

ten to screen themselves by flight as soon as foreign occupation ceases to protect their tyranny.

Why this ceaseless talk of temporal independence which is but a fiction? And if it were permitted me to further explain my idea I could prove without difficulty that the Church herself, severed from the cares and perils of her temporary power, would be the greater in the eyes of the people, and her authority increased as it was purified.

But these great questions are not within our province. The domain within which I must restrict myself is that of policy, and there inevitable consequences obtrude themselves.

Well, then, if it be true that Italian unity is for France a question alike of interest and honor; if at the same time the temporal power is a permanent obstacle to this union, this power must be abolished. I do not say that it is necessary to employ the force of our arms, but that at least they shall not assist in its maintenance. It is time to put an end to this double game that is being played upon the banks of the Po and upon the Tiber.

Emancipators in the north, we cannot become subservient in the south; if it is objected that our soldiers protect the Holy Father at Rome, I respond that protection without obedience is either ridiculous, or it is oppression in disguise; if we are the defenders of the temporal power let us march upon Bologna already in insurrection, let us invade Romagna, establish the power of the Pope upon its ruins, and stifle liberty in Italian blood, that is the complement of the expedition to Rome. But if we recognize the rights of the people of Bologna by the same token we proclaim that of the Romans, and the presence of our troops that keep them in subjection is an insult to our policy.

Gentlemen, it is with genuine regret that I have heard ex-

tolled in this place the action of a French general who has placed his sword at the service of the pontifical power. I have no fear in saying that this decision will find little response from without, and that most of the old friends of this officer will experience as much sorrow as surprise at his extraordinary intention, but that which crowned the general astonishment and which caused me the utmost surprise was the affirmative sign by which the President of the Council of State made known yesterday that an authorization apparently asked for had been favorably received by the French government, and that it was permitted this officer to serve in the Pontifical army without losing his authority; therefore the statement is official; but there are moral effects greater than all administrative acts. Either the commission of this officer is absurd or it obliges him to take command of that army of mercenaries, Swiss, Germans, and Croats, who sell their blood for the Papacy, to march at their head for the conquest of Romagna and to gather from the smoking walls of Bologna the bloody laurels of Colonel Schmidt. But on that day he will have facing him the allies of France, and perhaps behind the Piedmontese lines he will find the valiant legions whom he has so often led to victory, and there he will be reduced to the alternative of resigning his command or of drawing his sword against his country.

As for myself, I demand of the government that it cease those many equivocations unworthy of a nation like France, and that it put an end to the misunderstandings which are the direct consequence of a policy of liars and turncoats unacceptable to the country.

[Special translation by Mary Emerson Adams.]

WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE

THE RIGHT HON. WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE, great British statesman, financier, orator, and author, was born at Liverpool, England, Dec. 29, 1809, and died at Hawarden Castle, Wales, May 19, 1898. His father was Sir John Gladstone, a Scottish baronet and well-known merchant in Liverpool. His distinguished son was educated at Eton, and at Oxford, where he graduated in 1831 with high honors, and early manifested at the Oxford Union Debating Society his remarkable gifts as a debater and orator. Two years later he passed from the mimic Parliament to the greater one at Westminster, where he was, ere long, to take a memorable part in the political history of his country. He entered political life as a Conservative, and, winning the notice of Sir Robert Peel, became a junior lord of the Treasury, and in 1835, for a brief period, Under-Secretary for the Colonies. As a "Peelite," he held later the offices of Master of the Mint and president of the Board of Trade, and was sworn a member of the Privy Council. In 1845, he succeeded Lord Stanley (afterward Earl of Derby) as Secretary of State for the Colonies, and in 1847, on his representing Oxford University in Parliament, his political convictions underwent change, for abandoning Toryism he became a Liberal, while at the same time developing his gifts as a Parliamentary debater and great authority in finance. In the Aberdeen administration, and subsequently in that of Lord Palmerston, he held the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in 1858-59 undertook a special mission to the Ionian Islands to arrange some matters prior to their cession to Greece. In 1859, he was chosen rector of Edinburgh University, and in 1865, on the death of Palmerston, he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in Lord John Russell's ministry and leader in the Commons. After Mr. Disraeli's defeat (on Mr. Gladstone's resolutions in regard to the disestablishment of the Irish Church), his great Liberal adversary, in 1869, became for the first time Prime Minister. Mr. Gladstone held the premiership until 1873, during which he carried through the House much useful legislation, but suffered overthrow and retired from Parliament, giving place to the Disraeli administration. In the interval Mr. Gladstone was engaged in ecclesiastical controversy, during which he published his wrathful brochure on "The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance." In 1880, "the great Parliamentary hand" and his chief Liberal followers regained office, though harrassed by distress and sedition in Ireland, and by the embarrassments of the Egyptian war. In 1885, the Liberals were defeated and resigned, but in a few months Mr. Gladstone was again reinstated in office, when he introduced his Irish Home Rule Bill, which again brought defeat and resignation. He was, however, once more returned to power in 1893, though the Home Rule Bill was thrown out, and in the following year Lord Rosebery became Premier, and Mr. Gladstone, feeling the burden of years and the long strain of office, withdrew forever from the arena of his triumphs and defeats. Whatever may be thought of the "grand old man's" Irish policy or the few mistakes he made in legislation, there are few who would question the purity of his motives, the beneficence of his acts, or the lofty elevation of his character. His pen continued to be his solace in retirement, until his death in his ninetieth year. His chief writings embrace: "The State in Its Relations with the Church," "Studies on Homer," "Juventus Mundi," "Gleanings of Past Years," "The Impregnable Rock of Scripture," and "A Chapter of Autobiography."

(420)

ON DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DELIVERED AT WEST CALDER, NOVEMBER 27, 1879

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN,—In addressing you to-day, as in addressing like audiences assembled for a like purpose in other places of the county, I am warmed by the enthusiastic welcome which you have been pleased in every quarter and in every form to accord to me. I am, on the other hand, daunted when I recollect, first of all, what large demands I have to make on your patience; and secondly, how inadequate are my powers and how inadequate almost any amount of time you can grant me to set forth worthily the whole of the case which ought to be laid before you in connection with the coming election.

To-day, gentlemen, as I know that many among you are interested in the land and as I feel that what is termed "agricultural distress" is at the present moment a topic too serious to be omitted from our consideration, I shall say some words upon the subject of that agricultural distress and particularly because in connection with it there have arisen in some quarters of the country proposals which have received a countenance far beyond their deserts to reverse or to compromise the work which it took us one whole generation to achieve and to revert to the mischievous, obstructive, and impoverishing system of protection. Gentlemen, I speak of agricultural distress as a matter now undoubtedly serious. Let none of us withhold our sympathy from the farmer, the cultivator of the soil, in the struggle he has to undergo. His struggle is a struggle of competition with the United States. But I do not fully explain the case when I say the United States. It is not with

the entire United States, it is with the western portion of these States—that portion remote from the seaboard; and I wish in the first place, gentlemen, to state to you all a fact of very great interest and importance, as it seems to me, relating to and defining the point at which the competition of the western States of America is most severely felt. I have in my hand a letter received recently from one well-known and honorably known in Scotland—Mr. Lyon Playfair, who has recently been a traveller in the United States and who, as you well know, is as well qualified as any man upon earth for accurate and careful investigation. The point, gentlemen, at which the competition of the western States of America is most severely felt is in the eastern States of America. Whatever be agricultural distress in Scotland, whatever it be, where undoubtedly it is more felt in England, it is greater by much in the eastern States of America. In the States of New England the soil has been to some extent exhausted by careless methods of agriculture, and these, gentlemen, are the greatest of all the enemies with which the farmer has to contend.

But the foundation of the statement I make, that the eastern States of America are those that most feel the competition of the West is to be found in facts,—in this fact above all, not only they are not in America, as we are here, talking about the shortness of the annual returns and in some places having much said on the subject of rents and of temporary remission or of permanent reduction. That is not the state of things; they have actually got to this point that the capital values of land, as tested by sales in the market, have undergone an enormous diminution. Now I will tell you something that actually happened, on the authority of my friend Mr. Playfair. I will tell you something that has happened in one of the New England States,—not, recollect, in a desert

or a remote country,—in an old cultivated country and near one of the towns of these States, a town that has the honorable name of Wellesley.

