at three times the rent that the farmer paid. I am not speaking without facts, but representing facts which have been communicated to me by working members of these bodies, as to what is taking place on those bodies on which they themselves are placed as agricultural labourers, in the administration of these Allotment Acts. When a labourer finds that with all the assistance of his fellow labourers, it is scarcely worth his while to cultivate such land, let us take care he does not say that that Act was advocated by the Land Nationalisation Society. So with leasehold enfranchisement, and so with that still worse measure if possible, “the freeing of the land.” What does “the freeing of the land” mean? Why making land purchaseable like any other article of commerce. It means getting rid of the last remnant in our laws that the land is public property. (Much applause.) Now, I don't mean to say that, if I were a member of Parliament, I would not vote for these things. Nations, like individuals, have to learn their mistakes; and what we, who are really in favour of progress should do, is to induce the people to make their mistakes as soon as possible, as a judicious mother does with the child: she knows the child will touch the fire some day or other and burn itself, and she lets it burn its finger, so that at some further day it should not fall into the fire and get further and more serious injuries. For another reason also, I don't believe in those theorists who have more faith in their own theories than they have in the immediate physical good of their fellow creatures. Where is the proof of my earnestness, unless I am willing to vote for what would give the slightest advantage to even one individual. I ought not to stand up and say I will not vote for half a loaf being given to some man who has no loaf at all. I think we ought to vote for the smallest improvement, but take care not to be carried away and acknowledge that that is an improvement until there is evidence that it is so. Let us teach the people all the while to accept these good things that Tories, Liberals, and “politicians” offer them, but not to accept them believing they are all we have to ask for. Again—every man and woman ought

to have a fair chance on this beautiful and happy earth, to whose blessings every one of us has a right—and while I would never stop in urging this Land Nationalisation, I am not myself prepared to say that all reform and all progress is included in this one great thing. I am one of those who believe that one of the reasons why we lost the land was that the men were so selfish that they pushed the women out of their rightful position; but as long as men and women managed the land together they kept the land, and it was not till the men thought they could manage it all themselves, that they made such a mess of it (Laughter and applause). Therefore, I think justice to women is an essential element in the question we are discussing, and it is certainly essential to the proper keeping of the land when we have got it (Renewed laughter and applause). I think that we nationaliser: should bear this well in mind, that we must clearly put before the people of England the fact that no minor measure will be sufficient to realise the hopes we hold out to them—nothing short of an actual restoration of the land to the people as national property will realise these. On the other hand, I hope we shall not be like the dog in the manger—crying out against small reforms. Let us say to the people, “Take whatever is offered to you, but go on asking for your rights.” This is the position we should all take up on this question, and I am especially interested in this question, because it seems to me that above all others it is the great question which must interest the mass of the people. The possession of a home secure and safe to the family—a healthy and pleasant cheerful home, where the children can grow up happy, healthy, and accustomed to find their pleasure in all the instructive and never-dying enjoyments nature gives to human-beings, that object seems to me pre-eminently a woman’s question, and if the women wish that the men should lead such lives as every good woman wishes every good man should—then every woman must see to it that every man has to labour and has the means to labour successfully. That is the condition of woman’s right in man’s life, it is the condition of the happiness of the children; security of the home-life and family to the woman: security for upright, courageous, moral, and industrious life among the men. If we had only these things to look to we might say that, although not the only great legislation we seek, it is undoubtedly the foundation of all other great measures necessary for the welfare of the nation. I feel that we women and those men who more and more do so much for the moral progress of the world, as economists owe a deep debt of gratitude to our President, Dr. Wallace, for he is one who has seen clearly the kernel, as it seems to me, of the whole question; that it is not so much for the political advantages of the reform that we must look to-day, as for the possibility of giving to every family an independent comfortable home. The power of choosing a comfor-

table homestead for every family appears to me to be the root of this reform, and it excites in my mind, or rather heart, the most ardent enthusiasm. I long thought—the work we did among the poor has made me feel it as a strong and ardent passion for the good of my fellow creatures—that they must have a home—that the men must have honest, good, and healthy work to occupy them, and that women must have a secure home—the children must have a healthy home—that is the foundation of the whole question (Applause). The getting the money from the hands of the landlords into the hands of the Government, it seems to me would be a very small reform. The Government of the country would always consist of the richest men, and these men would always “job” and mismanage. What we want is that the produce of the land shall come to the people—the people who can work it and who *need* it—which is a not less sacred claim. I, at least, should not feel the same earnestness and enthusiasm on this subject if it were only an endeavour to attain the economical advantage of paying the rent into the hands of the State, as I do now, when our chief advocate on the question holds clearly and firmly to that great principle that the first duty of the nation, when it regains the land, will be to give a home to every family that desires to obtain it. (Much applause.)

In reply to questions, the Chairman said:—“We propose to buy the land without paying a penny. That can be very easily done, because it is not a matter of doubt, it is an absolute certainty that land in a growing community inevitably increases in value, just as its whole value is the creation of the growth of the community. When there is no community, there is no value in land, and exactly as a community increases in population and wealth, so land increases in value, and the estimate of the value of the land in this country for the last 50 years shows that it has increased in value at the rate pretty nearly of 2 per cent. per annum. (Cries of “No!” and “Yes!”) Perhaps they were not thinking of “land,” but of “agricultural land.” Land as a whole meant all the country, not agricultural land only. The value of land was usually more than what went into the landlord’s pockets. If the State were to take away the land to-morrow, giving the landlord bonds, not for the gross rental, but the net rent he receives, or if any portion of it were so taken by local authorities giving the landlords bonds, which, at fair interest would pay them the same rental that they now receive from the land—the increase in rental the government would get, letting it out in small portions required by working men and others throughout the country, would be so great that it would not only pay the interest on these bonds but also probably extinguish them totally in 40 years, after which time, without further payment, the land would become the property of the community.

Querist: Then you propose to let the land at an increased rental?

Dr. Wallace: No—can't you understand? If the landlord lets a farm nominally at £100, he does not absolutely get above £80, owing to costs of management, lawyers, repairs, and all sorts of expenses. Although many farmers have not been able to make farming pay, working men *always* make the land profitable to them, even though they always have to pay more per acre than the farmer—often two or three times as much. Under our system the poor man would get his acre or two at the same rate as the farmer now gets his farm, *which he has never hitherto done*, and yet the government or local authority, having no agents or lawyers to pay, and nothing to do but to collect the rents by means of existing tax-collectors, would have a surplus with which to pay off the land-bonds. There is no method of getting the land so equitable, so simple, so beneficial to the working-man and to the country, and so sure to be successful, as this method of fair purchase on the basis of the landlords' *net* receipts.

In reply to another question Miss Helen Taylor said that the question of compensation was not an essential element in membership of the Association; that is to say, when she joined, she intimated that she was not in favour of it, but she was informed that the fundamental principle was the nationalisation of the land, and any one could belong to the Society who was in agreement on that general principle. They wanted to see the people on the land, and the landlord no longer able to drive them off it, and the removal of the present domination of the landlord must ensue. However, whatever the opinion might be on these and other points, the Society would welcome all who were in concord on the one great principle of the desirability of securing the Nationalisation of the land. (Applause.) The rest was optional and suggestive.

Mr. W. Jameson, (Hon. Sec.) moved:—

“That this meeting sends the most hearty expressions of its sympathy with kindred associations across the seas in their struggle to liberate the land from the monopoly of individuals and establishing land owning upon a national and a rational basis.”

Mr. Soper seconded the motion. Referring to the difficulties and proposed methods of dealing with and disposing of the landlordism which keeps the people off the land, he said it had been proposed that it should be accomplished by a system of annuities not exceeding the net income now derived by landlords from the land. This would leave a considerable surplus at the disposal of the nation. With this surplus it was proposed gradually to redeem the annuities. Why should not these annuities be given in such a form that they would gradually extinguish them-

selves? Let the existing landlords have £3 per cent. annuities, but let that annuity be reduced every year by 1d. in the £, 3d. in the £3. That is, let the annuity for the first year be £3, for the second £2 19s. 9d., for the third year £2 19s. 6d., and so on, until extinguished. In 240 years we should get rid of it entirely without paying anything. Landlords would lose nothing in the end by this process, except the right of preying upon other people, for the annuities in this form would be equivalent to a perpetual annuity of £2 11s. 8d. per cent., while they would participate most largely in the consequent remission of taxation. The reduction would increase the national income by £366,000 a year, and this growing income with the large surplus from the land revenue and its annual increment would gradually extinguish all taxation and give a great impetus to industry. The land, being freed, would be available in large or small quantities to those who have a right to its occupation, and there would be abundance of employment. There ought not to be a single enemy to such a movement—one designed to promote the real happiness, contentment, enjoyment, and prosperity of the nation (Applause).

The motion was then put to the meeting, and unanimously carried.

APPENDIX.

Copy of letter from HON. SIR ROBERT STOUT, late Premier of New Zealand, to WM. JAMESON, Hon. Sec. Land Nationalisation Society.

DUNEDIN, N. Z.,
22nd March, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR,

I am pleased to receive your letter, and the Reports of your Society's meetings.

I am out of politics just now and have declined re-entering the political arena for a time, perhaps a long time. I take however as deep an interest as ever in Land Nationalisation. I believe State ownership of Land is the hope of the future, this view I have long held and regret that in the Colonies so little has been done in this direction. I send you a speech, or rather notes of a speech, I delivered in the House of Representatives in 1875. My views have not changed since then. I believe, though the feeling for Land Nationalisation is dull at present, as the inflated values of land have declined and land owning does not pay, yet the day will soon be here when the State will exercise more control over the heritage of the people than it does now. Of course provision must

be made for due security to the improvers and tillers of the soil. I send you a note how the Land agitation stands at present.

I need not say I shall be pleased to hear from you, and any information I can give or any aid, shall always be at your service, and at the service of such a just cause as Land Nationalisation.

Yours very truly,

(Signed,) ROBERT STOUT.

NOTES.

Up to 1875, the Land laws of New Zealand differed, each province having its own method of disposing of the waste Lands. There were two main ways: 1st, disposal for cash, or for cash by instalments, but mainly for cash at a month, prices varying from 5/- to £2 or even more per acre, or some Land was sold by auction. Townships were sold up to £30 or over per acre. 2nd, leasing for a term pastoral lands at so much per acre or per sheep, carrying capacity being estimated. In 1875 the provinces were abolished, but no alteration was made in the Land laws till 1877. These were then consolidated in a statute. The different modes of disposing of Land were still kept however, no two districts being alike. In 1875 and down till 1881, I had advocated State leasing versus State selling, and the Hon. Mr. Ballance had published articles in the papers showing how this could be done. In 1881, the Hon. Mr. Rolleston, then Minister of Land, introduced State leasing with permanency of tenure for agricultural lands. We call it perpetual leasing, as the rents have to be adjusted at the end of 30 years, and then after 21 years thereafter. This is still law. The Land Act of 1885 was introduced and carried by Mr. Ballance, extending the leasing system to pastoral lands, called the Small Run system, and also to very small farms of from 5 to 50 acres. This act is still in force; but last session, the first of a new parliament, there seemed a re-action against the leasing system, and as the Land department was in want of money, the Parliament wished more Land sold. People however have still the option of the leasing system. The present Minister of Lands, Mr. G. F. Richardson, and the majority of the House seemed in favour of freeholds and not of leaseholds. Unfortunately the Hon. Mr. Rolleston is not a member of the House. During the discussion of the Land Bill of last session, the Hon. Mr. Ballance was unfortunately absent on an Election enquiry.

(Signed,) ROBERT STOUT.

21st March, 1888.

CONSTITUTION AND RULES OF THE LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

—:O:—

I.—MEMBERSHIP.—Any person approving the principle of Nationalising the Land by equitable and constitutional means, may become a member of the Society, by subscribing annually to its funds. A Donation of five guineas confers Life Membership.

II.—MANAGEMENT.—The management of the affairs of the Society, shall be vested in a General Council, an Executive Committee and Officers.

III.—ELECTION.—The General Council and the Officers (who must also be Members of the Council,) shall be elected by the Members at the Annual General Meeting. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Officers and not more than twelve Members, elected by the General Council from their own body. Vacancies, whether in the Officers, General Council or the Executive Committee, occurring between the Annual Meetings may be filled up by the General Council, who may also add to their own number.

IV.—ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.—A General Meeting of the Members shall be held annually, as soon after the end of April as practicable, when a report of the proceedings of the Society, and a statement of accounts for the past year, shall be presented by the Executive Committee for adoption. Twenty-one clear days before the Annual Meeting, the Secretary shall forward to each Member, with notice of the Meeting, a list of Members to be proposed as Officers and General Council. In the event of a doubtful or disputed election, a ballot shall forthwith be taken, by the direction of the Chairman, or at the request of ten Members present.

V.—SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.—A Special General Meeting may be called by the direction of the President, the General Council, the Executive Committee, or at the written request of not less than ten Members, addressed to the Secretary, who shall then give twenty-one clear days' notice of such Meeting, with particulars of the business to be brought before the Meeting, and no other business shall be transacted at such Special General Meeting than that for which it shall have been convened.

VI.—MEETINGS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—The Executive Committee shall meet at such times and places as they may think expedient, three clear days' notice being given of each meeting. At such meetings all the affairs of the Society may be conducted, except those specially reserved for, or referred to the General Council, or General Meeting of Members by either of those bodies. Five Members shall form a quorum.

VII.—MEETINGS OF GENERAL COUNCIL.—The General Council may be convened at not less than twelve clear days' notice, by direction of the President or Executive Committee, or at the written request of five of its own Members, or at such times as the Council itself may fix. The business of the Meeting to be specified in the notice thereof. Seven Members shall form a quorum.

VIII.—BRANCH ASSOCIATIONS.—Societies may be admitted as Branches of the Land Nationalisation Society. The Executive shall have power to make and vary, from time to time, regulations for the formation or admission of such Branch Societies.

IX.—POWER OF DISASSOCIATION.—The General Council, by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the voting Members present, at a Meeting specially convened for the purpose, may disassociate from the Society, any Branch or affiliated Society, or any Member, official or not official, whose connection therewith they may deem sufficiently prejudicial to its interests.

X.—ALTERATION OF CONSTITUTION OR RULES.—No alteration, or alterations, of the Society's Constitution or Rules shall take place, unless by vote of two-thirds of the Members present at a General Meeting convened for the purpose; twenty-one clear days' notice being given.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

Office—57 CHARING CROSS, S.W.

Literature Depot—5, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

OBJECTS—

- To affirm that the STATE holds the LAND in trust for each generation.
- To restore to all their natural right to use and enjoy their native land.
- To obtain for the NATION the revenue derived from its LAND.

President—ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S.

Treasurer—FRANCIS L. SOPER, F.L.S., 7, Cholmesley Villas, Highgate, N.

Hon. Secretary—WILLIAM JAMESON.

Crown 8vo. pp. xiv.—Original Edition, Cloth, price 5s. Cheap Edition, Paper Cover, 8d., by post 11d. Limp Cloth, 1s. 6d., by post, 1s. 9d.

LAND NATIONALISATION

ITS NECESSITY AND ITS AIMS.

Being a comparison of the system of Landlord and Tenant with that of Occupying Ownership in their influence on the Well-being of the People. By

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D.,

Author of the "Malay Archipelago," "Island Life," &c., &c.

