

A Beautiful World.

No. 6.

DECEMBER, 1896.

VOL. III.

COLDLY November descends, stripping the glow from the wood-lands,
Drawing, with tremulous fingers, the curtain of mist o'er the landscape.
Gone is the warmth and the bloom. But the beauty? Ah, that is undying—
Changing through infinite phases, the glory never departeth.
Seek not in western skies the sweet, tender radiance of summer :
Vaporous mountains of clouds flame with the fires of sunset !
Strewn and sodden the leaves, but afresh in thicket and forest
The trees stand revealed to their lovers, in the pure perfection of form !
Greener than spring is the moss, more mellow than autumn the bracken
Lit by the wintry light, through the delicate lattice of branches.
Yes! always the vision is with us. But the men who had joy in beholding?
Priests in the Temple of Nature—priests who have passed from her service ;
In the world of shades have they knowledge of the scenes that here were beloved?
Chill beauty of English rivers, swept by the winds of October?
Island homes of the gods, asleep in the azure Aegean?
Blustering seas of the north, haunted by ghosts of the Vikings?
Rome in its stateliest prime, abode of the Lords of the World?
Does the vision endure? Ah! we know not. Enough to rest firm in believing
That here is the first revelation of the splendour that may be hereafter.
Even here dwells the King in his glory : bids us enter his Courts with rejoicing,
Bids us tread, with reverent hearts, the streets of the Beautiful City.

MUSAFIR.

In Memoriam.

DEATH has taken from us during the year five eminent Englishmen whose sympathies were with us and to whose services we owe much. The lives of Mr. George Richmond, Lord Leighton and of Sir John Millais: of Dr. Middleton and of Mr. William Morris belonged to the history of the nation, and it would be little to the purpose to attempt here any critical estimate of their place in art or letters. It must suffice to say a few grateful words about their personal relations to our cause, and to speak of those aspects of their manifold activity which enable us to claim them as fellow workers.

Mr. George Richmond, in his splendid old age, was one of the few survivors of the generation in which he achieved distinction. If a society can be said to have a birthplace ours may, without any strain of the imagination, be traced to his roof-tree, for he took the warmest interest in the early efforts of his sons, Mr. W. B. Richmond and Mr. John Richmond, to give voice and shape to the desire to save the picturesque as an element in modern life. By an accidental but happy coincidence, it was the lot of the present writer to receive at the same time the signed membership forms of Mr. George Richmond and of Lord Leighton—of the President of the Royal Academy, and of the retired R.A. A leaf in the register is devoted to the two honoured names. We regarded it then as the benediction of the Past and of the Present. Death has now given the last pathetic touch to the page.

Lord Leighton was not only a great artist: he was a man of wide and delicate human sympathy. He never held that Beauty lived only for the select few; and in the letter which he addressed to us, and which was so valuable a feature in the transactions of 1894, he gave eloquent expression to the patriotic desire to save the charm of rural scenery for the people of England. This was one of many proofs he gave of his good will; and among our treasured records is a letter from him, written not long before his death, assuring us of all the help a "disabled man can give."

In his successor, Sir John Millais, we found a no less sincere supporter. He was, like Lord Leighton, a member of our Council. It may not be amiss here to explain that although Sir John Millais watched, as many of us do, with approving interest, every step taken to improve the type of pictorial advertisement, he never painted anything with a view to its use on the hoardings. An admirable chromo-lithograph of one of his pictures has been widely displayed; but the proprietors of the commodity which it was used to popularise acquired the canvas by the ordinary process of purchase. In his kindly genial way Sir John Millais never dreamt of resenting the impression that he had "designed a poster." Nor have we any reason to suppose that he would have thought such work unworthy of a sincere artist. But he felt most keenly the destructive effect of wholesale indiscriminating puffery.