Mr. Playfair tells me this: Three weeks ago—that is to say about the first of this month, so you will see my information is tolerably recent,—three weeks ago a friend of Mr. Playfair bought a farm near Wellesley for \$33 an acre,—for £6 12s. an acre,—agricultural land, remember, in an old settled country. That is the present condition of agricultural property in the old States of New England. I think by the simple recital of that fact I have tolerably well established my case, for you have not come in England and you have not come in Scotland to the point at which agricultural land is to be had—not wild land, but improved and old cultivated land,—is to be had for the price of £6 12s. an acre. He mentions that this is by no means a strange case, an isolated case, that it fairly represented the average transactions that have been going on; and he says that in that region the ordinary price of agricultural land at the present time is from \$20 to \$50 an acre, or from £4 to £10. In New York the soil is better and the population is greater; but even in the State of New York land ranges for agricultural purposes from \$50 to \$100, that is to say from £10 to £20 an acre.

I think those of you, gentlemen, who are farmers will perhaps derive some comfort from perceiving that if the pressure here is heavy the pressure elsewhere and the pressure nearer to the seat of this very abundant production is greater and far greater still.

It is most interesting to consider, however, what this pressure is. There has been developed in the astonishing progressive power of the United States—there has been developed a faculty of producing corn for the subsistence of man with a

rapidity and to an extent unknown in the experience of mankind. There is nothing like it in history. Do not let us conceal, gentlemen, from ourselves the fact; I shall not stand the worse with any of you who are farmers if I at once avow that this greater and comparatively immense abundance of the prime article of subsistence for mankind is a great blessing vouchsafed by Providence to mankind. In part I believe that the cheapness has been increased by special causes. The lands from which the great abundance of American wheat comes are very thinly peopled as yet. They will become more thickly peopled and as they become more thickly peopled a larger proportion of their produce will be wanted for home consumption and less of it will come to you, and at a higher price. Again, if we are rightly informed, the price of American wheat has been unnaturally reduced by the extraordinary depression, in recent times, of trade in America, and especially of the mineral trades, upon which many railroads are dependent in America and with which these railroads are connected in America in a degree and manner that in this country we know but little of. With a revival of trade in America it is to be expected that the freights of corn will increase and all other freights, because the employment of the railroads will be a great deal more abundant and they will not be content to carry corn at nominal rates. In some respects therefore you may expect a mitigation of the pressure, but in other respects it is likely to continue.

Nay, the prime minister is reported as having not long ago said,—and he ought to have the best information on this subject, nor am I going to impeach in the main what he stated,—he gave it to be understood that there was about to be a development of corn production in Canada which would entirely throw into the shade this corn production in the United

States. Well, that certainly was very cold comfort as far as the British agriculturist is concerned, because he did not say—he could not say—that the corn production of the United States was to fall off, but there was to be added an enormous corn production from Manitoba, the great Province which forms now a part of the Canada Dominion. There is no doubt, I believe, that it is a correct expectation that vast or very large quantities of corn will proceed from that Province and therefore we have to look forward to a state of things in which, for a considerable time to come, large quantities of wheat will be forthcoming from America, probably larger quantities and perhaps frequently at lower prices than those at which the corn-producing and corn-exporting districts of Europe have commonly been able to supply us. Now that I believe to be, gentlemen, upon the whole, not an unfair representation of the state of things.

How are you to meet that state of things? What are your fair claims? I will tell you. In my opinion your fair claims are, in the main, two. One is to be allowed to purchase every article that you require in the cheapest market and have no needless burden laid upon anything that comes to you and can assist you in the cultivation of your land. But that claim has been conceded and fulfilled.

I do not know whether there is an object, an instrument, a tool of any kind, an auxiliary of any kind, that you want for the business of the farmer which you do not buy at this moment in the cheapest market. But beyond that you want to be relieved from every unjust and unnecessary legislative restraint. I say every unnecessary legislative restraint because taxation, gentlemen, is unfortunately a restraint upon us all, but we cannot say that it is always unnecessary and we cannot say that it is always unjust. . . .