LAND FOR THE PEOPLE—How to obtain it, how to manage it, 1s. 0d.
By **CHARLES WICKSTEED.**

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY TRACTS.

		s. d.
I.—The Land Difficulty:—How shall we deal with it?	per 100	1 0
II.—The Land for the People	"	1 0
III.—How Land Nationalisation will benefit Householders, Labourers, and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	"	2 0
VI.—The Why and How of Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	8 0
VII.—The Land as National Property (Professor F. Newman)	"	4 0
VIII.—How to experiment in Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	1 0
IX.—The Great Land Question (H. Hutchinson)	"	6 0
X.—Running Notes on the Pamphlet by Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., entitled "National Progress and Poverty" (Professor F. W. Newman)	per 100	1 6
XI.—The Agricultural Question (Jas. B. Thorold Rogers)	"	1 0
XII.—The Gospel of Land Nationalisation (Rev. W. R. Fletcher, M.A.)	"	1 0
XIII.—Six Points of the People's Land Charter	per 1000	2 0
XIV.—"Resolution" to be proposed in New House of Commons) affirming the fundamental principle of Permanent State Sovereignty over Land. Authorities quoted	"	2 0
XV.—State Tenants versus Freeholders (A. R. Wallace)	per 100	1 0
XVI.—Note on Compensation to Landlords (A. R. Wallace)	"	2 0
XVII.—Land Nationalisation versus Land Monopoly	per 1000	2 0
XVIII.—Land Lessons from America (A. R. Wallace)	per 100	4 0
XIX.—Land Nationalisation (Miss Helen Taylor)	"	2 0
XX.—The Landlord Tribute of England (F. L. Soper)	"	1 0
XXI.—"Resolution" in favour of Land Nationalisation (for use at Public Meetings)	"	0 6
Protest to our Fellow Citizens (Professor F. W. Newman)	per 100	1 0
Programmes of the Society	"	1 0
Land and Family in China	"	2 0
Landlords' Rights and Englishmen's Wrongs (A. McDonnell)	"	6 0
"Our Land" (F. L. Soper)	per doz.	3 0
Landlordism, what it is, what it does, and what should be done with it (F. L. Soper)	"	2 0
"Our root of evils," a tract for to-day (Index)	per 100	8 0
The Year of Jubilee (Rev. Philip N. Wicksteed, M.A.)	"	4 0
Annual Reports from 1881 to 1887-8	per copy	0 2

SHAW & SPARKS, Printers, Dockhead, London, S.E.

REPORT
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION
SOCIETY,
1888-9.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

To obtain for the **INDIVIDUAL** his right to use **LAND**.

To obtain for the **NATION** its right to the **LAND** Revenues.

PRINTED FOR THE LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY, AND PUBLISHED BY THEM AT
THE OFFICE, 11, SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

President—

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S.

Vice-Presidents—

DESMOND G. FITZGERALD.

E. D. GIRDLESTONE, B.A. Oxon.

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN.

A. J. OGILVY.

A. C. SWINTON.

MISS HELEN TAYLOR,

WILLIAM VOLCKMAN.

Treasurer—

FRANCIS L. SOPER, F.L.S.

Hon. Secretary—

H. G. MOBERLY.

Secretary—

JOSEPH HYDER.

Bankers—

LONDON AND COUNTY BANK, LIMITED, COVENT GARDEN.

Council—

REV. J. D. ALFORD.

CLEMENT M. BAUGHACHE, B.A. (New-
poll. Mod.)

F. GILMORE BARNETT.

H. HOOD BARRS, LL.B.

REV. OSWALD BIRCHALL, M.A.

REV. J. W. BLACK, M.A.

WM. BROCKIE (Sunderland).

D. BRODIE, M.D.

MRS. BRYANT, D.Sc.

T. J. COBDEN-SANDERSON.

H. J. COX (Hackney Branch).

*E. T. CRAIG (of Kalahine).

DAVID CRICHTON.

JOHN CROWN (Sunderland).

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D.

HENRY DEACON

REV. T. G. DYKE.

P. R. DOMONEY (President Simpton.
S.B.)

OSWALD EARP, B.A.

*T. H. ELLIOTT.

*F. W. FLEAR.

GEO. GERDE (Aberdeen).

J. T. STUART GLENNIE.

A. HALSTEAD (Harrogate).

JULIUS HOMAN.

E. B. HAMEL.

GEO. JACOB HOLYOAKE

COUNCILLOR THOS. JONES (Newport,
Mon.)

SPENCER JACKSON.

*WM. JAMESON.

REV. E. PAN JONES, Ph.D. (Mostyn).

*GEO. J. KNIGHT.

B. LUCRAFT, M.L.S.B.

CHARLES MACKAY, LL.D.

*J. R. McILRAITH, M.A. LL.B.

MRS. A. BLUNDEN MARTINO.

S. NELSON (Swaffham Branch).

R. OWEN.

J. A. PARKER.

REV. W. H. RATCLIFF, M.A.

*A. J. REYNOLDS.

*W. REYNOLDS.

EDGAR ROBINSON (Isle of Man).

J. Mc G. ROSS, J.P. (Aldess).

J. SOWRY (Gloucester)

S. SHAFER (Ex-President Trades'
Union Congress).

REV. T. TRAVERS SHERLOCK, M.A.

T. W. TAUNTON.

REV. ARNOLD TAYLOR, M.A.

MRS. W. TEBB.

COUNCILLOR T. R. THRELFALL (Ex-
President Trades' Union
Congress).

J. TURLE, M.D.

WILLIAM UNWIN, M.A. Oxon.

T. F. WALKER (Birmingham).

J. WRYTE (Inverness).

*CHARLES WICKSTEE (Kettering).

REV. PHILIP H. WICKSTEED, M.A.

GEO. O. WIGHT (Sunderland).

REV. C. FLEMING WILLIAMS (Alder-
man L.C.C.)

S. D. WILLIAMS (Sutton).

LT.-COL. A. T. WINTLE, Lt. R.A.

J. MARTIN WOOD.

*J. WOODMANSEE.

The Council regret that, since the Annual Meeting, Mr. Jameson has felt compelled—by the pressure of private business—to resign the office of Honorary Secretary. Mr. H. G. Moberly, kindly consenting, has been elected to fill his place.

Those marked with an * and the Officers constitute the Executive Committee.

OFFICE—11, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

HELD AT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB, JUNE 20TH, 1889.

A. R. WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., IN THE CHAIR.

REPORT

PRESENTED TO AND APPROVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY.

WITH very great satisfaction the Executive have to announce that the progress of the cause of Land Nationalisation since their last Report was presented has far exceeded that made during any corresponding period in the Society's history. That this result is partly due to other agencies than those directed by the Land Nationalisation Society, the Executive cordially acknowledge.

At the same time, it will be seen by the following statement of the Society's position now, and of its work during the year, that distinct and most important influence has been exerted by this organisation upon the movement to abolish Landlordism.

The total receipts of the Society since the last Report have been £733 12s. 2d.; its expenditure £539 7s. 5d.; leaving a Balance in the Treasurer's hands on May 31st of £309 2s. 5d.

In consequence of the increase in funds and therefore, of the amount of work to be done, compared with previous years, the Executive have felt it necessary to secure the services of a salaried officer, and to obtain more convenient office accommodation. In October last Mr. Joseph Hyder was appointed Assistant-Secretary, and the Society's office was removed to 11, Southampton Street, Strand, W.C. The Executive acknowledge with

pleasure the great energy and ability shown by Mr. Hyder in the discharge of his duties.

SMALL HOLDINGS FUND.

The increase in the funds at the Society's disposal already mentioned has been chiefly due to the generosity of one of its members, who, in August last, gave a donation of £500 to be employed in the advocacy of *Small Holdings, Crofts, and Allotments* for working men, in accordance with the principle of Land Nationalisation.

This munificent gift was, at the suggestion of the President, constituted a separate fund. Particulars of expenditure from the Small Holdings Fund accompany the Balance Sheet presented by the Society's Treasurer.

But, although this accession of funds has caused great activity in a special direction, there has not in the meanwhile been any failure to assert the Society's main principle, viz: the restoration of the whole soil of the United Kingdom to the unrestricted control of the nation, nor does the advocacy of Small Holdings in any way involve departure from methods hitherto suggested for giving effect to the above principle. The words of Miss Helen Taylor at the Society's last Annual Meeting suitably illustrate this statement. "It is not so much for the political advantages of the reform that we must look to-day, as for the possibility of securing to every family an independent comfortable home."

The following extract from tract, No. 27 (*Our Proposals*) will indicate briefly the line of advocacy adopted by the Society in the discharge of its important trust:—

"We declare, That this planet belongs to the Human Race, not to the Landlords; That it is for the use of all, not for the aggrandisement of a few; That the right of every man to work and to reap the fruit of his work comes before the right of a Landlord to charge him for permission to work, or of an employer to make a profit out of his work; And that if the occupier of many acres does not see how to make a profit out of his laborers, that is a reason not for his turning off the men, but for his giving up the acres.

As a first step then we demand:—

"That Local Bodies, locally elected, be established throughout the country.

"With power to take land from time to time on behalf of the State for Small Holdings, in such quantities and situations as the number and kinds of applications for it generally may indicate.

"Such lands to be taken over absolutely, not merely hired.

"'Fair Compensation' being given to the Landlord, payable in State Bonds transferable.

The Land never to be re-aliénated, but to be let out:—

"In limited areas;

"With Fixity of Tenure;

"And right to value of improvements if Occupier wishes to retire;

"At reasonable Rents.

"To be periodically revised, and raised or lowered according as the land, apart from improvements, may have risen or fallen in value

"Occupier to hold always direct from the Board.

"And all Mineral Rights to be reserved to the State."

LECTURES.

One hundred and thirty-four lectures have been given under the auspices of the Society since its last Annual Meeting. Of this number—four times as great as that of last year—Miss Helen Taylor has delivered 9; Mr. Charles Wicksteed 4; Mr. T. R. Threlfall 35; Rev. E. Pan Jones, Ph.D. 11; Mr. William Jameson 26; the Rev. J. D. Alford 25; and Mr. Joseph Hyder 24.

All the above lectures, with the exception of those by Miss Helen Taylor, which were delivered early in the autumn of last year—have been directly connected with the advocacy of Small Holdings. Their effect has been such as to amply justify the hope that public opinion will ere long compel legislation in accordance with the Society's principles. For, in the course of a lecturing campaign extending over nearly 30 counties, and including many important towns—especially in the Midlands, in no single instance was a hostile resolution proposed, while, on the other hand, the Resolution demanding Small Holdings in accordance with the principle of Land Nationalisation was carried with a unanimity in many cases amounting to enthusiasm. It may be added that the meetings addressed were frequently of considerable size, the audiences in many cases ranging from 500 to upwards of a 1000.

Reporting on the results of his lectures, Mr. Alford, (who has a well-established reputation as a lecturer on Financial Reform), states:—"The discussion which followed the lectures, showed that the people are keenly alive to the evils that the Society is endeavoring to remove; and the peculiar features of its method of dealing with the land question were most favourably received There is an intense eagerness after education on this subject all over the country."

Dr. Pan Jones, who has labored long for the cause of Land Reform in Wales, in reviewing his lecturing campaign, says: "As to the prospects in Wales, there is, I am happy to state, a perfect unanimity amongst the people, throughout the Principality, that something must be done to relieve the over-crowded towns, and at all the meetings I held the principles and proposals of the Land Nationalisation Society were adopted and looked upon as the only remedy for the present state of things."

Mr. Threlfall, whose influence as a leader of the Labor Party, enabled him to secure the aid of the Trade Unions in organising most of his lectures, reports: "There was the strongest determination everywhere apparent that when once the Irish question was

settled. the subject of Land Reform must come next. I was very much struck with the general 'no compromise' tone shown. This will not brook half-and-half measures such as "Free Trade in land," etc., but is eager for something like a full and final settlement. In nearly every case a resolution in accordance with the lines laid down by the Land Nationalisation Society was carried *unanimously*, and even these exceptions were only notable by one or two opponents showing their hostility."

Finally, Messrs. Jameson and Hyder, whose lectures have chiefly been delivered within the Metropolitan area, report that there is a very marked advance of opinion among the Radical Clubs and organisations of London on the vital importance of regarding *the repopulation of rural districts with independent workers*, as essential to the solution of the terrible social and industrial problems of the capital.

LOCAL ORGANISATION.

Under this heading the Executive have some interesting items to report. Branches of the Society were established at Neath, Swansea Valley, and Ffestiniog, in Wales, after Dr. Pan Jones had lectured at these places. He is hopeful of forming a network of Branches throughout the Principality as the result of his lecturing there on the Society's behalf. Other Branches have been formed at Edmonton and Swaffham. But a feature of especial significance in connection with the progress of Land Nationalisation in London has been the formation of a Branch in Hackney, under the presidency of Alderman Fleming Williams, which now has 86 members, and has, during the past winter season, held a number of most successful meetings in every division of the Borough. The Executive gratefully acknowledge the services of their colleague Mr. F. W. Flear in initiating this new departure in Metropolitan politics. It is a step that, if imitated in every London constituency, would speedily arouse the electorate to the fact that they are sufferers not merely through local landlordism, but through landlordism wherever it exists in the three Kingdoms.

LITERATURE.

The additions to the Society's list of pamphlets and tracts have been greater and more varied than in any previous year, and include, "A Colonist's Plea for Land Nationalisation," by A.J.O.; "Village Politics," by Chas. Wicksteed; "Our Proposals," already noticed; "Tax and Take—Both;" "Two Impediments to Land Reform;" "Hope for the Toilers;" and "Land Nationalisation in Scotland," by William Jameson. These, with other publications of the Society numbering 36 in all, have been very extensively circulated during the year. The fresh literature, including reprints, has amounted to 260,000 pamphlets and tracts.

Some of the Society's literature has been translated into Welsh, and largely circulated in the Principality.

THE PRESS.

The attention which the Society's work has received both from the Metropolitan and Provincial Press, has, since our last meeting, been of a most gratifying character.

Our lecturers have been very fully reported even by papers hostile to the Society's work. That stage in the progress of a movement, indicated by unfavorable or dubious leading articles, has also been reached in many instances. The "Scottish Leader," however has been distinctly favourable to the Society's method of settling the land question in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, and the "Star" has definitely included "Small Holdings" under local authorities popularly elected, among the items of its programme. The *Cork Eagle* is, in Ireland, a firm supporter of the Society.

From press cuttings it is ascertained that the cause of Land Nationalisation has, during the last twelve months, received from the press generally about *double* as much attention as it did during the previous year. The Executive cannot regard this rate of progress as unsatisfactory.

PARLIAMENTARY AND PUBLIC ACTION.

At the Annual Conference of the Highland Land League held at Inverness in last September, where the Society was represented by Mr. A. J. Ogilvy and Mr. J. Mc G. Ross, a resolution in favour of Land Nationalisation was unanimously carried, and Mr. Ross's Crofters Bill, referred to in the Presidential Address last year, was approved.

