

where no such restrictions exist, there seems no reason why new licences in Ireland should not pay toll, and be subject to conditions as in England, more especially as unless the law is altered they have a qualified right of renewal which does not exist in England. The Royal Commission recommended that the law as to renewal and transfer in Ireland should be the same as in England, and there seems no good reason why this should not be so, with, of course, a saving of existing licences. The provision in the Act of 1902 that nothing therein should affect the law as to renewal or transfer of licences, was put in for the sake of precaution.

The payments directed to be made as a condition of granting a new licence might be annual payments, which should be added to the compensation fund, or a capital sum, which might be applied in extinguishing a particular licence, or added to the compensation fund, as the licensing authority thought fit. The right to compensation would only be given as in England, in the case of existing licences, that is, on licences in force at the time of the passing of the Act.

I have not gone into all the details of the Act of 1904, but I have endeavoured to show that its provisions can well be applied to Ireland. Many of those interested in the cause of temperance were opposed to this measure becoming law, but now that it has become law, it is to be hoped that they will carefully watch its operation and assist the attainment of the object of the legislature, namely the reduction of the abnormal number of licensed houses in the sister country, with reasonable compensation where the licence is taken away from no fault of the holder, but in the interests of the public alone. Ireland has hitherto been in advance in temperance reform, witness the Sunday Closing Act of 1878, and the prohibition of new licences by the Act of 1902. Let them follow the example of England, and take the steps necessary to adopt a similar measure, which, if properly worked, will have the effect of reducing the number of public houses, already far too numerous, and improving the condition of those that are left in the interests of the public and making them contribute their fair share to the taxation of the country.

4.—*A Plea for Tillage Farming on Co-operative Lines.*

BY LORD CASTLETOWN OF UPPER OSSORY.

[Read March 7th, 1905.]

I MUST first of all apologise for the type of paper I am privileged to read before you to-night. It must be to a certain extent, egotistical, it must be in the nature of a proposition, and I must ask you to believe what I state though some of the facts may appear remarkable, and I must also apologise for not

giving an account of the exact locality where the experiment has taken place, though I am perfectly willing to take any persons to the locality, and let them judge for themselves.

Now for the egotistical portion. Most of those who are here now forget, perhaps, that I, after consultation with the late Mr. John Bright, and after the first two years working of the Land Act, 1881, succeeded in getting a large committee of men together to inaugurate an extensive scheme of Land Sale, and Purchase.

After considerable difficulty, and several debates in Parliament and elsewhere, a scheme was formulated, handed to the Liberal Government then in power, and would have been adopted by them, I think, but unluckily the Government went out, and soon after the Ministers who had taken an interest in it, went into opposition. The scheme was left in the Castle's pigeon holes, and came eventually out of its nest as the Land Purchase Act of 1886, commonly called the Ashbourne Act. What I had learnt during the arrangement of the scheme gave me much information on the Land System generally. I realised that, however good the Act of 1886 might be, larger and more drastic measures were necessary. I brought forward some questions on these points in the House of Lords, and wrote several (to my mind) instructive articles on the subject, but no attention was paid to them, though I knew they were on the right lines. I also suggested the scheme which is now called The Congested Districts system, to a very prominent Minister. I was informed in writing, by him, my idea was Utopian. In twelve months it was introduced by Mr. Balfour, and became the law of the land, while another Land Act was placed on the Statute Books. Unluckily, in all these tentative measures, the Government had a knack of leaving out one or two points of extreme value, the omission of which weakened if they did not sterilise the Acts themselves. This is one of the peculiarities of rule by the Castle in Ireland. They will consult a Scotchman, a Dane, a Bohemian, an Englishman, anyone rather than an Irishman on a matter essentially Irish, the present system of land tenure or land cultivation in Ireland.

I, having served this apprenticeship, and having also learnt much in working Land Schemes and Land Problems, and feeling that the day must come when a comprehensive Land Bill would be brought in, viz. : the Land Bill, 1903 (though it has owing to negligent drafting many very great mistakes) came to the conclusion I should do well to work up such portion of the problem as would be of value in a short time or worth investigation, and so I set to work to find out how best could much of the lighter soil of Ireland now laid down in bad grass be utilised for the advantage

of all sections of the Land Community, viz.: labourers, farmers, and landowners.

The dreadfully sad history of Ireland's continuous depletion by emigration appealed to me also intensely, and as I have before said, the scheme I had prepared for the Congested Districts bore directly and most vividly on the working of those classes of land.