Now, gentlemen, having said thus much my next duty is to warn you against quack remedies, against delusive remedies, against the quack remedies that there are plenty of people found to propose, not so much in Scotland as in England; for, gentlemen, from Midlothian at present we are speaking to England as well as to Scotland. Let me give a friendly warning from this northern quarter to the agriculturist of England not to be deluded by those who call themselves his friends in a degree of special and superior excellence and who have been too much given to delude him in other times; not to be deluded into hoping relief from sources from which it can never come. Now, gentlemen, there are three of these remedies. The first of them, gentlemen, I will not call a quack remedy at all, but I will speak of it notwithstanding in the tone of rational and dispassionate discussion. I am not now so much upon the controversial portion of the land question—a field which, Heaven knows, is wide enough—as I am upon matters of deep and universal interest to us in our economic and social condition. There are some gentlemen and there are persons for whom I for one have very great respect, who think that the difficulties of our agriculture may be got over by a fundamental change in the land-holding system of this country.

I do not mean, now pray observe, a change as to the law of entail and settlement and all those restraints which I hope were tolerably well disposed of yesterday at Dalkeith, but I mean those who think that if you can cut up the land, or a large part of it, into a multitude of small properties that of itself will solve the difficulty and start everybody on a career of prosperity.

Now, gentlemen, to a proposal of that kind I for one am not going to object upon the ground that it would be incon-

sistent with the privileges of landed proprietors. In my opinion, if it is known to be for the welfare of the community at large, the legislature is perfectly entitled to buy out the landed proprietors. It is not intended probably to confiscate the property of a landed proprietor more than the property of any other man; but the state is perfectly entitled, if it please, to buy out the landed proprietors as it may think fit for the purpose of dividing the property into small lots. I don't wish to recommend it because I will show you the doubts that to my mind hang about that proposal; but I admit that in principle no objection can be taken. Those persons who possess large portions of the spaces of the earth are not altogether in the same position as the possessors of mere personalty; that personalty does not impose the same limitations upon the action and industry of man and upon the well-being of the community as does the possession of land; and therefore I freely own that compulsory expropriation is a thing which for an adequate public object is in itself admissible and so far sound in principle.

Now, gentlemen, this idea about small proprietors, however, is one which very large bodies and parties in this country treat with the utmost contempt; and they are accustomed to point to France, and say: "Look at France." In France you have got 5,000,000—I am not quite sure whether it is 5,000,000 or even more; I do not wish to be beyond the mark in anything—you have 5,000,000 of small proprietors, and you do not produce in France as many bushels of wheat per acre as you do in England. Well, now I am going to point out to you a very remarkable fact with regard to the condition of France. I will not say that France produces—for I believe it does not produce—as many bushels of wheat per acre as England does, but I should like to know whether the wheat of France is pro-

duced mainly upon the small properties of France. I believe that the wheat of France is produced mainly upon the large properties of France, and I have not any doubt that the large properties of England are upon the whole better cultivated and more capital is put into the land than in the large properties of France. But it is fair that justice should be done to what is called the peasant proprietary. Peasant proprietary is an excellent thing, if it can be had, in many points of view. It interests an enormous number of the people in the soil of the country and in the stability of its institutions and its laws. But now look at the effect that it has upon the progressive value of the land—and I am going to give you a very few figures which I will endeavor to relieve from all complication lest I should unnecessarily weary you. But what will you think when I tell you that the agricultural value of France—the taxable income derived from the land, and therefore the income of the proprietors of that land—has advanced during our lifetime far more rapidly than that of England? When I say England I believe the same thing is applicable to Scotland, certainly to Ireland; but I shall take England for my test because the difference between England and Scotland, though great, does not touch the principle, and because it so happens that we have some means of illustration from former times for England which are not equally applicable for all the three kingdoms.