In consequence of the action of the last Trade Union Congress, the following resolution was passed by the Executive:

"That this Executive tenders to Mr. S. Shaftoe, President of the recent Trades' Union Congress at Bradford, its heartiest congratulations on the fact that a Resolution, insisting on Land Nationalisation, was carried at that Congress by the splendid majority of 66 votes against 5. It, further, assures him of the full co-operation of this Society with any effort the Trades' Unions may contemplate to bring the question of Land Nationalisation before Parliament as a distinct issue."

Mr. Shaftoe emphasised a very cordial reply by joining the Society. The Resolution and reply were afterwards circulated by the Society as a leaflet.

The Co-operation referred to in the above resolution has already indirectly begun. For, the Labor Electoral Association, which received its mandate from the Trades' Congress of the previous year, unanimously resolved at its first Annual Congress to make

Land Nationalisation a plank in its platform. At a more recent Congress held at Liverpool during Easter, when the Society was represented by Mr. Hyder, the following resolution was adopted :

"That Local bodies, popularly elected, shall be empowered to take land for Small Holdings at a fair valuation, and let (not sell) it, to workers generally, at a fair rent, giving to the tenants security of tenure and the right to their own improvements."

That the Society's views both on the question of principle, and of practical application, should thus receive the endorsement of an Association aiming at the direct representation of Labour in Parliament, on a far more extensive scale than has hitherto been attempted, is a noteworthy fact. There is solid ground for believing that Land Nationalisation will become a test question at the next General Election in every constituency where organized working men preponderate. To the energetic efforts of Mr. T. R. Threlfall, Secretary of the Labor Electoral Association, is largely due the satisfactory progress recorded in this section of the Society's Report.

On learning that a Committee of the House of Commons had been appointed (in March) to consider the subject of Small Holdings, steps were taken by the Executive to provide that evidence by representatives of this Society should be tendered thereat.

The following gentlemen kindly placed themselves at the Society's disposal: the Rev. Arnold Taylor, Rector of Church-Stanton, Devon, and Mr. Chas. Wicksteed, of Kettering, who are intimately acquainted with the needs of English agricultural laborers; the Rev. Dr. Pan Jones, of Mostyn, North Wales, and Mr. J. Mc G. Ross, J.P., of Alness, Ross-shire, who are eminently qualified to give valuable evidence as to the needs of Wales and Scotland.

The abstracts of their evidence were in course of preparation *in response to a request* from the Small Holdings Committee, when to their astonishment and regret the Executive received the following letter from Mr. Gray, its Secretary: "I am directed by the Committee to inform you that they have already called a large number of witnesses before them, and that they do not feel justified in calling upon your Society to give evidence before them."

LAND NATIONALISATION ABROAD.

In the United States and in the British Colonies the movement continues to make headway, but it is an especially noteworthy fact that during the past twelve months Land Nationalisation Associations have been founded in Germany, France, and Switzerland, and have already begun to make their power felt. The sentiment expressed in debate by a member of the great Council of Basel will be endorsed by an increasing number of

land-reformers: "Our territory is so small that we ought not only to avoid selling away a single yard of it, but we ought, on the contrary, to be taking steps to acquire the *whole* of it as the undeniable property of the whole community.

In concluding this Report, the Executive appeal to all those who realise how rapidly the question of Land Nationalisation is becoming one of practical politics, to associate themselves with the Society in its work. There is unquestionably a vast number of sympathisers in the country who have not yet been brought into touch with this Society, or with any other organization holding principles in common with it. To these it is pointed out that the minimum annual subscription necessary to qualify for membership of the Land Nationalisation Society is *One Shilling*, and that the numerical strength of the Society is of scarcely less importance than the maintenance of its funds.

— BRANCHES. —

Edmonton	-	-	-	Hon. Sec.,	MR. E. WELLAND.
Ffestiniog	-	-	-	"	MR. J. HUGHES.
Hackney	-	-	-	"	MR. F. W. FLEAR.
Neath	-	-	-	"	REV. J. EDWARDS.
Swaffham	-	-	-	"	MR. R. PETCH.
Swansea Valley	-	-	-	"	MR. J. D. OWEN.

During the year MR. GEORGE PORTEOUS, of Dalkeith, has been added to the list of District Honorary Secretaries.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE FROM MAY 1ST, 1888, TO MAY 31ST, 1889.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
May 1st, 1888.							
To Balance brought forward ...	114	17	8		53	14	11
Contributions ...	225	15	0		11	7	8½
Literature sold ...	7	17	2		36	5	0
					15	0	0
					4	4	1
					6	12	10½
					1	13	11
					20	12	11½
					5	3	0
					9	13	4
					4	7	6
					3	3	0
					6	11	7½
					169	19	11
					348	9	10

Examined and found correct, { (Signed) H. G. COOPER,
HERBERT G. MOBERLY.

13th June, 1889.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

SMALL HOLDINGS FUND.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE TO MAY 31ST, 1889.

	£	s.	d.
A North Briton, per Dr. A. R. Wallace	500	0	0
By Fees to Lecturers for 121 Lectures	110	13	6
" Expenses for do., viz.: hire of Rooms, printing and circulating Bills, Advertising, etc. ...	171	1	5
" Printing Tracts and Leaflets for circulation ...	36	2	1
" Postage of Letters and Parcels, and Telegrams ..	10	6	5
" Secretary's Salary, 7½ months (moiety) ...	16	5	0
" Rent of Office (additional) ...	12	5	0
" Office Expenses (hiring, lighting and housekeeper) moiety ...	4	4	1
" Balance carried forward ...	139	2	6
To Balance brought forward ..	£500	0	0
Examined and found correct, ..	139	2	6
Total	£500	0	0

Examined and found correct, { (Signed) H. G. COOPER,
HERBERT G. MOBERLY,

13th June, 1889.

SUBSCRIPTIONS & DONATIONS.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
A North Briton ...	500	0	0	"D.N.F." ...	25	0	0
Allord, Rev. J. D. ...	0	5	0	Day, W. ...	0	5	0
Angus, G. ...	0	5	0	Deacon, H. ...	1	1	0
Ashton, J. ...	0	5	0	"D. G. H." (M.D.) ...	0	5	6
Bailhache, C. M., B.A. ...	1	1	0	Dines, C. ...	0	2	0
Baker, W. L. ...	0	5	0	Domoney, P. R. ...	0	5	6
Bade, H. J. ...	0	5	0	Downar, G. F. ...	0	2	0
Farclay, Miss I. ...	0	2	6	Dougherty, J. ...	0	5	0
Barnett, F. G. ...	1	1	0	Dodd, T. R. ...	0	5	0
Bartlett, G. ...	0	2	0	"D. J. G." ...	0	4	0
Bell, Alf. ...	0	2	6	Dyke, Rev. T. G. ...	0	6	0
Bennett, F. J. ...	0	10	0	Dunbobbin, S. ...	0	1	0
Beeston Liberal Association	0	10	0	Earp, O. B.A. ...	0	10	0
Ridwell, R. S. ...	0	2	6	Elliot, T. H. ...	0	10	0
Birchall, Rev. O., M.A. ...	0	17	0	Erwood, S. A. ...	0	5	0
Bishop, A. ...	1	0	0	Evans, Rev. D. ...	0	5	0
Bishop, R. J. ...	0	2	6	Featherstone, Miss E. ...	0	3	0
Black, Rev. J. W., M.A. ...	0	1	0	Ffestiniog Branch ...	0	10	0
Blakie, T. ...	0	3	0	Fitzgerald, D. G. ...	2	0	0
Bloomfield, A. C. ...	0	1	0	Flear, F. W. ...	0	10	0
Bolton, W. ...	0	1	0	Freeman, F. ...	0	7	6
Boxer, E. ...	0	1	0	Freeman, Rev. W. ...	0	5	0
Boyle, A. ...	1	10	0	Frost, R. J. ...	0	1	0
Brazier, A. ...	0	2	6	Genmell, G. ...	0	2	0
Brent, J. ...	0	1	0	Gerrie, G. ...	0	5	0
Broadberry, A. E. ...	0	1	0	Girdlestone, E. D., B.A. ...	1	1	0
Brown, Jas. ...	0	9	0	Gooch, F. ...	0	2	6
Brown, J. A. ...	1	0	0	Gould, E. ...	0	5	0
Brownlee, J. M. ...	0	1	0	Green, R. ...	0	2	0
Burke, L. J. ...	0	1	0	Griffiths, T. C. ...	0	2	6
Cameron, T. ...	0	2	6	Hamel, E. B. ...	0	10	6
Chandler, Mrs. ...	1	0	0	Hamson, J. ...	0	5	0
Chandler, J. H. ...	0	1	6	Hamilton, Mrs. M. ...	0	2	0
Chapman, Dr. ...	0	5	0	Haley Meeting ...	0	9	6
Clark, H. ...	0	1	0	Harsley, F. W. ...	0	2	0
Cooke, W. H. ...	0	1	0	Hainsworth, J. ...	0	1	0
Cooper, H. G. ...	0	2	6	Harris, G. E. ...	0	1	0
Cotton, Mrs. ...	1	1	0	Harrison, J. ...	0	5	0
Couper, R. M. ...	0	3	0	Hexham Liberal Association	0	15	0
Coverney, Miss K. ...	0	5	0	Higgins, J. ...	0	2	6
"C.H." (A Friend) ...	0	5	0	Hills, W. ...	0	1	0
Crichton, D. ...	0	5	0	Holden, I., M.P. ...	2	1	0
Cobden-Sanderson, T. J. ...	1	1	0	Hole, Jas. ...	0	10	0
Contributions per Dr. Pan Jones ...	0	8	6	Holyoake, G. J. ...	0	1	0
Contributions per T. R. Threlfall ...	0	11	6	Homan, J. ...	5	5	0
Culpin, G. F. ...	0	2	6	Hood, Rev. A. ...	0	1	0
Dagley, W. T. ...	0	2	6	Hull, Miss H. ...	0	2	6
Daniell, Mrs. M. M. ...	0	5	0	Hyder, J. ...	1	3	6
Davies, E. ...	0	1	0	Inglis, A. ...	0	0	6
Davis, W. H. ...	0	2	6	Inman, E. ...	0	1	0
Davis, J. W. ...	0	1	0				

Carried forward £ 564 5 6

SUBSCRIPTIONS & DONATIONS—Continued.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Brought forward	564	5	6				
Jackson, Spencer	1	0	0	Payne, A. W.	0	10	6
Jameson, W.	0	5	0	Perkins, C. H.	0	5	0
Jameson, Mrs. W.	0	2	6	Phillips, J. H.	0	1	0
Jenkinson, J.	0	1	0	Phillips, S. E., F.C.S.	0	3	0
Johnston, T.	1	0	0	Pontis, Mrs. R.	0	2	6
Jones, Rev. E. Pan, Ph.D.	0	10	0	Porteous, G.	0	2	6
Jones, Rev. M.D.	1	0	0	Portbury, W.	0	1	0
Jones, T.	1	1	0	Potter, A.	0	1	0
Kemp, C.	0	1	0	Prudhoe Liberal Association	0	5	0
Kettering Meeting	0	6	0	Pyott, J.	0	2	6
Kitchener, H. W.	0	2	6	Ralphs, E.	0	2	0
Kitson, W.	0	2	6	Ratcliff, Rev. W. H., M.A.	0	5	0
Knight, G. J.	0	5	0	Ratcliffe, F.	0	1	0
Knott, G.	0	1	0	Reed, T.	0	2	6
Knowlton, J.	0	1	0	Rees, E.	0	10	0
Kurtz, A. G.	1	0	0	Reeve, D'Arcy W.	10	0	0
"A Lady"	0	2	0	Reynolds, G.	1	0	0
Lacy, G.	1	1	0	Reynolds, F.	0	5	0
Livesey, J. T.	0	1	0	Reynolds, A. E.	0	10	0
Lewis, A.	0	2	6	Reynolds, A. J.	0	10	0
Linde, Mrs. L.	0	2	0	Reynolds, C.	0	10	0
Linde, T., M.D., D. Sc.	0	1	0	Reynolds, W.	0	10	0
Lindsay, Miss E.	0	5	0	Richards, W.	0	3	0
Lindsay, T. E.	0	2	6	Rigby, T. A.	0	10	0
Marfleet, C.	0	2	6	Robinson, J. J.	0	5	0
Martins, Mrs. A. Blunden	5	0	0	Rose, D.	0	2	6
Massey, C. C.	3	0	0	Ross, J. M. G., J.P.	5	0	0
Mason, A.	0	2	6	Russell, W. R.	0	1	0
Maxwell, W.	0	1	0	Ryton Literary Association	0	7	6
"M.R.R."	0	10	0	Salt, J.	0	5	0
"M.M."	0	2	6	Samuells, J. G.	0	1	0
McIlraith, J. R., M.A., LL.B.	0	2	0	Schofield, T.	0	1	0
Melladew, T.	0	7	6	Scott, Rev. T. W.	0	5	0
Merck, E.	0	2	6	Shaftoe, S.	0	2	6
Mellor, J.	0	2	6	Sherlock, Rev. T. T., B.A.	0	2	6
Miller, R.	2	0	0	Shinner, W. J.	0	5	0
Mitchell, J.	0	5	0	Smallman, C.	0	1	0
Moberly, H. G.	1	0	0	Soul, E. M.	0	1	0
Monteith, J. A.	0	2	6	Soper, F. L., F.L.S.	15	15	0
Mousley, G.	0	2	6	Souter, W. J.	0	1	0
North Branch of the L.N.S.	0	5	0	Southampton Reform Hall			
Newbould, C.	0	2	6	Trustees	3	3	0
Newcastle Liberty Club	0	3	9	Spensley, Rev. W.	0	10	0
Newmarket Meeting	0	6	3	Squirrell, M.P.	0	10	0
Newman, Professor F. W.	12	2	0	Starling, S.	0	1	0
Nicholson, A.	0	10	0	"Scotsman"	0	5	0
Ogilvy, A. J.	35	0	0	Sumner, S.	0	1	0
Olliff, W.	0	2	0	Swansea Valley Branch	0	7	6
O'Toole, J.	0	2	6	Swaffham Branch	0	14	0
Owen, H. J.	0	1	0	Swinton, A. C.	5	0	0
Owen, R.	0	10	6				
Pagliardini, T.	0	10	0	Carried forward	£685	19	6

PUBLIC MEETING.

After the meeting of members a public meeting was held, and there was a large attendance. The Hon. Secretary referred to letters of regret for absence from Miss Helen Taylor; Mrs. S. Bryant, D.Sc.; Earl Compton; Sir George Trevelyan, M.P.; Sir Walter Foster, M.P.; Sir Robert Head; Mr. Firth, M.P.; Mr. R. C. Graham, M.P.; Professor F. W. Newman; Rev. W. Tuckwell, M.A.; Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, M.A.; and Mr. G. J. Holyoake.

The President, who was received with cheers, then gave an Address, as follows:—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

Our Report, which you have just heard read, sufficiently shows that the past year has been both an eventful and a successful one in regard to the progress of our movement. But there are many other matters, of more general interest, which point in the same direction, and to which I propose to call your attention.

