

CORRESPONDENCE.

NATIONALISATION OF THE LAND.

know that Mr. Wallace has distinctly stated this, but I suppose it is intended, for I suppose the State is not to be a loser. May I ask him then kindly to say further :—

1. Are the present tenants, who are, for the future, to hold under or purchase from the State to be holders in perpetuity—or if not, for what term, and under what conditions ?

2. In the event of the actual present tenant declining to continue at the rent (or price) to be fixed by the Government valuer, to whom is the tenancy next to be offered—or how is the selection of a tenant to be made by the State ?

3. Is any limit to be placed to the extent (or value) of land which one person may occupy ? Supposing he farms by aid of superintendents or bailiffs, is that to be deemed personal occupation ? If not, how is the line to be drawn ?

It will be seen that I imagine Mr. Wallace does not design to limit personal occupation merely to so much as a man can actually cultivate with his own hands—but that it may include what has been cultivated by hired labour. If so, this involves extension to cultivation under superintendence of foremen, bailiffs, or other intermediates.—J. BOYD KINNEAR, Kinloch, Fifeshire, Oct. 28.

SIR,—If I understand Mr. Wallace aright, his proposal is to dispossess the whole of the present owners of land, in so far as they are not actual farmers, and to transfer the ownership to the present farmers, on condition of their paying to the State the full rent (or price), as it may be estimated by valuers. I do not