Here is the state of the case. I will not go back any further than 1851. I might go back much further; it would only strengthen my case. But for 1851 I have a statement made by French official authority of the agricultural income of France as well as the income of other real property, namely, houses. In 1851 the agricultural income of France was £76,000,000. It was greater in 1851 than the whole income

from land and houses together had been in 1821. This is a tolerable evidence of progress, but I will not enter into the detail of it because I have no means of dividing the two—the house income and the land income—for the earlier year, namely, 1821. In 1851 it was £76,000,000—the agricultural income; and in 1864 it had risen from £76,000,000 to £106,000,000. That is to say, in the space of thirteen years the increase of agricultural values in France—annual values—was no less than forty per cent, or three per cent per annum. Now I go to England. Wishing to be quite accurate, I shall limit myself to that with respect to which we have positive figures. In England the agricultural income in 1813-14 was £37,000,000; in 1842 it was £42,000,000, and that year is the one I will take as my starting point. I have given you the years 1851 to 1864 in France. I could only give you those thirteen years with a certainty that I was not misleading you, and I believe I have kept within the mark. I believe I might have put my case more strongly for France.

In 1842, then, the agricultural income of England was £42,000,000; in 1876 it was £52,000,000—that is to say, while the agricultural income of France increased forty per cent in thirteen years the agricultural income of England increased twenty per cent in thirty-four years. The increase in France was three per cent per annum; the increase in England was about one half or three fifths per cent per annum. Now, gentlemen, I wish this justice to be done to a system where peasant proprietary prevails. It is of great importance. And will you allow me, you who are Scotch agriculturists, to assure you that I speak to you not only with the respect which is due from a candidate to a constituency, but with the deference which is due from a man knowing very little of agricultural matters to those who know a great deal?

And there is one point at which the considerations that I have been opening up, and this rapid increase of the value of the soil in France, bear upon our discussions. Let me try to explain it. I believe myself that the operation of economic laws is what in the main dictates the distribution of landed property in this country. I doubt if those economic laws will allow it to remain cut up into a multitude of small properties like the small properties of France. As to small holdings, I am one of those who attach the utmost value to them. I say that in the Lothians—I say that in the portion of the country where almost beyond any other large holdings prevail—in some parts of which large holdings exclusively are to be found—I attach the utmost value to them. But it is not on that point I am going to dwell, for we have no time for what is unnecessary. What I do wish very respectfully to submit to you, gentlemen, is this. When you see this vast increase of the agricultural value of France you know at once it is perfectly certain that it has not been upon the large properties of France, which, if anything, are inferior in cultivation to the large properties of England. It has been upon those very peasant-properties which some people are so ready to decry. What do the peasant-properties mean? They mean what in France is called the small cultivation—that is to say, cultivation of superior articles pursued upon a small scale—cultivation of flowers, cultivation of trees and shrubs, cultivation of fruits of every kind, and all that in fact which rises above the ordinary character of farming produce, and rather approaches the produce of the gardener.

Gentlemen, I cannot help having this belief that, among other means of meeting the difficulties in which we may be placed, our destiny is that a great deal more attention will have to be given than heretofore by the agriculturists of

England, and perhaps even by the agriculturists of Scotland, to the production of fruits, of vegetables, of flowers, of all that variety of objects which are sure to find a market in a rich and wealthy country like this, but which have hitherto been consigned almost exclusively to garden production. You know that in Scotland, in Aberdeenshire—and I am told also in Perthshire—a great example of this kind has been set in the cultivation of strawberries—the cultivation of strawberries is carried on over hundreds of acres at once. I am ashamed, gentlemen, to go further into this matter as if I was attempted to instruct you. I am sure you will take my hint as a respectful hint—I am sure you will take it as a friendly hint. I do not believe that the large properties of this country, generally or universally, can or will be broken up into small ones. I do not believe that the land of this country will be owned as a general rule by those who cultivate it. I believe we shall continue to have, as we have had, a class of landlords and a class of cultivators, but I most earnestly desire to see—not only to see the relations of those classes to one another harmonious and sound, their interests never brought into conflict; but I desire to see both flourishing and prospering, and the soil of my country producing as far as may be under the influence of capital and skill, every variety of product which may give an abundant livelihood to those who live upon it. I say, therefore, gentlemen, and I say it with all respect, I hope for a good deal from the small culture, the culture in use among the small proprietors of France; but I do not look to a fundamental change in the distribution of landed property in this country as a remedy for agricultural distress.

But I go on to another remedy which is proposed, and I do it with a great deal less of respect; nay, I now come to the