Even our present very conservative legislators have felt themselves compelled to do something—or rather, to make believe that they are going to do something—in the way of land-law reform. I allude especially to the various Select Committees they have appointed—on Small Holdings, on Town Holdings, and quite recently, on Woods and Forests and Land Revenues of the Crown. We do not for a moment suppose that these Committees will lead to any important or useful results in the way of legislation, but they will certainly, in their Reports and Evidence, furnish us with much valuable materials for our unceasing warfare against the evils of land monopoly and landlordism. We have taken steps, as you have learnt by our Report, to give evidence on the “Small Holdings” Committee, and I think it would also be very important to keep an eye on the “Woods and Forests” Committee, and to insist that the lands under the control of the Government should be utilised for the benefit of the people in the manner we advocate. We must also urge our friends in Parliament to protest vigorously against any proposal to alienate these lands—a proposal which is almost certain to be made on the ground of the comparatively small revenue they now produce. The practice of all recent governments, Liberal and Tory alike, has been to take every opportunity of bartering public rights over land for hard cash, and this practice must be stopped.

In Ireland we have had the "Ashbourne Act" put in force on a more extended scale; and this Act, though utterly wrong in principle, as creating a new body of landlords with every power to oppress which the old ones possessed, yet affords us a clear and practical illustration of how easy it would be to acquire the land for the whole people instead of for a small section of it. As an example of this I may mention a case given in the *Times* newspaper of Nov. 19th last year. An estate, the reduced rental of which was £280 a year, was sold to the tenants under the "Ashbourne Act," the tenants paying only £180 a year for 49 years, and then becoming freeholders of their farms. These tenants have thus had their rents reduced more than 35 per cent., and in addition will have the land presented to them at the end of 49 years! Never was there a more unjust, absurd, and quixotic proceeding. If they can pay this reduced rent for 49 years it may be fairly assumed that it is a fair and even a low rent—or if not it could be reduced a little more; but why give these particular tenants the land, to the exclusion of all other Irishmen, living and unborn? If landlords, under a government guarantee, are willing to sell on such terms as these, the whole community should benefit by it—not the few who happen to be tenants of these particular landlords at this particular time. As one iniquitous result of this "Act," some of the great City Companies have sold their Irish Estates and pocketed enormous sums of money. These estates were originally granted for public purposes, and their revenues properly belong to this metropolis as a whole, and it is a great scandal that both the public and the metropolis should be deprived of all share in them by a few obscure private individuals forming close corporations. Never till quite recently, under pressure of public opinion and fear of being called to account for their stewardship, have these corporations used any portion of their vast wealth for the benefit of the community.

Another Government enquiry, though not directly on the land question, has an important connection with it—the Lords' Commission on the Sweating System. I will just call your attention to the evidence of one of the factory inspectors, Mr. Lakeman, who stated that "the work of the country was gradually becoming monopolised more and more by large men, who were becoming larger and larger, while the small men were becoming smaller and smaller;" and, as one of the results of this ever-increasing monopoly, men were working 18 hours a day for a pound a week. This statement of Mr. Lakeman is supported by an article in the *Daily News* of September last, which states that millionaires are steadily increasing, and that during the preceding year four estates had paid probate duty on an aggregate of 9½ millions sterling; and this only includes the *personal* property

of the deceased, who might have had landed property to an equal or even greater amount.

One of these recent millionaires was Mr. Rylands, of Manchester, whose firm, in its various factories, employed nearly 12,000 workers—the surplus profits of whose labour, beyond a bare subsistence for themselves, all went into the pockets of one family—till it was recently converted into a Limited Liability Company. Now what is the fundamental cause why one man can get so many other men to work for his benefit? It is simply the monopoly by the few of the whole land of the country! Make the land freely accessible to all, and millions of workers, now forced to labour for employers, will work for themselves and be independent of employers. They will then be able to accumulate capital, and associate together in manufacturing or other industries, ultimately becoming themselves the recipients of the millions of profit now absorbed by a few individuals. Without the power of *compelling* men to work for him by the pressure of starvation, the Capitalist will be nowhere. His capital, in money or credit, will be of little value, and though he may be able to live on it in idleness himself, he will no longer be able to accumulate millions on millions, in order that succeeding generations, in ever-increasing numbers, may live in idleness upon the labour of other men.

No doubt these Committees and Commissions will look upon this accumulation of wealth—this increase of millionaires—as a proof that all is well, and that, with a few minor reforms, we can continue to go on just as we are. They will urge on emigration as a remedy, regardless of the fact stated in the official Emigration Statistics for 1888, that, since 1851, three million two hundred and seventy-six thousand emigrants have left Ireland. And is Ireland any better off? The wholesale evictions, the perennial famine, cry aloud against this awful depopulation of a country, and afford a complete demonstration that it is no remedy for the disease—which is, simply, starvation directly caused by landlordism. Let the landlords emigrate and throw open the whole Irish land to the Irish people, and we shall at once stop both the emigration and starvation of the workers.

Another point on which our capitalist legislators are always expatiating is the improved condition of the workers, proved, they say,—(1) by diminished official pauperism; (2) by increased rate of wages. But both these alleged proofs are valueless and altogether beside the real point at issue. Diminished official pauperism is quite distinct from diminished poverty, and depends solely on the way the poor law is administered. Out-door relief is now more and more discouraged, distress being relieved by ever-increasing charitable associations; while, as we all know, many die of starvation in the midst of our wealthy cities rather than go to the workhouse. By a Parliamentary Paper just issued, it appears

that in the past year 29 persons have been declared by Coroners' juries to have died of starvation in this great metropolis. Again, the *rate* of daily or weekly wages being higher than 20 or 30 years ago, proves nothing whatever—because it is not the *nominal rate of the wages*, but the *constancy of employment* that secures the well-being of the workers. Where men were formerly engaged and paid by the week, they are now engaged and paid by the day or even by the hour, and often make less actual wages than they did formerly.

A gentleman, who has been a poor law guardian in Liverpool and has worked much among the poor, has made a careful estimate of the numbers of the *unemployed* from all available sources of information, and arrives at the startling conclusion that there are always, on the average, about *six millions*, including workers and their families, among the unemployed, most of whom have to depend on some form of charity to support life.* Then, again, we must remember that house rent is enormously dearer than it was,—that workers are often forced to live long distances from their work, and have to pay either in money or labour to reach it,—and, lastly, that though daily wages for skilled labour and exceptionally hard work have risen, yet at the same time payment for piece work in scores of trades, employing millions of city workers, has steadily decreased for many years—considering all this, we shall see the utter falsity of the statement that the condition of the workers in general has materially improved during the last 30 or 40 years.

To turn to a subject more directly affecting us.—The last year has seen the alienation of another portion of the National Domain by our landlord legislators, by means of the Glebe Act. The Glebe Lands, comprising many thousand acres all over the country, belonging to the Church—and therefore to the people—of England, are by this Act empowered to be sold, and will doubtless be sold, and bought at low rates by adjacent landlords. Some few liberal and independent clergymen have let out their glebe land to labourers with excellent results, but it requires courage to do this, as it is always opposed by the surrounding landlords and farmers. The Rev. Mr. Tuckwell, of Stockton, in Warwickshire, has thus utilised a glebe farm of 200 acres, giving the labourers security of tenure for 14 years, and the land at a fair rent, with the most satisfactory results. It is stated in the *Daily News* of September 11th, 1888, that most of the labourers with two acres of land, grow bread and potatoes for their families the whole year round, in addition to providing food for a pig, and this only by utilising the spare time of the family. This makes all the difference between wretchedness and comfort for the labourers; and as they are better fed they are able to give a better day's work to their employers. One old man of 70 lives wholly on his

* "Poverty and the State," by Herbert V. Mills—p. 73.

allotment of four acres. The landlord apologists and newspaper writers keep reiterating, over and over again, that with present prices of corn labourers *cannot* cultivate land at a profit, and that to offer it them is to tempt them to their ruin. But here, and in every other case without exception in which the experiment has been fairly tried, they *do* make it pay, and even old men of 70 find no difficulty in living, by their labour, on the land. The secret of this is, the care and minute attention of the labourer working for himself. These men grow 40 bushels of wheat to the acre, the farmer's average being barely 30: while potatoes, beans, and other crops are equally good. Have we not a right, then, to demand, both in the interest of the labourers and of the whole community, that all who wish it shall have land, when the result of so employing the land is, to give an increase in the food production of the country of full 30 per cent., to diminish and ultimately to abolish pauperism, while the increased earnings of these men would almost all be spent in home manufactures, and do more to revivify our trade than any extension of our markets among savage tribes.

In the same newspaper of September 1st, 1888, there is an account of allotments in Lincolnshire, where the men pay £3 an acre for good land, and make on the average £16 an acre profit. Though these allotments have been let for many years there has never been a default of rent, which is paid six months in advance. Now these two cases of the effects of allowing labourers to have land, are in addition to all those given by myself and others, and especially by Mr. Impey in his excellent little books, and they demonstrate as a fact that labourers are enormously benefited by having land on reasonable terms—and, if *they* are benefited the whole country is benefited to a still greater extent, by the decrease of pauperism, by the increased demand for our manufactures, and by the increased happiness and contentment of our people.

In connection with this subject, I wish to call special attention to one of the most remarkable and valuable little books of the day—Mr. H. V. Mills' "POVERTY AND THE STATE." Mr. Mills has had practical experience of the working of our poor-law system, and of the various efforts that have been made to relieve distress and find work for the unemployed. He shows that every attempt that has been made to help the workers, by opening workshops of various kinds and providing materials for them to work upon, has failed, for the uniform reason that the products of their labour could not be sold, and, gradually accumulating, the experiment had to be given up. And he explains that the reason of this is that all goods that can be made and sold at a profit are already made by capitalists and employers of labour. Besides, you can only employ a few classes of men in this way. You cannot open shops for

every trade in the kingdom, yet we know that men of every trade are often without work and become paupers.

Mr. Mills had his plan suggested to him by finding in Liverpool, first, a baker out of work: then, next door to him, a shoemaker out of work; and next door again, a tailor in the same condition. Neither of them but wanted shoes, and clothes, and bread; yet under our present social arrangements they could not supply each other's wants, but, becoming paupers, would have to be supported in idleness by the community. Some of our great Unions have from 4,000 to 5,000 paupers to provide for, and among these will of course be found men and women of all trades pretty nearly, on the average, in the same proportion as they exist in the whole community. Now, 4,000 persons require 4,000 suits of clothes a year, and here is work for a certain number of Spinners and Weavers, Tailors and Hatters, Stockingmakers, Shoemakers, Tanners, and Dressmakers. The same 4,000 require breakfasts, dinners, teas, and suppers every day in the year. Here is work for Cooks and Kitchen-maids, for Farmers and Gardeners, for Milk-maids and Dairy-maids, for Bakers and Fruit-preservers. He proposes, then, that instead of the 4,000 paupers living in idleness (or employed on unproductive labour) at the cost of the community, they shall cultivate about 2,000 acres of land under proper supervision, and shall produce almost everything they need, and consume almost all that they produce. He shows that by properly proportioning the various kinds of stock kept on this farm—sheep, cattle, horses, and pigs—ample food and clothing could be produced to supply all their *wants* and many *comforts* by only four hours' labour a day. Things that could *not* be produced on the farm, as sugar, tea, raisins, spices, and a few other articles, would be purchased by the sale of surplus produce—but the produce sold would always be the kinds now largely imported from abroad, and the sale of which would not compete with other English producers. Butter, cheese, bacon, wheat, eggs, and beef are such products, the price of which is determined by the foreign supply. Mr. Mills goes into the details of his scheme, and his results are supported by the experience of the industrial colonies of the Netherlands which he visited, and of which he gives a most interesting account, for which account alone his book is worth purchasing. In these colonies many thousands of men, women, and children are self-supporting, and live in comfort; and this although everything is done in the most primitive manner and labour-saving machinery is rigidly excluded. The reason of this exclusion is, that otherwise it would not be possible fully to employ the inmates without raising too much surplus products, the sale of which would compete injuriously with that of the outside community.

Mr. Mills, on the other hand, proposes that every kind of labour-saving machinery should be employed, and that the time thus

saved should be given to education, to amusements, and to private work for the individuals' benefit. One of the most remarkable facts brought out by the inquiry is, that the necessary land could be purchased, together with tools, machinery, live stock, and a stock of food till the first crops came in, for a sum equal to two years' poor rates. That is, by paying two years' poor rates we should altogether abolish them for the future, rendering not only our paupers, but all the unemployed who are liable to become paupers, altogether self-supporting. This will perhaps seem incredible; but if we consider the fact that an old man of 70, with his wife, can wholly support themselves by working on four acres of land, with no help from machinery, and with all the difficulty of finding a market for that portion of their produce they are obliged to sell, we shall see the probability, that on the large scale needed by a community of 4,000 persons, with all the aid of machinery and the best agriculture, the result Mr. Mills describes might be attained, while the first cost is a matter of comparatively simple calculation in which a practical farmer, as he is, is hardly likely to be mistaken.

It will be a disgrace to the country if this plan is not fairly tried; and if successful, as I have the greatest confidence it will be, it will afford a crowning demonstration of the vital necessity of the people having free access to, and the full control of the land of their country; because it will prove that poverty and want of work are wholly landlord-created, and that, whether as individual independent workers or in *co-operative association*, our labouring classes, if permitted, can support themselves upon the land.

Mr. Mills' most instructive and suggestive book can be obtained of Kegan Paul for one shilling, and without approving of all his methods, except for paupers, I strongly recommend our members to read it, and to do their best to influence public opinion to have the scheme fairly tried.

I have now only to notice briefly one or two other public matters bearing upon our subject.

Only last week in Cornwall we had Mr. Gladstone discussing the system of *life-leases* prevalent there, as in Wales and in some other parts of the country. He characterised this as "the worst system he could conceive;" he stated, what we all know so well, that there could be no "free contract" in this case between the poor miner wanting a home and the wealthy lord of the soil. He declared that the matter "deserves the attention of the legislature," and trusted that the House of Commons would find a remedy for the present state of things.

If Mr. Gladstone were a younger man, and had not his life's work already cut out for him, he would surely see that a system of property which again and again requires the interference of the legislature to prevent the seller from oppressing the buyer, must

be an unsound system. He himself had to interfere between the Irish tenant and his landlords. The Tory government interfered a little bit—or rather pretended to interfere—between the English tenant and landlord by their “Compensation for Disturbance Bill,” their “Hares and Rabbits Bill,” and another special “Preservation of Hares Bill.” they now have in hand; the town tenants are to be soon protected from the landlords by the “Leasehold Enfranchisement Bill,” and now I suppose we shall want a “Life Leaseholders Relief Bill.” We want no such laws to interfere between buyers and sellers of wheat or cotton, of beef or boots, or of any other commodity whatever, the simple reason being that other commodities are not of the same nature as land, are not such complete monopolies, are not so absolutely essential to existence, and are therefore subject to “free contract,” which land is not and never can be.

Another indication of the same principle is afforded by the last fad of a landlord government, the establishment of a “Board of Agriculture;” of course with well salaried officials paid by the people. Now why does agriculture want a “board” rather than cotton spinning, or iron founding, or ship building? Simply because these latter industries are subject to free competition, while the former is and always has been bound and trammelled by landlord interests and landlord restrictions. while the agriculturist himself has never been free to work out his own ideas and has never had his self-interest aroused in favour of improvement by absolute security for his own outlay. It is landlord-despotism alone that cries out for a “Board of Agriculture,” to remedy the evils caused by its own blindness, ignorance, and cupidity. What a satire it is on British Agriculture under landlordism, that the poor, ignorant, down-trodden, agricultural labourer, whenever he gets a bit of land to do what he likes with, produces from it heavier crops than the capitalist tenant farmer aided by the best scientific agriculture of the day!