Now, I am not going to weary you with statistics as to the amount of this type of land, but everyone knows that in Ireland there is a very large amount of it. Land that is now bad grass, land that should be continually broken up on certain lines: I do not refer to the rich old pastures of Meath or Kildare, or Limerick or Tipperary, but I am referring to a very large section of the land of Ireland which is now unremunerative. It was on this type of land I determined to experiment. When I call it unremunerative, I am, perhaps, using too strong a word. It is land which does not give the proper return, and is not treated to my mind in the proper manner of cultivation. I had in my own hands about 400 acres of this land, bounded on three sides by public roads. It was all in bad grass, but was good, sound tillage land, dry and drained. I may at once say I had not sufficient capital to set to work to farm it myself. But even if I had, I should have selected it for my experiment. I began by putting some gates in the public roads leading into it, and I made a few rough roads where required. It was very well protected by hedges, and was divided into many different sized divisions. The district in which it was situated is one where mixed farming is the custom. A small village of about 80 or 100 inhabitants is close to the land, also a railway where trains stop twice a day, up and down, from and to Dublin. I began by asking any of the labourers or farmers who were tenants if they wished for an extra piece of land for cropping. They all seemed pleased at the prospect and large areas were let by auction for the use of one crop. Of course it was nearly all in ley oats and barley. I placed a tactful and carefully trained steward in the place to supervise the tiller, to keep a portion in tillage for experimental purposes, and for demonstration. I will refer to this later on. Before letting the land by auction, I had it carefully valued, and I decided under no circumstances to go beyond a certain price for the acre. Fortunately enough, I found at the first auction the bidders themselves were well able to gauge the value. I may state here without giving the figures, that I obtain a considerable addition to my original rental, and how much the plan has done for the people themselves, I will explain later on.

There is one curious point to be noted in connection

with the letting value, and if there are any of the gentlemen present who perambulate the country assessing values of land for the State, I commend the fact to their notice. There are two small farms divided by the public road from the demesne land. These two farmers have twice been into court, and have, each time, had a fairly considerable reduction given to the farms. They take land for cropping purpose every year in the demesne land, and pay willingly twice what they pay under their statutory agreement. Yet there is only the width of the public road between the two areas of land, and I have never yet been able to find out what difference there was in the two descriptions of land. Perhaps, some day when relieved from the strain of their office, and when luxuriating on a pension, some of these gentlemen will explain to me the true differences.

To return, however, to the work. Naturally after the second and third years of the experiment, most of the land was broken up and tilled in different croppings, some in turnips, some in potatoes, mangolds, etc. I then realised that more land was required, as we got more applications, so we let in smaller areas, and every year we have done this as much as possible, so that what we call smaller farmers are not ousted by the greed of the larger farmers. This has been most successful, and this year we have treble the number of lettings to what we had of last year. The next difficulty we encountered was keeping up the proper rotation of crops. We decided eventually every year or every second year to take up a certain area to lay down in temporary grass again. I could not ask the "tillers" to do this, as the expenditure in grass seeds and sowing would be costly. I therefore, select on the advice of agent and steward, certain fields for the purpose, and sow them in grass seeds myself. These fields we lay down, and the tillers are given the first chance of purchasing the meadowing. In connection with the tillage lands, I keep on hand and convenient to it, an area of good enough grass for sheep, cattle, and horses, and each tiller has the first chance of putting on a certain number of each according to the agent's decision. Naturally all upkeep of fences, roads and gates, is made by me, but the tillers are incited to leave only a furrow or ridge of grass between plot and plot. This conduces to making them careful of their neighbour's and their own boundaries, and I find there is very little ill-feeling or squabbling if any.

The demonstration field varies every year as much as we can make it, so that different types of cropping may be shown, but I must honestly say I have not been able to do all I could wish in this part of the experiment.

While on this point I wish to say, I do not claim that my scheme is perfect. I am convinced that numerous useful

plans could be "evolved." I believe the experiment to be the right work now, and that different systems would have to be adopted on different lands and in different localities.

I will now give you the results of the scheme as far as I and the people are concerned. My own statement is very simple. I have increased the rent I was receiving and I have benefited the district in which I live, and have improved the financial status of all in it, as far as I can find by careful enquiry. As regards the demonstration field, this year I will give you the carefully drawn out statement of results.

FARM MEMORANDUM—1904.