What is termed scientific agriculture consists largely in applying artificial manures brought from the other side of the globe, to supply the waste of the rich manurial products of 40,000,000 of people with which we now pollute our rivers and keep up a full crop of zymotic diseases among our population. Give the people free access to the land; let them spread naturally over it, so that they may themselves consume its products, and return all the waste matter immediately to the soil: and not only will pauperism be abolished, but they will certainly never require the services of a Board of Agriculture.

When we consider how deeply the belief in the value, the security, and the importance of land as private property is ingrained in the popular mind—a belief largely due to its being the only means of escape for individuals from the tyranny and

injustice of landlordism—we can but wonder at the vast progress we have made, and at the decided change in the attitude of the public and the press towards us during the last few years. We can truly say—as the Liberal leader has said on another great question—that the flowing tide of opinion is with us. Self-interest, or supposed self-interest, of course keeps back that tide in the case of the wealthy classes, but we find many great thinkers among us, many of the clergy of all denominations who best know the needs of the workers, and—most important of all—we find that the thinkers among the workers themselves—and they are numerous—are becoming our fast supporters. Nothing has been more cheering to myself during the past year than the declaration of the Chairman of the Trades' Union Congress that an effective land-reform must be searching and durable, that it must in fact give the land to the people, followed by a Resolution passed almost unanimously, "that no settlement will be satisfactory short of Land Nationalisation."

Now, the great body of workers, of whom this Congress was a worthy representative, have—or will soon have—the power of directing legislation in their own hands. What they have to do for the next few years is to influence their weaker brethren in this matter, to impress upon them the vital importance of this great reform, first to themselves individually, and through them to the whole community. They must also impress upon the poorer class of voters the inviolability of the ballot, and the duty of making no promise against their conscience either to landlord, employer or customer. Then, their time will come, and when the next Liberal government has settled the Irish question in the most thorough manner, and has shortened the duration of Parliament to at most three years, they have only to make Land Nationalisation the working man's test question at the polls, and march on to assured victory (loud applause).

Mr. Walker (Birmingham) proposed the following resolution:—

Whereas the control now exercised by landlords over the land

- (1.) deprives the people of their natural right of access to the land as an alternative means of livelihood to wage service;
- (2.) enables landlords to exert a most despotic power over the rest of the community;
- (3.) deprives the nation of the revenue of the land and consequently imposes upon the people an enormous burden to meet national requirements.
- (4.) is the fundamental cause of poverty and distress, with their inevitable concomitants, vice and crime;

and whereas these evils are increasing year by year with the growth of population, and become therefore an increasing source of disquietude and danger, it is urgently needful that, at the earliest moment possible, the land of this country be brought under the direct and unrestricted control of the people.

He supported the principles asserted in that resolution with the greatest enthusiasm. The land nationalisers contended that the

whole of the land of the country must be brought under the unrestricted and direct control of the people, and that everything else asked for in amelioration of existing evils must give way to this. At present the worker was driven down by or under civilization to starvation wages. He drew two graphic pictures of the despotism exercised over our workers, and of the general happiness and brightness that would shine all round if every man and every woman had their natural and rightful share and enjoyment of "the earth and the fulness thereof," the State acting as the one landlord for the whole nation, and wisely spending the immense wealth that would then be created—wealth so great, that people were already beginning to ask what they would do with it if they got possession of the land, and it no longer made thousands of millionaires (loud cheers). As soon as ever the worker stands side by side with his fellow men of the higher classes, freed from the artificial distinctions and barriers by which he is now surrounded, a wonderful spirit of fellow-feeling and co-operation will, exclaimed Mr. Walker, with much enthusiasm, come into play, and there will be an immense increase of productive power, accompanying the acceptance of the view laid down of old by Robertus. At present we saw the labourer, by the very nature of things, unable to improve his position, and the landlord placed in arbitrary and sometimes despotic power, but directly they acknowledged the just principle of utilising for the common benefit, the fund produced by the labour of the community, class distinctions would tend to disappear, and the cultured few be gradually replaced by a cultured nation. It was the duty of all who sought the benefit of mankind, to work or do something for that day when every citizen would have his just share in that earth which God had provided for all His creatures. It would be said, "Oh! but there are the Bessemers, the Rothschilds and men of that class, they have acquired great sums of money and property; how are you going to deal with them?" He was reminded of a case in point, where he had been in a position to go through the papers of a dead millionaire, and he was curious to ascertain in what the wealth consisted, in a permanent form. Out of three-and-a-half millions, there was only £200,000 that was not directly comprised in land. There were "railways," "canals," and various other descriptions of property, all with land under them. He contended that the State should occupy the position of the one landlord to the nation. Immense sums of money become invested in mortgages, manufactories, and under the guise of the money-lender, the landlord's hand is stretched out over the workers of the land, and prevents their obtaining their legitimate share of its blessings. Just another illustration of the evils which grow out of landlordism of the soil. In Birmingham we wanted to put down a sewer for the

advantage of the community, and we had to pay £7,000 to the intervening landlords, merely for permission to do an act of public service. Why such an imposition is nothing less than blackmail. All such gross anomalies and crying evils would disappear with the State in the position of the one controlling and trustee landlord. Suppose, under such a desirable system, we wanted to put a railway down, what should we do? What do we do now? We pay compensation to every landlord along the route, and everyone opens his mouth as wide as possible. With one landlord, the occupying tenants would simply go somewhere else; their rent-producing power would go with them, and the wealth of the nation would not be lessened one atom (cheers). It was said that the *agricultural* rent of England was disappearing. Well, it might wholly disappear, and yet England, as a whole, might have its rent increased. We do not want deer forests and broad acres for fox hunting, but to produce as many happy, bright-eyed people as possible (cheers). This desirable consummation would be the inevitable result of the wise expenditure of the National Wealth for the benefit of all (cheers).

The resolution was seconded by Mr. C. Wicksteed (Kettering). He said he was "no socialist," and that there would always be "inequalities" in the community—that always there would be some spendthrifts and others saving. The question, however, was whether it was desirable, there should be a great many excessively poor and a great many excessively rich, as is the case now. It was the present ownership of land which creates excessive demoralizing poverty and excessive demoralizing wealth. Their intention was to get this wrong righted, and a good system substituted for a bad one. It was astonishing to contrast the indignation of the British people in denouncing the continuance of our national tribute of £40,000 a year in pensions with their patience under a burden of hundreds of millions, which burden Land Nationalisation will entirely remove (cheers). With reference to existing landowners, although the wrong of the present land-owning system was traceable to their ancestors, it was no less wrong, indeed it was worse, that the descendants should be increasingly rewarded (cheers). Thinking men recognize there is such a thing as unearned riches, but they don't all recognize that that means unearned poverty. Then we have the question, what does the private ownership in land involve? Under private ownership the best use to which land may be put, is not that by which men and women will lead the most useful or moral lives, but that which will enable landlords to extort the most out of them (applause). That also is an unassailable position. No moral or thinking man can resist the conclusion that we were put here on the earth to use it for our benefit, and that we were not placed here to create wealth for a number

of landlords (applause). Mr. Wicksteed went on to insist upon the necessity of security of tenure to enable the rent-paying working classes to hold possession of land, so that they could not be turned out of their little homestead so long as they paid a fair rent. Land Nationalisers must hammer away at public opinion; and in spite of all the adverse repressive influences of unrighteous power and the immorality it produced, Land Nationalisers would march forward with confidence to their ultimate triumph (cheers).

Dr. R. Macdonald, M.P., supported the resolution. He referred to the length of time occupied in bringing a question to the period of ripeness for settlement, and was glad to note that such progress was being made as the Report showed. He was sorry to say that if the Crofters got possession of their own land, they would directly become *resisters* of reform. He had letters from his own constituents, asking that the County Council should be moved in the matter, and that it should obtain Parliamentary aid in that direction. That would suit very well, he thought, if they *leased* the land of the County Council, but on no account must the County Council be allowed to part with the freehold of the land (cheers). He completely endorsed what Dr. Wallace had said, that it was wrong from every point of view that one set of men, such as the Crofters of the present day, should be given the land they now rent, and for future generations to be debarred from obtaining any. In the highlands those who had no land formed one-fourth of the population. Were these to be left out in the cold, and become paupers? The Irish who bought under the Ashbourne Act would be Tories in the next generation, fighting for the continued possession of the land. He thought Land Municipalisation should be backed up by Land Nationalisers. It would be getting in the thin end of the wedge. If they could aid the County or District Councils to get possession of the land in some way, so much the better; he did not care in what way it was done, so long as they did not let them have power to sell it (cheers).

An amendment was here sent up to the Chairman, but was ruled inadmissible and irrelevant.

Mr. A. J. Ogilvy, a Tasmanian Landowner, said, we cannot give a precise remedy, until we convince and show the people exactly what the evil is. We have to convince them as to the right and wrong of the case. We are happy to adopt any principle that will bring the land into our hands. We are not bound to any particular method, but there is one remedy which seems so simple, so unlikely to excite active hostility, that we have it put forward in "Our Proposals." What we are aiming at is already recognised to some extent in legislative enactments or Bills. The Irish Land Act, the Crofters' Act, the Agricultural

Holdings Act, the Allotments Act, contain phases of everything we want. Under the Irish Land Act the landlord is shown that he cannot "take all he can get." that excessive rent is not to be taken from the tenant, that the right of the occupier to live in decency and comfort comes before the right of the landlord to get all he can; also, that the tenant must not be evicted, except for non-payment of rent, and must be compensated for improvements. It is also shown in the Crofters' Act that if there is not land enough for the tenant to live upon, the landlord must yield it; then, in the Allotments Act, that local bodies may acquire land compulsorily and let it out for labourers. These acts, therefore, contain the germs of all that we want. Finally, in answer to the question, "what are your principles, what do you want?" we desire that these advantages should be applicable to the whole kingdom (cheers).

Mr. Soper showed how the idea embodied in the resolution could be practically carried out. What they had to do was to get rid of landlordism (cheers) and deliver the people from a state of servile dependence. He was not opposed to the taxation of land values. They had as much right to tax the land as they had to tax vans and wheels, and a great deal more reason, for vans and wheels were the product of industry, but land was not. Rent itself was a tax levied by landlords upon the people, and in taxing rent, therefore, we do but recover a portion of that which has been confiscated from us. But the taxing of rent or land values will bring but a very doubtful advantage while the landlords retain the power to tax the people. The latter will eventually pay in the form of increased rent what they now pay in taxes, while, what is most important of all, the land will be no more accessible to labour than it is now. By first abolishing the landlord control and bringing the land under the direct administration of the people, even if we continued to pay to landlords the net income they now receive, a much greater, more certain and immediate advantage could be gained. The nation, taking the gross rents and paying to landlords their net income, could secure, from various sources, a surplus of twenty millions per annum available for the immediate reduction of taxation, while the land could then, without cost or trouble, be placed at the service of labour to any extent desired in the form of allotments, crofts, or small holdings. The surplus labour of our congested towns could thus be drawn off and made productive, and our land be again dotted over with happy, prosperous rural and industrial villages. A very simple Act of Parliament, decreeing that, from and after a certain day, the Crown, on behalf of the people, would resume possession of the land, and henceforth all rent of land would be due and payable to the national exchequer, would effect this, and would not be open to the charge of confiscation or spoliation. To accomplish this—

to restore the people to the land, to give them better and happier homes, to make all labour productive—is the only effectual remedy for existing evils, the first essential step in the amelioration of the people (applause).

As Treasurer of the Society; he begged to say that they were prepared to exert themselves to carry out these objects to the utmost extent to which they would be empowered by funds placed at their disposal. Last year they had a handsome donation from Scotland of £500; and he appealed to patriotic Englishmen to show a like generosity and public spirit (cheers).

Mr. Jameson said he would not detain the meeting at that late hour, but he could not resist reference to the question which had been raised of the Housing of the People in this great metropolis. It was his firm conviction that the restoration of the national land to the people would be a practical remedy for the existing state of things (hear, hear).

The policy of the Land Nationalisation Society for the last twelve months had been chiefly to assert this one point, *i.e.*, the right of every man to secure access to the land, independently of wage-service. If the principles of the Society were carried out, instead of London and other great cities being over-crowded, there would no longer be a glut in the labour market; and, instead of the people being forced into the great centre of industry, there would be a free distribution of labour all over the country, and as a consequence there would be a cessation of the high rents, such as we are compelled to pay in London now (cheers).

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.



"However difficult it may be to embody the theory of the Nationalisation of the land in fact, equity sternly commands it to be done."—HERBERT SPENCER.

LAND NATIONALISATION

versus

LAND MONOPOLY.

Land is that which every man, woman, and child must use. From the Sovereign to the pauper, all depend equally upon the Land for food, clothing, and shelter.

Land is the natural heritage of all, like air, water, and sunshine.

Land, made by no man, yet needed by all men, is in this country, monopolised by a mere handful of the population, who can practically work their will on the rest of the community.

Land Monopoly permits, for example, 536 Peers to claim absolute possession of 15 millions of acres of the surface of these islands, (*one-fifth* of the entire area) and to abstract from the earnings of their fellow-men £13,000,000 a year in the shape of rent. Meanwhile, they themselves neither toil nor spin.

Land Monopoly originated in Fraud, and continues in Injustice.

Land Monopoly has given power to the monopolisers so to influence legislation, that their monopoly, land, which should pay the whole Government Revenue, contributes but ONE EIGHTY-FIFTH.

Land Monopoly necessitates the taxation of articles of common consumption to the extent of £44,000,000 a year, which, with all other taxation would cease, were the Land Nationalised.

Land Monopoly necessitates the importation from foreign countries of enormous quantities of food stuffs, which could be perfectly well produced at home, if our producers had fair play.

Land Monopoly is at the root of depression in trade.

Land Monopoly has created Pauperism.

Land Monopoly is the cause of the starvation rate of wages paid to so many hundreds of thousands of our workers.

Land Monopoly is the main cause of the frightful overcrowding in our towns, with its attendant idleness, drunkenness, immorality and crime.

Land Nationalisation on the other hand, would restore *equality of opportunity* to all workers, and rid the country of idlers. It would make business safe in towns, because trade-men need no longer fear the ground landlord. The *natural* increase in the value of town-land would go to diminish rates and taxes, instead of into the pockets of those who had done nothing to make that increase.

Land Nationalisation would make farming safe and profitable, because there would no longer be despotic landlords to maintain out of the farmers' capital and industry. It would give the agricultural labourer the opportunity of using (on the same terms as the farmer) as much land as he could manage.

Workers! Join the Land Nationalisation Society in its efforts to abolish those iniquitous laws which permit Land Monopoly. An annual subscription of **not less than ONE SHILLING** constitutes membership.

CONSTITUTION AND RULES

OF THE

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

I.—MEMBERSHIP.—Any person approving the principle of Nationalising the Land by equitable and constitutional means, may become a member of the Society, by subscribing annually to its funds. A Donation of five guineas confers Life Membership.

II.—MANAGEMENT.—The management of the affairs of the Society shall be vested in a General Council, an Executive Committee and Officers.

III.—ELECTION.—The General Council and the Officers (who must also be Members of the Council,) shall be elected by the Members at the Annual General Meeting. The Executive Committee shall consist of the Officers and not more than twelve Members, elected by the General Council from their own body. Vacancies, whether in the Officers, General Council or the Executive Committee, occurring between the Annual Meetings may be filled up by the General Council, who may also add to their own number.

IV.—ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.—A General Meeting of the Members shall be held annually, as soon after the end of April as practicable, when a report of the proceedings of the Society, and a Statement of Accounts for the past year, shall be presented by the Executive Committee for adoption. Twenty-one clear days before the Annual Meeting, the Secretary shall forward to each Member, with notice of the Meeting, a list of Members to be proposed as Officers and General Council. In the event of a doubtful or disputed election, a ballot shall forthwith be taken, by the direction of the Chairman, or at the request of ten Members present.

V.—SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING.—A Special General Meeting may be called by the direction of the President, the General Council, the Executive Committee, or at the written request of not less than ten Members, addressed to the Secretary, who shall then give twenty-one clear days' notice of such Meeting, with particulars of the business to be brought before the Meeting, and no other business shall be transacted at such Special General Meeting than that for which it shall have been convened.

VI.—MEETINGS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—The Executive Committee shall meet at such times and places as they may think expedient, three clear days' notice being given of each meeting. At such meetings all the affairs of the Society may be conducted, except those specially reserved for, or referred to the General Council, or General Meeting of Members by either of those bodies. Five Members shall form a quorum.

VII.—MEETINGS OF GENERAL COUNCIL.—The General Council may be convened at not less than twelve clear days' notice, by direction of the President or Executive Committee, or at the written request of five of its own Members, or at such times as the Council itself may fix. The business of the Meeting to be specified in the notice thereof. Seven Members shall form a quorum.

VIII.—BRANCH ASSOCIATIONS.—Societies may be admitted as Branches of the Land Nationalisation Society. The Executive shall have power to make and vary, from time to time, regulations for the formation or admission of such Branch Societies.

IX.—POWER OF DISASSOCIATION.—The General Council, by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the voting Members present, at a Meeting specially convened for the purpose, may disassociate from the Society, any Branch or affiliated Society, or any Member, official or not official, whose connection therewith they may deem sufficiently prejudicial to its interests.

X.—ALTERATION OF CONSTITUTION OR RULES.—No alteration, or alterations of the Society's Constitution or Rules shall take place, unless by vote of two-thirds of the Members present at a General Meeting convened for the purpose; twenty-one clear days' notice being given.

HINTS FOR HELPERS.

I.—Let everyone who sympathises with the objects of the Society become a member (minimum subscription is only one shilling).

II.—Educate your acquaintances and induce them to join.

III.—Introduce the subject to Debating Societies, and into the local newspapers.

IV.—Always carry a few suitable leaflets for distribution, and for enclosure in letters to friends.

V.—Try to get a sufficient number of members to form a Branch for united action.

VI.—The Secretary will be glad of information of interest, such as newspaper correspondence, and the names and addresses of reformers who are likely to benefit by a study of the Society's Literature.

VII.—Endeavour to organise at least one Public Meeting or Debate during the winter. The Executive will gladly send a lecturer where local friends find a room, and in some cases is prepared to defray part of the cost of the latter.

VIII.—The Secretary will be happy to receive a call from any visitor to or resident in London, who is interested in this question.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

Change of residence should be notified to the Secretary.

The literature published by the parent Society will be supplied to Branches and members at cost price.

Copies of the Society's Rules to be had on application.

REGULATION FOR BRANCHES.

I.—Branches of the Land Nationalisation Society are required to accept the general principles of the parent Society.

II.—Each Branch is expected to contribute, annually, one-fourth of its subscriptions to the parent Society.

III.—Each Branch shall furnish to the parent Society a yearly report of its proceedings and a statement of its position.

IV.—Each Branch, for every one hundred of its members, or portion thereof may elect a representative, who shall be entitled to a seat and vote on the Council of the parent Society.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

11, Southampton Street, Strand, London.

PUBLICATIONS.

Land Nationalisation: its Necessity and its Aims, by Dr. A. R. Wallace. Paper cover 11d.; Limp cloth 1s. 9d., post free.

Land for the People: how to obtain it, how to manage it, by C. Wicksteed. Paper cover 9d.

A Colonist's Plea for Land Nationalisation, (No. XXIII.) by A. J. O., of Tasmania. Paper cover 3d.

Cloth Bound Volumes of the Society's Pamphlets and Reports, each 2s.

		s. d.
I—The Land Difficulty—How shall we deal with it?	per 100	1 0
II—The Land for the People	"	1 0
III—How Land Nationalisation will benefit Household-ers, Labourers, and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	"	3 0
VI—The Why and How of Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	8 0
VII—The Land as National Property (Professor F. W. Newman)	"	4 0
VIII—How to Experiment in Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	1 0
IX—The Great Land Suit (H. Hutchinson)	"	6 0
X—Running Notes on the Pamphlet by Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., entitled "National Progress and Poverty" (Professor F. W. Newman)	"	1 8
XI—The Agricultural Question (Jas. E. Thorold Rogers)	"	1 0
XII—The Gospel of Land Nationalisation (Rev. W. R. Fletcher, M.A.)	"	1 0
XIII—Six Points of the People's Land Charter	per 1000	2 0
XIV—"Resolution" (to be proposed in New House of Commons) affirming the fundamental principle of Permanent State Sovereignty over Land, Authorities quoted	"	2 0
XV—State Tenants <i>versus</i> Freeholders (A. R. Wallace)	per 100	2 0
XVI—Note on Compensation to Landlords (A. R. Wallace)	"	1 0
XVII—Land Nationalisation <i>versus</i> Land Monopoly	per 1000	2 0
XVIII—Land Lessons from America (A. R. Wallace)	per 100	4 0
XIX—Land Nationalisation (Miss Helen Taylor)	"	2 0
XX—The Landlord Tribute of England (F. L. Soper)	"	1 0
XXI—"Resolution" in favour of Land Nationalisation (for use at Public Meetings)	"	0 6
XXII—Paupers, and the Cultivation of the Soil, Wm. Gibson Ward	"	1 0
XXIV—Trades Unionists and Land Nationalisation	per 1000	2 0
XXV—Village Politics and Cottage Farms (C. Wicksteed)	per 100	4 0
XXVI—Tax and Take—Both, by A. J. O.	"	2 0
XXVII—Our Proposals	per 1000	3 0
XXVIII—Two Impediments to Land Reform, by A. J. O.	per 100	2 0
XXIX—Land Nationalisation in Scotland, by W. Jameson	"	2 0
XXX—Hope for the Toilers	per 1000	3 0
Protest to our Fellow Citizens (Professor F. W. Newman)	"	1 0
Programmes of the Society	"	1 0
Landlords' Rights and Englishmen's Wrongs (A. McDonnell)	"	6 0
"Our Land" (F. L. Soper)	per doz.	3 0
Land'ordism—What it is, what it does, and what should be done with it (F. L. Soper)	"	2 0
"Our root of evils," a tract for to-day (Vindex)	per 100	8 0
The Year of Jubilee (by the Rev. Philip H. Wicksteed, M.A.)	"	4 0
The Right of the State to control all Monopolies of Necessary Articles	"	2 0

REPORT
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION
SOCIETY,

1889-90.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

To obtain for the **INDIVIDUAL** his right to use **LAND**.

To obtain for the **NATION** its right to the **LAND** Revenues.

REPORT
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION
SOCIETY,

1889-90.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

To obtain for the **INDIVIDUAL** his right to use **LAND**.

To obtain for the **NATION** its right to the **LAND** Revenues.

PRINTED FOR THE LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY, AND PUBLISHED BY THEM AT
THE OFFICE, 14, SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

President—

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE, LL.D., F.R.G.S., D.C.L.

Vice-Presidents—

GRANT ALLEN,
DESMOND G. FITZGERALD,
E. D. GIRDLESTONE, M.A. Oxon.,
MICHAEL FLURSCHHEIM,
HENRY HUTCHINSON,

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN,
A. J. OGILVY,
A. C. SWINTON,
Miss HELEN TAYLOR,
WILLIAM VOLCKMAN.

Treasurer—

FRANCIS L. SOPER, F.L.S.

Hon. Secretary—

H. G. MOBERLY.

Secretary—

JOSEPH HYDER.

Bankers—

LONDON AND COUNTY BANK, LIMITED, COVENT GARDEN.

Council—

REV. J. D. ALFORD.
*CLEMMENT M. BAILHACHE, LL.B.
F. GILMORE BARNETT.
H. HOOD BARRS, LL.B.
F. R. BELL, M.P.S.
REV. J. W. BLACK, M.A.
WM. BROCKIE (Sunderland).
D. BRODIE, M.D.
MRS. BRYANT, D.Sc.
T. J. COBDEN-SANDERSON.
*H. G. COOPER.
H. J. COX.
E. T. CRAIG (of Ralahine).
DAVID CRICHTON.
JOHN CROWN (Sunderland).
*G. F. CULPIN.
T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D.
HENRY DEACON
REV. T. G. DYKE.
P. R. DOMONEY (Pres. Southampton
S.B.)
OSWALD EARP, M.A.
*T. H. ELLIOTT.
REV. J. ELLIS, B.A.
*F. W. FLEAR.
GEO. GERRIE (Aberdeen).
J. T. STUART GLENNIE.
A. HALSTEAD (Harrogate).
E. B. HAMEL.
JAMES HOLE (Hon. Sec. Commons Pre-
servation Society.)
JULIUS HOMAN.
GEO. JACOB HOLYOAKE.
COUNCILLOR THOS. JONES (Newport,
Mon.).
SPENCER JACKSON.
*WM. JAMESON.

REV. E. PAN JONES, Ph.D. (Mostyn).
GEO. J. KNIGHT.
B. LUCRAFT, M.L.S.B.
*J. R. McILKRAITH, M.A., LL.B.
MRS. A. BLUNDEN MARTINO.
S. NELSON (Swaffham Branch).
R. OWEN.
J. A. PARKER.
A. W. PAYNE (Hackney Branch).
REV. W. H. RATCLIFF, M.A.
*A. J. REYNOLDS.
*W. REYNOLDS.
*W. RICHARDS.
EDGAR ROBINSON (Isle of Man).
J. Mc G. ROSS, J.P. (Alness).
J. SOWREY (Gloucester).
S. SHAFTOE (Ex-President Trade
Union Congress).
REV. T. TRAVERS SHERLOCK, B.A., C.C.
T. W. TAUNTON.
REV. ARNOLD TAYLOR, M.A.
MRS. W. TEBB.
T. R. THRELFALL, C.C. (Ex-President
Trade Union Congress).
REV. WILLIAM TUCKWELL, M.A.
(Stockton).
J. TURLE, M.D.
WILLIAM UNWIN, M.A. Oxon.
T. F. WALKER (Birmingham).
*CHARLES WICKSTEED (Kettering).
REV. PHILIP H. WICKSTEED, M.A.
GEO. O. WHITE, (Sunderland).
REV. C. FLEMING WILLIAMS (Alder-
man L.C.C.)
S. D. WILLIAMS (Sutton).
LT.-COL. A. T. WINTLE, late R.A.
*J. WOODMANSEE.

Those marked with an * and the Officers constitute the Executive Committee.

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

Held at the NATIONAL LIBERAL CLUB, JUNE 19th, 1890.

A. R. WALLACE, LL.D., D.C.L. (OXON), IN THE CHAIR.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

For the Year ending May 31st, 1890.

DURING the financial year that has just terminated, the main principle of Land Nationalisation has made such headway as cannot but be cheering to all its advocates. The Society has greatly strengthened its position, and widened its influence, and it is with much pleasure that the Executive reports on the past year's work, which has been more extensive, and it is believed, more effective than that of any previous year.

The Committee desires to express its appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the Society and to the cause by the Secretary, Mr. Joseph Hyder.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Including the Small Holdings' Fund, there was a balance in hand on May 31st, 1889, of £309 2s. 5d.; since then the total Receipts of the Society have been £387 11s. 9d., and the Expenditure £530 7s. 9d., leaving a balance in hand on May 31st, 1890, of £166 6s. 5d.

NEW MEMBERS.

There has been a very considerable accession of new members. The present year commences with a membership showing an increase of 40 per cent. upon last year's register, and, including the Branches, of more than 200 per cent. upon that of the year before. It is hoped that our members will continue to display their interest in the movement by enlisting fresh supporters. The minimum subscription, being only One Shilling per annum, should be an inducement to very many more Land Nationalisers to enhance their own and the Society's usefulness by becoming members. Apart from the pecuniary help thus rendered, there would be the moral force of a strong union, which is greatly needed in face of the powerful combination of prejudice, self-interest, ignorance, and indifference which we have to combat.

SMALL HOLDINGS FUND.

It will be remembered that the Society benefited in July, 1888, by the munificent donation of £500 from an anonymous friend. This amount, which was made a special fund for the advocacy of Small Holdings, has now been exhausted. The expenses of over 200 public meetings have been charged upon this fund in addition to the printing of nearly 250,000 suitable tracts, and a proportion of office and secretarial expenses. These facts show that the money has been expended with the greatest possible economy; and, in again acknowledging its deep obligation to the donor, the Committee earnestly hopes that the noble example of "North Briton" may be followed by some other friend of this righteous cause.

A LAND NATIONALISATION VAN.

Particularly is this needed now that a new plan of campaign is being contemplated. Much good can be accomplished in the country districts if the Society be enabled to undertake it with the necessary vigor. To this end it is considered that the most effective way will be by means of a conveyance with an organiser in permanent attendance. Frequent meetings can be held, literature can be widely distributed, branches can be established, and honorary local correspondents and rural distributors appointed. In many ways our educational object may be effectively supplemented and materially assisted by organisation, with a view to electoral action when the time comes. From the experiment which has been already made in this direction we are very sanguine of good and lasting results.

SPECIAL APPEAL.

Therefore we would particularly commend this new project as being well worthy of the special favor of reformers who recognise the tremendous importance of making the most of the time before the next general election.

LECTURES.

The year's record of Lectures surpasses that of any previous year. Altogether 152 public meetings have been held in England, Scotland and Wales, by the Parent Society alone, besides a large number under the auspices of the Branches.

The area covered by the lectures has been very extensive, including nearly every county in England and Wales, in addition to those given in Scotland. Very great interest has been shown in these meetings, and they have in most instances been extremely well attended. It is encouraging to know also that they have been carefully reported by the local press, and that thus our doctrines have obtained a still wider hearing.

The following have been the lecturers, and the number of lectures given by each:—

Miss Helen Taylor ...	19	Mr. T. H. Elliott ...	2
Rev. Joseph Ellis, B.A. ...	11	Mr. William Jameson ...	2
Rev. Dr. E. Pan Jones ...	11	Mr. Adam Brazier ...	2
Mr. C. M. Bailhache, LL.B. ...	5	Mr. F. L. Septer, F.L.S. ...	1
Mr. L. J. Burke ...	5	Mr. Joseph Hyder ...	90
Mr. Charles Wicksteed ...	4		

Besides the above, we may acknowledge the great service rendered to the cause by one of our members, the Rev. William Freeman, of Norwich, who at over 100 lectures in all parts of the country has invariably advocated Land Nationalisation on the lines of the Society.