6½ ACRES LEY OATS.		AVERAGE PER ACRE, £3 12s.	
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Ploughing	.. 6 10 0	3 acres good, yielding 22 bls. per acre @ 9s.	29 14 0
Harrowing	.. 3 5 0	3 acres good, yielding 9 ton straw @ 30s.	13 10 0
Seed (Imported)	.. 12 10 0	1½ acres medium, yielding 15 bls., per ac. @ 9s.	10 7 0
Sowing	.. 1 12 6	1½ acres medium, yielding 2¾ ton straw @ 30s.	4 2 6
Harvesting & threshing	6 10 0	2 acres Bog, 10 bls., per acre @ 9s.	.. 9 0 0
Artificial Manure	.. 7 16 4	2 acres Bog, 2 ton straw @ 30s.	.. 3 0 0
Rent	. 8 2 6		
	<u>£46 6 4</u>	Deduct cost	.. <u>£69 13 6</u>
			.. <u>46 6 4</u>
		Nett profit on 6½ acres Mixed land.	.. £23 7 2

1904.

MEMORANDUM.

RESULT OF THE 3 GOOD ACRES.

	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Ploughing	.. 3 0 0	3 acres oats, 22 bls. per acre @ 9s.	.. 29 14 0
Harrowing	.. 1 10 0	9 tons straw, @ 30s. per ton	.. 13 10 0
Seed	.. 6 0 0		
			<u>£43 4 0</u>
Sowing	.. 0 15 0	Deduct cost	.. <u>21 15 0</u>
Harvesting & threshing	3 0 0	Nett profit, 3 acres	.. £21 9 0
Artificial Manure	.. 3 15 0		£7 3s. od.
Rent	.. 3 15 0		
Cost of tilling, or £7 15s. per acre	<u>£21 15 0</u>		

1904.
MEMORANDUM.

<i>From</i>	LOWER KYLEAHAW, 6½ ACRES LEY OATS.	<i>To</i>	<i>Date,</i>
	Cost of Tilling.	Yield Oats and Straw.	Profit.
	Profit per acre.		
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
3 acres, prime ..	21 15 0	43 4 0	21 9 0
1½ „ medium..	10 17 6	14 9 6	3 12 0
2 „ Bog ..	14 10 0	12 0 0	Loss 2 10 0
			Loss 1 5 0

But, taken altogether, field yielded nett profit of £3 12s. od. per acre, even after heavy expenditure in seed and artificials without which, however, small crop would have been got.

Steward's Statement.

I daresay many farmers, if there are any in the room, will disagree with some of the expenditure and some of the result prices. Farmers nearly always do disagree with each other on those sort of points, but all I can say is, I saw the crop, and it was a very fine crop, indeed, and quite a good demonstration crop for the land it was grown upon.

Now I will come to the "tillers" return. It is not easy, I need hardly say, to get at their annual financial balance-sheets. Many keep none, many I think have a little idea what they make, but they know very quickly if they lose. Therefore, I can safely say, they have not lost, as I have more applications for land than I can grant, and I know that they have done very well under the system. Luckily, we were able to get three to give us their results for this year, and I will read out those results, giving no names, but vouching for the authenticity, and if any one wishes to go down there and question these points, I shall be glad if they will do so.

I.

1904.
MEMORANDUM.

1st YEAR.

<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>Date,</i>
CONACRE OF	LEY OATS.	
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Cost of ploughing 1 acre	1 0 0	16 bls. oats, per acre @ 9s.
Harrowing & sowing 1 acre ..	0 15 0	per bl. ..
Seed ..	1 8 0	2 tons straw, @ 1s. 6d.
Cutting & threshing ..	1 0 0	per cwt. ..
Manure ..	0 5 0	£10 4 0
Rent ..	1 10 0	Deduct cost ..
	£5 18 0	Nett profit ..
		£4 6 0

2ND YEAR.

MEMORANDUM.

<i>From</i>	<i>Date,</i>	<i>To.</i>			
			CONACRE.	TURNIPS.	
			£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Ploughing ..			0 17 0	Value of Turnips ..	14 0 0
Preparing for drills ..			1 15 0	Deduct cost ..	8 1 0
Drilling twice ..			1 0 0		-----
Manure ..			2 0 0	Nett profit ..	5 19 0
Seed ..			0 4 0		-----
Thinning, 10s. and Grubbing, 5s. ..			6 15 0		
Rent ..			1 10 0		

			£8 1 0		

3RD YEAR.

MEMORANDUM.

<i>From</i>	<i>Date,</i>	<i>To.</i>			
			CONACRE.	BARLEY.	
			£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Ploughing ..			0 17 0	10 bls. barley @ 14s. 3d. per barrel ..	7 2 6
Harrowing & sowing ..			0 10 0	2½ tons straw @ £1 per ton ..	2 5 0
Seed ..			1 0 0		-----
Cutting & Threshing ..			1 0 0	Deduct cost ..	9 7 6
Rent ..			1 10 0	Nett profit ..	4 17 0
			-----		-----
			£4 17 0		

II.

1904.

1ST YEAR.

MEMORANDUM.

<i>From</i>		<i>Date,</i>		
		<i>To</i>		
		CONACRE.	LEY OATS.	
	£ s. d.			£ s. d.
Ploughing	.. 1 0 0	14 barrels oats, @ 9s.		.. 5 6 0
		per barrel		.. 2 12 6
Harrowing	.. 0 10 0	1¼ ton straw @ 1s. 6d.		.. 2 12 6
Seed	.. 1 6 0			£8 18 6
Sowing	.. 0 5 0	Deduct cost		.. 5 15 6
Cutting and Threshing	1 0 0	Nett profit		.. £3 3 0
Artificial Manure	.. 0 4 6			
Rent	.. 1 10 0			
	<u>£5 15 6</u>			

2ND YEAR.

MEMORANDUM.

<i>From</i>		<i>Date,</i>		
		<i>To</i>		
		CONACRE.	TURNIPS.	
	£ s. d.			£ s. d.
Ploughing	.. 0 17 0	Value of Turnips		.. 15 0 0
Preparing for drills	.. 2 0 0	Deduct cost		.. 9 0 0
Drilling twice	.. 1 10 0			
Manure	.. 1 19 0	Nett profit		.. £6 0 0
Seed	.. 0 4 0			
Thinning, 10s. and Grubbing, 10s.	.. 1 0 0			
Rent	.. 1 10 0			
	<u>£9 0 0</u>			

		1904.		2ND YEAR.	
		MEMORANDUM.			
<i>From</i>		<i>To</i>		<i>Date.</i>	
		CONACRE.	TURNIPS.		
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Ploughing	..	0	17 0	Value of turnips in drills	12 0 0
Preparing for drills	..	2	0 0	Deduct cost	.. 9 1 0
Drilling twice	..	1	10 0		
Manure	..	2	0 0	Nett profit	.. <u>£2 19 0</u>
Seed	..	0	4 0		
Thinning & grubbing	..	1	0 0		
Rent	..	1	10 0		
		<u>£9 1 0</u>			

		1904.		3RD YEAR.	
		MEMORANDUM.			
<i>From</i>		<i>To</i>		<i>Date</i>	
		CONACRE.	BARLEY AFTER ROOTS.		
		£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Ploughing	..	0	17 0	11 barrels barley, @ 14s.	.. 7 14 0
Harrowing	..	0	5 0	per bl.	.. 7 14 0
Seed	..	1	0 0	2 tons of straw, @ 1s.	.. 2 0 0
Sowing	..	0	5 0	per cwt.	.. 2 0 0
Harvesting & threshing	..	1	0 0		
Rent	..	1	10 0		
		<u>£4 17 0</u>		Deduct cost	.. 4 17 0
				Nett profit	.. <u>£4 17 0</u>

		1904.			
		MEMORANDUM.			
		SUMMARY.			
		PER ACRE (IRISH.)			
NETT PROFIT LEY OATS.		NETT PROFIT TURNIPS.		NETT PROFIT BARLEY OR OATS.	
£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
4	6 0	5	19 0	4	10 6 barley.
3	3 0	6	0 0	5	16 0 oats.
3	18 0	2	19 0 (sold in drills.)	4	17 0 barley.
<u>£11 7 0</u>		<u>£14 18 0</u>		<u>£15 3 6</u>	
AVERAGE PROFIT,					
<u>£3 15 8</u>		<u>£4 19 4</u>		<u>£5 1 2</u>	

I think I have fairly established the fact that Irishmen of the three classes who live on the land, viz. :—Owner, farmer and labourer can make money out of this idea, or experiment. I have also conclusively proved, that mixed farming will pay.

If you can make mixed farming pay, you are also improving the condition of the smaller town and village population who sell seeds, implements, manure, etc. You put also certain check on the tide of emigration, because you give the younger members of a family an inducement to stop in the land of their birth. They require other inducements, but that is not the problem before us to-day.