The custom is to invite questions after the lectures, and this we think is a salutary one as tending to more fully elucidate points that might otherwise remain obscure.

In every case in which the resolution has been put it has been carried, and in every case except two by a unanimous vote. After each meeting the resolution has been forwarded to Mr. Gladstone, and to the local Member of Parliament.

The Committee gladly take advantage of this opportunity to convey its best thanks to Miss Helen Taylor, and to those other friends who have voluntarily furthered the movement by their able platform advocacy. Nor can the Committee pass unnoticed the valuable help rendered by various Liberal and Radical Associations and Clubs, and also by individuals in the important work of organising these meetings.

DEBATES.

As occasions offered, members have attended and taken part in debates upon the land question. Numerous applications have been received for literature for the use of those who were about to lead discussions on Land Nationalisation.

The attention of secretaries and members of local parliaments and general debating societies is respectfully invited to the fact that such applications will always meet with a liberal and prompt response.

BRANCHES.

Much good has been done by the Branches, and particularly by those of Hackney and Swaffham, which have been very fortunate in having as guiding spirits, men who are most thoroughly in earnest upon this question, and as able as they are zealous.

The Hackney Branch (Mr. F. W. Flear, Hon. Sec.) now has a membership of 114, and seven good meetings have been held under its auspices during the year. It is worthy of note, that the President of this Branch is an Alderman of the London County Council (Rev. C. Flenning Williams), and that three other members of that Council are Vice-presidents.

The Swaffham Branch has a smaller membership, but makes up in its activity, and by its regular monthly winter meetings, which were well reported in the local press, has kept our principles prominently before the people of East Anglia. Mr. F. R. Bell (President), and Messrs. Reuben Petch (Hon. Sec.) and Nelson, have rendered great assistance in the missioning of adjoining villages.

The desire of the Committee is to establish a system of branches throughout the country, and gratifying progress has been made in the preliminary steps during the present summer, and in the selection of rural distributors and correspondents.

LITERATURE.

Besides the necessary reprints of previous literature, an important addition has been made to the list of the Society's publications in the shape of Pamphlet No. 31. It is a reprint (by permission) of an article written by Mr. Ogilvy for the Co-operative Wholesale Society's Annual for 1890, and is entitled, "Land Nationalisation: Why we want it; what we mean by it; and how we mean to get it." A valuable tract by Mr. Ogilvy on the "Ethics of Compensation," is also in course of publication.

Dr. Pan Jones has translated several more leaflets into Welsh. The Committee have under consideration the re-publication of

Dr. Wallace's book, "Land Nationalisation: Its necessities and its aims," as the President has been good enough to present the Society with the copyright of it.

"LAND AND LABOR."

At the Council Meeting held on July 3rd, 1889, among other suggestions which were offered for the extension of the Society's influence, was one urging the importance of establishing a monthly newspaper. Steps were taken to test the opinion of the members upon the question, and to see whether the suggestion could be adopted without unduly taxing the Society's resources. The Committee having received satisfactory promises of support, decided to make the experiment, and were influenced in their decision by the generous guarantees of Mr. Spencer Jackson, Professor Newman and Mr. Ogilvy.

The title chosen for the new venture was *Land and Labor*, and the first number appeared on November 1st, 1889. The Committee desire to express their sincere thanks to Mr. Ogilvy for having undertaken the duties of honorary editor.

Since its establishment, it has been found that *Land and Labor* has clearly proved its usefulness in a number of ways, and in none more than in forming a link with our members and in strengthening their interest in the cause.

REVISION OF PROGRAMME.

For some time a Sub-Committee has been engaged upon the revision of the programme, and both the Executive Committee and the General Council have agreed to the programme as now presented to the Annual General Meeting. It is believed that our position is more distinctly defined by the revised version.

POLITICAL ACTION.

Advantage has been taken of every opportunity that has presented itself of influencing public and parliamentary opinion upon questions connected with Land Nationalisation. *The Western Australia (Constitution) Bill* seeks to alienate a vast territory in favour of a comparative handful of 43,000 colonists, who happen to inhabit Western Australia at the present time, and is utterly neglectful of the rights of all others.

The following is the text of the petition of protest which was prepared by the Committee, and which was signed by, among

others, many of the best known land reformers in the House of Commons.

1. That numbers of eminent men and political economists now admit that the "Unearned Increment" accruing to the land by the growth or direct action of the community should be secured for the community.
2. That the simplest way to secure this is for the Government of the Colony to possess the fee-simple of the land, letting it out on lease only.
3. That for want of some such system grave evils have resulted in all the Australian Colonies, such as
 - (a) All the vast yearly increase of value of the land has been needlessly sacrificed.
 - (b) Whenever the State requires land for Railways or other Public purposes, it has to buy back this land at enormously increased price, inasmuch that many desirable public works have to be left undone in consequence of this greatly enhanced cost.
 - (c) It is found that when the land is unconditionally alienated, the progress of industry is greatly impeded. Speculators buy up and withhold the building sites around the growing cities, and check the development of minerals by excessive demands for royalties; and, what is found to be worst of all, capitalists buy up vast areas before the land has acquired value, devoting it to the most primitive pastoral purposes, and withholding the land from cultivation; for a small produce which the landowner can keep all to himself is of more consequence to him than a much larger produce which he must share with other people.
4. In giving a Constitution to the only remaining portion of Australia which as yet has none, a great opportunity exists for trying the experiment of granting the lands of the New Colony to its Government in trust for its inhabitants (present and future), such lands to be inalienable.

THE IRISH LAND PURCHASE BILL.

In reference to this dangerous attempt to buttress landlordism, the following resolution was passed unanimously by the Committee and circulated through the Press:—

"That the Executive Committee of the Land Nationalisation Society unanimously protests against the Irish Land Purchase Bill, on the ground that it merely substitutes one set of landlords for another, entirely overlooking the rights of the people generally to the land, and therefore leaving untouched the evils inherent in landlordism, from which Ireland is now suffering."

Members of Parliament received a marked copy of the specially written articles which appeared in the May issue of *Land and Labor*, and steps were also taken to urge upon Members to vote for Mr. Edmund Robertson's most valuable instruction, which would vest the ownership of the lands purchased in some public authority, providing for the application of the net rents and profits thereof to public purposes, local or national, in Ireland.

NATIONAL LIBERAL FEDERATION.

Action was taken to bring Land Nationalisation under the notice of the Manchester Conference, and although it was not formally discussed, it is noteworthy that all references to it were favourably received. At that Conference, Mr. Gladstone, in speaking of the taxation of land values, said that that is "the first name which must be filled into the present outline map of Local Government." Again, in referring to the Allotment Act of 1887, he spoke of its well-known inefficiency, but commended "the good principle which it embodies.

THE PRINCIPLE OF COMPULSORY EXPROPRIATION.

This good principle Mr. Gladstone expressed as follows:—"That where, in the judgment of a competent public authority, land is necessary, then it shall be taken whether the owner desires it or not. He should receive fair compensation, but he would not be entitled to object." This principle is of the very essence of Land Nationalisation, and it is most gratifying to know that it is accepted by the Liberal Party through its most distinguished representative. All that we need now is its proper application.

LIBERAL CONFERENCE AT NORWICH.

Before the ex-Premier visited Norwich, we held a most successful series of village meetings in Norfolk, and forwarded to him a copy of the resolution which was unanimously passed at each of these crowded and representative gatherings. It is satisfactory to observe that this information was duly noted by the Liberal Chief, and that his Lowestoft speech, while making clear the fact that he does not yet understand what Land Nationalisers propose, yet showed how this question is being forced upon the consideration of Party leaders.

LAND CONFERENCES IN SOUTH LONDON.

On the invitation of the South London Liberal, Radical & Democratic Federation, the Executive appointed delegates to attend a series of conferences, at which this Society, the English Land Restoration League, The Fabian Society, The Social Democratic Federation, The Socialists' League, The Free Land League, and The Liberty and Property Defence League, were invited to express their views on "Land Nationalisation from the point of view of the working man," the object in view being eventually to formulate a scheme of Land Nationalisation to which all could give their adhesion. It was thought that these meetings were of sufficient importance to justify the issue of

special Conference Supplements of the Society's paper, *Land and Labor*, and the Executive have to express their gratitude to Miss Taylor for the special donation which she gave to meet this extra expense. At the last of these Conferences, the South London Federation presented a scheme, which, however, the majority of the delegates present could not accept without modification, and it has consequently been referred back for that purpose.

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS—THE BETTERMENT PRINCIPLE.

The shameful way in which landlord legislation of the past has exempted landlords from taxation has come to receive almost general condemnation, and the London County Council has done much to awaken the public conscience in this matter by its action in the matter of the proposed Strand Improvements. In the Bill which will empower the effecting of those improvements are clauses which, if passed, will also enable the County Council to meet their cost by levying upon the increment that will accrue to the value of the adjacent land as their direct result. The justice of such a proposal is becoming more and more recognised, and a Special Committee of the House of Commons has been appointed to collect evidence upon this point. It will be seen that the only logical deduction from the "betterment" principle when once admitted is the complete Nationalisation of the land, so that the power to appropriate unearned increment under any circumstance shall be entirely destroyed.

TRADE UNION CONGRESS AT DUNDEE, SEPTEMBER, 1889.

The Executive notes with great pleasure that this important body again declared emphatically against any land reform other than Land Nationalisation.

LABOR ELECTORAL CONGRESS.

The Secretary represented the Society at the Annual Congress of the Labor Electoral Association, which was held on April 7th and 8th, at Hanley. Our standard resolution was unanimously passed.

ELGIN AND NAIRN ELECTION.

The result of this election unmistakably marked a step forward, since Mr. Seymour Keay fought his contest chiefly on this question, and against the active hostility of men of his own party for whom Land Nationalisation was too advanced.

LAND NATIONALISATION AS PRACTICAL POLITICS.

Mr. R. T. Reid's Resolution, May 6th, 1890.

The Executive cannot but feel that one of the most cheering events of the year was the debate and division upon the resolution of Mr. R. T. Reid, Q.C., on May 6th, 1890.

The text of Mr. Reid's motion was as follows:—

"That in the opinion of this House, a measure is earnestly needed enabling Town Councils and County Councils in England and Scotland to acquire by agreement or compulsorily, on fair terms and by simple, inexpensive machinery such land within or adjoining their several districts as may in their judgment be needed for the requirements of the inhabitants."

Scotland was excluded from the terms of the resolution by the raising of a point of order, and the words "and Scotland" were therefore omitted.

Mr. Reid made an admirable and convincing speech which was a weighty indictment of the whole system of private property in land. Mr. A. H. Dyke Acland seconded the resolution, and a long and spirited debate ensued, in which, among others, Mr. John Morley strongly supported the resolution as "pointing to a solution of the land problem which was reasonable, moderate, and involved no breach of equity."

The result of the division was

Against the resolution	175
For " " "	159
Majority against	<u>16</u>

The Executive trusts that this remarkable evidence that the flowing tide is with us will induce many friends who have hitherto held aloof, because doubtful of the practicability of landlord expropriation, to give in their adhesion as supporters of the Society in its efforts to promote the restoration of all the land and all the land revenues to the people.

DIOGENES FUND.

During the year, the fighting power of Land Nationalisation has been materially reinforced by the munificence of an anonymous friend of the movement, who has, at a cost of £3000, purchased an annuity of £340 for 10 years, to be devoted to the cause. It is vested, under the name of the "Diogenes Fund," in the hands of three trustees. Out of the first instalment, the trustees forwarded £50 to the Land Nationalisation Society, which the Committee gratefully acknowledges; £50 to the English Land Restoration League; £20 to the Scottish Land Restoration League; and £20 to the "United Committee for the Taxation of Rents and Ground Values."

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE FROM JUNE 1ST, 1889, TO MAY 31ST, 1890.

	£	s.	d.
June 1st, 1889.			
To Balance brought forward ...	169		11
" Contributions ...	355		0
" Sale of Literature ...	31		9
By Rent of Office ...			32
" Office Expenses ...			11
" Office Furniture ...			2
" Secretary ...			73
" Hire of Room and Reporting ...			5
" Lectures ...			20
" Printing and Stationery ...			174
" Literature and Press Cuttings ...			13
" Contribution to Strike Fund ...			5
" Postages and Telegrams ...			47
" Advertising ...			2
" Incidental ...			1
" Balance in Treasurer's hands ...	£165		13
" Balance in Secretary's hands ...			0
			4
			13
			1
			166
			6
			5
			557
			11
			8

Examined and found correct, { (Signed) H. G. COOPER,
J. R. McILRAITH, M.A., LL.B.

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY.

SMALL HOLDINGS FUND.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE FROM JUNE 1ST, 1889, TO MAY 31ST, 1890.

	£	s.	d.
To Balance brought forward...	139	2	6
By Lectures
" Printing
	139	2	6
	139	5	1½
	7	17	4½
	139	2	6

Examined and found correct, { (Signed) H. G. COOPER,
J. R. McILRAITH, M.A., LL.B.

16th June, 1890.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Adams, J.	0	1	0	Brought forward	20	7	8
Addison, W.	0	1	0	Cain, Rev. T.	0	1	6
Aldridge, H. R.	0	2	6	Cameron, T.	0	2	6
Allen, Grant	0	5	0	Cantlow, J.	0	1	0
Amos, Rev. D.	0	1	0	Carter, R.	0	1	0
Anthony, Rev. Professor F. E., M.A.	0	10	0	Chalcraff, G.	0	1	0
Angus, G.	0	3	0	Chamerton, E.	0	1	0
Austin, W. T.	0	1	0	Clark, H.	0	1	0
Austing, G. P.	0	10	0	Clayson, H. R.	0	1	0
Back, T.	0	1	0	Conoley, C.	0	2	6
Bacon, F. J.	0	2	6	Cooke, W. H.	0	2	6
Bailey, W.	0	1	0	Cooper, H. G.	0	5	0
Bailhache, C. M., LL.B.	1	1	0	Cornell, W. R.	0	1	0
Bale, H. J.	0	10	0	Cotton, Mrs.	1	1	0
Barnett, F. G.	1	1	0	Coverney, Miss K.	0	5	0
Barrs, H. Hood, LL.B.	1	1	0	Cox, C.	0	5	0
Barrett, Professor	0	1	0	"C. G."	1	0	0
Bateson, Mrs. A.	1	0	0	Craig, E. T.	0	1	6
Bell, Alf. S. S.	0	2	6	Crichton, D.	0	5	0
Bell, F. R.	0	2	6	Cunningham, J.	0	1	6
Bennett, F. J., F.G.S.	1	0	0	Daniel, Mrs. M. M.	0	5	0
Berkeley, R.	0	1	0	Davies, H. H.	0	7	6
Birchall, Rev. O., M.A.	0	12	6	Davies, E.	0	1	0
Birtwistle, R. D.	0	1	0	Davies D. E.	0	2	6
Bishop, A.	2	0	0	Davis, W. H.	0	2	6
Bishop, R. J.	0	2	6	Davis, E.	0	1	0
Blackwell, Dr. Elizabeth	2	2	0	"D. N. E."	25	0	0
Black, Rev. J. W., M.A.	0	1	0	Dagley, W. T.	0	2	6
Blew, W.	0	1	0	Dawkins, Colonel W.	1	0	0
Bliss, A. J.	0	2	6	"D. G. H." (M.D.)	1	0	0
Bloomfield, A. C.	0	2	6	Day, W.	0	2	6
Branch at Hackney	1	0	0	Deacon, H.	1	1	0
Branch at Swaffham	1	2	8	Devlin, P.	0	4	0
Brandreth, H. S.	1	2	0	"Diogenes Fund"	50	0	0
Bolton, W.	0	1	0	Dodd, T. R.	0	5	0
Booth, J.	0	1	0	Dogherty, J.	0	2	6
Boyle, A.	1	1	0	Donaney, P. R.	0	5	0
Boxer, E.	0	2	6	Donkin, J.	0	10	6
Bradier, A.	0	2	0	Downar, G. F. (per)	0	10	0
Brent, J.	0	3	0	Downer, J.	0	1	0
Broad, J.	0	1	0	Doyle, P.	0	1	0
Broughton, W.	0	2	6	Dunbobbin, S.	0	1	0
Brown, J. A.	1	0	0	Dyke, Rev. T. G.	0	5	0
Brown, Alexander	0	2	6	"D. J. G."	0	4	0
Brownlee, J. M.	0	1	0	Earp, Oswald, M.A.	2	0	0
Bryan, Evan	0	2	6	Edwards, G.	0	1	0
Bryant, Dr. Sophie	0	10	0	Edwards, E. M.	0	5	0
Buckland, J.	0	2	6	Elliott, T. H.	0	10	0
Burke, L.	0	2	0	Elliott, J. A.	0	1	0
Burridge, J.	0	2	6	Ellis, Rev. J., B.A.	6	5	6
				Ellis, E.	0	10	0
Carried forward	20	7	8	Carried forward	115	14	8

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.—Continued.

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	115	14	8
Ellis, Edward	0	1	0
Erwood, S. A.	0	5	0
Evans, J. D.	0	1	0
Featherstone, Miss E.	0	3	0
Fitzgerald, D. G.	2	0	0
Flear, F. W.	0	5	0
Fletcher, R.	0	5	0
Flürschein, Michael	5	0	0
Forteach, L.	0	1	0
Frank, W. H.	0	5	0
Freeman, Rev. W.	0	5	0
Freeman, F.	0	7	6
Freeman, L.	0	1	0
Frost, R. J.	0	1	0
Gerrie, G.	0	5	0
Gibbon, R. W.	0	1	0
Gilshanan, J.	0	1	0
Girdlestone, E. D., M.A.	1	11	0
Glendinning, A.	0	5	0
Gooch, F.	0	2	6
Gold, A.	0	5	0
Gould, C. W.	0	1	0
Green, R.	0	2	0
Greenwood, J. A.	0	1	0
Griſſith, L.	0	1	0
Griſſby, E.	0	1	0
Gunton, Rev. C. F.	0	3	6
"H. Darbyshire"	50	0	0
Hamel, E. B.	1	0	0
Harbert, F. P.	0	5	0
Harris, G. E.	0	1	0
Hainsworth, J.	0	1	0
"H.G.R."	0	10	0
Hawke, J.	0	2	6
Higgs, G.	0	1	0
Hines, W.	0	3	6
Holah, E.	0	5	0
Holding, H. B.	0	5	0
Hole, J.	0	10	0
Holling, W.	0	1	0
Holyoake, G. J.	0	1	0
Hood, Rev. A.	0	1	0
House, W.	0	1	0
Howells, W. T.	0	1	0
Hull, Miss H.	0	2	6
Hull, J.	0	10	0
Hyder, J.	0	2	6
Innes, H. L.	0	5	0
Jackson, Spencer	10	0	0
Jameson, W.	0	7	0
Jameson, Mrs. W.	0	2	6
Jex, F.	0	1	0
Carried forward	192	15	2

	£	s.	d.
Brought forward	192	15	2
Johnston, T., C.C.	0	10	0
Jones, Rev. E. Pan	0	10	0
Jones, T., C.C.	1	1	0
Kay, W.	0	1	0
Kitchener, H. W.	0	2	6
Knowlton, J.	0	2	0
Leah, Mrs. E.	0	10	0
Lewis, A.	0	2	6
Lewis, H. A.	0	1	0
Lib. Assoc., Prudhoe	0	7	6
" " S. Oxfordshire	0	13	0
" " West Stanley	0	1	6
" " Blaydon	0	12	0
Livesey, J. T.	0	1	0
Locke, W.	0	2	6
Lockwood, H.	0	1	0
Lovitt, F.	0	4	6
Macindoe, J.	0	1	0
Mackenzie, M.	2	0	0
Macrae, Rev. David	0	5	0
Marriott, A. J.	0	1	0
Marshall, C. H.	0	1	0
Martino, Mrs. A. B.	5	0	0
Massey, C. C.	3	0	0
Matthews, J.	0	2	6
McArthur, J.	0	1	0
McCourt, J.	0	1	0
McLraith, J. R., M.A., LL.B.	0	5	0
McNiven, L.	0	1	0
McQuire, D. W.	0	1	0
Meeting at Capel Iwan	0	7	3
" " Colchester	0	7	7
" " Southampton	0	12	6
" " Acomb & Whitley	0	6	6
Melladew, T.	0	7	6
Merrifield, J.	0	2	6
"M.K.R.R."	0	10	0
Middlemiss, G.	0	1	0
Miers, Mrs.	0	5	0
Miller, R.	3	0	0
Millar, J.	0	2	6
Milbourne, Capt. T.	0	5	0
Moberly, H. G.	1	0	0
Moody, I.	0	1	0
Mortlock, G. B.	0	2	0
Morris, L.	0	1	0
Mousley, G.	0	2	6
Muir, M. M. Pattison M.A.	0	15	0
Newman, Professor F. W.	12	0	0
Nightingale, W. H.	0	5	0
Norris, G.	0	5	0
O'Donovan, J.	0	5	0
Carried forward	230	1	6

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS.—Continued.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Brought forward	...230	1	6	Brought forward	...321	6	0
Ogilvy, A. J. 50	0	0	Simpson, F. 0	2	0
O'Leary, J. 0	1	0	Smith, H. P. 0	10	0
O'Toole, J. 0	2	6	Smith, J. 0	1	0
"P. J. A." 0	5	0	Smith, Rev. A. 0	1	0
Parker, G. 0	1	0	Soper, F. L., F.L.S. 5	5	0
Parr, J. 0	1	0	Soul, E. M. 0	1	0
Pawley, G. F. 0	1	0	Sowry, J. 0	10	0
Payne, A. W. 0	5	0	Spence, J. 0	1	0
Pearce, B. 0	1	0	Squirrel, M. P., C.C. 0	10	0
Pemberton, S. B. 0	5	0	Stanley, S. 0	1	0
Petch, R. 0	1	0	Stewart, A. 0	4	0
Phillips, S. H., F.C.S. 0	5	0	Stevenson, J. W. 0	2	0
Pontis, Mrs. R. 0	2	6	Stirton, J. S. 0	1	0
Pollitt, J. E. 0	7	6	Summerhayes, Dr. W. 0	10	0
Portbury, W. 0	1	0	Strapps, M. G. 0	1	0
Porteous, G. 0	2	6	Swinburne, J. 2	0	0
Postlethwaite, W. T. 0	1	0	Swinton, A. C. 5	0	0
Powell, A. 0	2	6	Taylor, Rev. A., M.A. 1	0	0
Pugh, A. 0	2	6	Tebb, W. 2	2	0
Pyott, J. 0	5	0	Thacker, H. 0	5	0
Quick, E. 0	1	0	"T. C. S." 0	1	0
Radical Club, Windsor 0	7	0	Thomas, J. 0	1	0
" " Cambridge 0	5	0	Thomas, D. 0	1	0
" " Boro' of Hackney 0	2	6	Thomas, Rev. J. G. 0	5	0
Ratcliffe, Rev. W. H., M.A. 0	10	0	Thompson, S. 0	6	0
Ratcliffe, F. E. 0	1	0	"T. C. S." 0	1	0
Read, C. 0	1	0	Tufnail, F. 0	2	6
Reed, T. 0	2	6	Trounsen, J. W. 0	2	6
Rees, E. 0	1	0	Unwin, Wm., M.A. 1	0	0
Reeve, D'Arcy W. 30	0	0	Waite, A. 0	2	0
Reform Club, Chatham 0	10	6	Walkden, C. 0	2	6
Reynolds, G. 1	0	0	Walker, T. F. 5	0	0
Reynolds, W. 1	0	0	Walker, C. 0	3	0
Reynolds, A. J. 0	10	0	Warder, W. 0	1	0
Reynolds, A. E. 0	10	0	Warren, H. 0	2	6
Reynolds, C. 0	10	0	Waters, M. 0	1	6
Roberts, T. 0	1	0	Waterfall, Wilson, J.P. 1	0	0
Robinson, J. J. 0	5	0	Watson, C. 0	2	6
Roff, J. E. 0	1	0	Watson, H. 0	1	0
Rose, D. 0	2	6	Whittingham, T. H. 0	2	6
Ross, J. McG., J.P. 1	0	0	Wicksteed, C. 0	5	0
Russell, F. J. 0	1	0	Wicksteed, Rev. P. H., M.A. 0	5	0
Russell, W. R. 0	1	0	Wight, G. O. 0	4	0
Samuel, D. E. 0	1	0	Wilkinson, H. 0	1	0
Samuells, J. G. 0	2	6	Wilkins, J. 0	2	0
Salt, J. 0	5	0	Williams, S. D. 5	5	0
Scott, Rev. T. W. 0	5	0	Williams, Howard 0	5	0
Seaborn, A. 0	1	0	Wilson, T. 0	2	6
Service, F. W. 0	2	6	Winfrey, R., C.C. 0	2	6
Shepard, W. 0	2	0	Woodmansee, J. 0	5	0
Sherlock, Rev. T. T., B.A. 0	2	6	Wood, A. J. 0	2	6
Shinner, W. J. 0	5	0	Wood, E. 0	2	0
Simpson, R. J. 0	1	0	"W.D.A." 0	1	0
				Young, C. 0	1	0
Carried forward	...321	6	0	TOTAL	... £355	15	0

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED SINCE MAY 31st, 1890.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Robinson, E.	1	0	0	Brought forward	7	10	0
Monteith, J. A.	0	2	6	Kurtz, A. G.	1	0	0
Bines, J.	0	1	0	"D. N. F."	5	0	0
Owen, R.	0	10	6	Conoley, C.	0	5	0
Brockie, W.	0	10	0	Spensley, Rev. W.	0	2	6
Wood, B. J.	0	1	0	Moody, F.	0	1	0
Cobden-Sanderson, T. J.	1	1	0	Mitchell, J.	0	5	0
Kitson, W.	0	5	0	Nicholson, A.	0	10	0
Maxwell, W.	0	1	0	Flürsheim, M.	5	0	0
Wight, G. O.	0	10	0	Reeve, D'Arcy W.	20	0	0
Perkins, C. H.	0	5	0	Fox, W. S., C.C.	5	5	0
Uttley, S.	0	5	0	Souter, W. J.	0	1	0
Taylor, L.	0	1	0	"C. W."	1	1	0
Wilson, T.	0	2	6	Knight, G. J.	0	5	0
Richards, W.	0	3	6	Ogilvy, Mrs.	0	10	0
Miller, R.	1	0	0	Bidwell, W. T.	0	2	0
Turle, J., M.D.	0	10	0	Higgs, G.	0	1	0
Threlfall, T. R.	0	5	0	Deacon, H.	1	1	0
Smallman, C.	0	1	0	A Friend	0	10	0
Bell, F. R.	0	5	0	Ashton, J.	0	5	0
Clericus	0	10	0	Chapman, Dr.	0	5	0
Carried forward	7	10	0	TOTAL	48	19	6

LAND NATIONALISATION SOCIETY,

14, Southampton Street, Strand, London.

PUBLICATIONS.

Land and Labor: (The organ of the Land Nationalisation Society.) Monthly, One Penny. Trade supplied by G. Vickers, 172, Strand.

Land Nationalisation: its Necessity and its Aims, by Dr. A. R. Wallace. Paper cover 11d.; Limp cloth 1s. 9d., post free.

Land for the People: how to obtain it, how to manage it, by C. Wicksteed. Paper cover 9d.

A Colonist's Plea for Land Nationalisation, (No. XXIII.) by A. J. O., of Tasmania. Paper cover 3d.

Cloth Bound Volumes of the Society's Pamphlets and Reports, each 2s. 6d.

		s	d.
I.—The Land Difficulty—How shall we deal with it?	per 100	1	0
II.—The Land for the People	"	1	0
III.—How Land Nationalisation will benefit Householders, Labourers and Mechanics (A. R. Wallace)	"	2	0
VI.—The Why and How of Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	8	0
VII.—The Land as National Property (Professor F. W. Newman)	"	4	0
VIII.—How to Effect a Bill on Land Nationalisation (A. R. Wallace)	"	1	0
IX.—The Great Land Fault (H. Hutcheson)	"	6	0
XVI.—Note on Compensation to Landlords (A. R. Wallace)	"	1	0
XVII.—Land Nationalisation <i>versus</i> Land Monopoly	per 1000	2	0
XVIII.—Land Lessons from America (A. R. Wallace)	per 100	4	0
XIX.—Land Nationalisation (Miss Helen Taylor)	"	2	0
XX.—The Landlord Tribute of England (F. L. Soper)	"	1	0
XXI.—"Resolutions" in favour of Land Nationalisation (for use at Public Meetings)	"	0	6
XXII.—Pamper, and the Cultivation of the Soil (Wm. Gibson Ward)	"	1	0
XXIV.—The Land Crisis and Land Nationalisation	per 1000	2	0
XXV.—Village Politics and Cottage Farms (C. Wicksteed)	per 100	4	0
XXVI.—Tax and Tithe—Both (A. J. O.)	"	2	0
XXVII.—Our Proposals	per 1000	3	0
XXVIII.—Two Investments to Land Reform (A. J. O.)	per 100	2	0
XXIX.—Land Nationalisation in Scotland (W. Jameson)	"	2	0
XXX.—Hope for the Toiler	per 1000	3	0
XXXI.—Land Nationalisation: Why we want it; What we mean by it; and How we mean to get it (A. J. O.)	each	0	1
XXXII.—The Ethics of Compensation (A. J. O.)	per 100	1	0
Protest to our Fellow Citizens (Professor F. W. Newman)	per 1000	1	0
Programme of the Society	"	1	0
Landlords' Rights and Englishmen's Wrongs (A. McDonnell)	"	6	0
"Our Land" (F. L. Soper)	per doz.	3	0
Landlordism—What it is, what it does, and what should be done with it (F. L. Soper)	"	2	0
"Our root of evils," a tract for to-day (Index)	"	8	0
The Year of Jubilee (Rev. Philip H. Wicksteed, M.A.)	"	4	0
The Right of the State to control all Monopolies of Necessary Articles	"	2	0

FREDERICK SHAW & Co., Printers, Dockhead, London, S.E.