I think I have established these facts and now I will point out the moral of my experiment :

A large number of landowners have sold their properties, or are selling them, retaining in their own hands areas of demesne or grass lands of possibly inferior quality. Now, if they will try my experiment, where it is feasible, they will confer a great boon on their humbler neighbours, they will advance their own prosperity, they will improve the agricultural training of the people, and they will benefit enormously and indirectly the district they live in. They will also have, if they do not employ stewards, plenty of interesting problems to superintend in this work, and during those intervals that they can spare from racing, hunting, shooting, fishing or “devoluting” or any other amusement the Irish villa owner chooses to take up. That is one point in the moral. The next is perhaps more important still. I refer to the future and also present working of the Congested Districts Board. I have made a very special study of this question for many years, and lately I have gone over it again. The people in those districts are beginning to wish to leave their old holdings, and better themselves, and I hear that the Board has bought a large area of land, but seems to be moving very slowly in migrating the people and causing thereby much discontent. I suggest that my scheme gives them, and even the Estates Commissioners, a way out of some of their difficulties. Let me enumerate the advantages and put them forward as a concrete case, I will assume that the Board has in hand 500 acres of fair land suitable for migration. It has got the consent of, say twenty families, ready to move from their old homes in the West. I will assume that twenty houses exist or are built on the holdings conveniently situated to deal with the twenty-five acres suitable for each person. By adopting my scheme the new tillers are placed in a position to benefit at once by their new position. With a tactful superintendent an area is reserved for the cattle and sheep they may have to start with. Each family would be working

so much land, and would be assisting each other no doubt as is the custom in the West. There would be an immediate start of work under advice while the Department could reserve a small piece of the area as demonstration land to be tilled in the most suitable manner. This course of action could be continued, say for six years or so, by which time full rotation would have been achieved, and the steward could give carefully drawn and confidential reports of the working, and the position financially of each family. By that time some might have wished to emigrate or move elsewhere, or one or other of the families might have dwindled down to the older members only, and new arrangements be necessary. This is an easy plan, it is based on the clan system, the spirit which undoubtedly even now underlies and vivifies much of Irish thought, and it is simple, economical and fair to all. If possible one of the Raffeisen Banks should be established which I have started in connection with my scheme. (I formed the first of all of them at Doneraile many years ago, and it is still working well). That is my suggestion to the Board. Let me now take the present *system* and contrast it. Land and cottage is handed over to a man who has no knowledge of this kind of tillage. He and his neighbours erect enormous fences to keep each other's cattle out, and by degrees, I am convinced, that the strongest man financially, or the village gombeen man will become the real, though perhaps secret owner of the whole 500 acres within a limited time, thus absolutely frustrating the work of the Board.

The procedure of the Estates Commissioners can also, I should think, in some cases, be assisted by the adoption of such a scheme, but as I see one or two of them present I shall I hope have the pleasure of hearing their views. In conclusion, I may say I had nearly decided not to make public my successful experiment, as I had had formerly bitter experience that, though an Irishman may know something of Ireland even if he produces a valuable scheme for amelioration, his views are decried and left in the cold until, perhaps, they are reproduced under another name by some wild, long-haired and marvellously clever being from Bohemia or Timbuctoo or any other place, rather than Ireland. It is then called The Slavonian, Co-ordinate, Co-operated, Ireland Milking Scheme or some such name, and is lauded to the skies by a subservient Press. I also was afraid that some friendly agitator would think the people were going on too peacefully in our district, and that he would come down upon us in our tillage garden of peace with orators, bands, and leaguers, and ask questions about us in Parliament, and make all further work impossible.

Well, I have decided to run these risks, and the scheme

and the experiment is before you. It is based on tribal lines, on the old Irish system of mutual assistance called "Cojencey" on my part, and on the desire of one Irishman to help his fellow countryman in a simple unostentatious way, but successfully. It can be amplified to any extent, and I shall be only too delighted if I can see my humble endeavour become the nucleus of an agricultural tillage revival, and the means of turning useless ranches into homes of industry for Irishmen and women.

5.—*Practical Education in our Schools.*

BY REV. T. A. FINLAY, S.J.

[Read 5th May, 1905.]

It will be admitted as a fundamental principle that the aim of all education is to fit children to do their duty worthily and successfully in later life. This conception of education covers a wide field. It includes the cultivation of the moral and religious sense, as well as the intellectual and physical faculties. We are not concerned here with this wider significance of the term. We confine our attention to that narrower view which regards education as a preparation for the material tasks of life, as the training which fits a man or woman to earn a livelihood, and by so doing to contribute to the general welfare of the community. In this sense only can education be regarded as falling within the competence of the State, or included in its legitimate functions.

The principle is generally accepted without question that it is the duty of Government to provide for the education of the people. Rates are levied for this purpose, and large grants of public money are made for Primary and Secondary Schools and for Universities. What is the justification of this outlay? Is it so obvious as is generally assumed? Why should the State educate a child any more than it should feed or clothe him? The obligation of furnishing the child with the healthy conditions of bodily growth is left to the parent to discharge, the State intervenes only when it is necessary to force the neglectful parent to fulfil his duty. Why should the same principle not be applied in regard to the growth and development of the mind? For myself I cannot furnish a ready answer to the question. The right and the duty of educating the child