In Mr. William Morris we had a warm and a candid friend. A melancholy interest attaches to the speech which he delivered at the general meeting, for it was, we believe, the last of his public utterances. Imperfect as is the report which we give of his remarks, much that will be recognised as characteristic is preserved in the epitome. Something of the tone of weariness, of disillusionment, which often marks the close of a life of rare achievement may be perceived in his warnings. Of the breadth and vigour of Mr. Morris's sympathies it would be superfluous to speak, and no one probably has done so much to give practical effect to the ideal of grace and simplicity as a factor in everyday existence. He was a great craftsman as well as a great teacher. He propagated his doctrine by the visible deed. In his poetry he opened up new sources of romantic sentiment, charming away the vexations of an outworn century, with the freshness and fragrance of the old days when the world was young. But he did not disdain the practical side of culture, and, by simply producing the finer types, he forced even fashion to understand the difference between taste and vulgar display in the arrangements of an English home. His views on political and social questions—or at any rate the application of them to questions of detail—were not shared by many whose zeal for right and for the public good was not a whit less energetic than his. But no one could ever have doubted the single-minded self-sacrificing spirit which prompted his every act. We are safe, even on the neutral ground of our Society, in affirming that he did a notable service to progress by proving that an enthusiastic belief in democracy is compatible with the earnest conviction that not in the accumulation of material wealth, but in the development of the finer perceptions by the individual lay the test of the perfect Social State.

Dr. Middleton takes rank among scholars and critics rather than among active workers in the realm of art. But as a writer and teacher he exercised a singular influence, and the enthusiasm he felt was all the more fruitful because it led him to seek exact knowledge and to enforce the highest standard of æsthetic truth. Those who had the privilege of knowing him privately will not need to be told how thoroughly he entered into the aims of our Society. As Director of the South Kensington Museum he had an opportunity of proving, by many practical measures, his anxiety that the treasures accumulated there should be utilised to the fullest extent for the delight and the instruction of the larger public, as distinguished from the connoisseurs.

We have to record, also, with sincere regret, the death of Mrs. Burbury, one of the first members of our Society and of our Council. In her, some of those who have taken a large part in our labours have to lament the loss of a kinswoman, and many, of a valued friend.

October 15.

A Retrospect of the Year.

THE last number of A BEAUTIFUL WORLD appeared in the month of December, 1895. If we have not, in the interval, been able to communicate with the members of the Society, the silence has not been due to lack of matter. There has been much to say; the report of the General Meeting cried aloud for publication, and, since then, much has been attempted and something achieved. For the present we must be content to supplement an account of the proceedings at our annual gathering with a general retrospect. After Christmas we hope to lay a heavier tax on the patience of our friends.

What have we succeeded in doing? We do not shrink from answering the inevitable question. If the test of success be immediate results cognisable by the eye of the wayfaring man, we have done very little indeed. We cannot parade statistics in this fashion—that, under the breath of our protest, so many thousands of field boards have been swept away, or that, thanks to the withering scorn of our invective, the area of unseemly placards has shrunk by so many hundreds of thousands of square yards. Nay, we hasten to add that we never expected to have measurable results to point to at this early stage of our effort. But, if the more reasonable criterion of usefulness be applied; if we are invited to say what advance we have made in educating and in eliciting public opinion, we can reply with confidence that we have good cause to be content. Three or four years ago there was no whisper of resistance to the progressive disfigurement of town and country; to-day the demand for reasonable regulation has become familiar as a public question. We have already outlived the stage of ridicule, and may hope before long to enter that of serious controversy. Concerning the end we have no misgiving.

But we do not disguise from ourselves the existence of one impediment which is not the less formidable because it confronts not our movement alone, but every movement that does not belong to the sphere of party politics. We contend that, if local representative bodies be invested with power to control spectacular advertising, there will be no indisposition on the part of those interested to conform to the regulations prescribed. But, in the absence of authoritative control, the competition between individuals to catch the public eye must lead to an indefinite extension of a practice which is alike injurious to the trades concerned and to the comfort of the community. An Act of Parliament, in short, is necessary as a basis of reform. A very brief and simple one would suffice, but an Act of Parliament there must be. Now the experience of the past Session confirms the experience of several that preceded it. A Bill brought in by a private member has little chance of being advanced to a third reading, if it suits the whims or the interest of any other members

to oppose it. Unhappily, one member of the House of Commons has deemed it right to defeat Mr. Boulnois's Bill in this very simple way.

It is, of course, possible that, if we are exceptionally fortunate in the coming Session, the measure may make its way to the Statute Book. But it will be prudent to adopt some collateral methods, and the Council will soon have to consider the expediency (1) of urging the Home Office to prepare a measure for amending the Local Government Act in the direction we desire, or to grant a Committee to inquire into the subject; and (2) of asking the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider the policy of taxing exposed advertisements, which has been adopted with advantage to the revenue in most Continental States.

One incident of the Session was encouraging as a proof that the House of Commons is by no means indifferent on matters affecting the defence of scenery. As to the merits of the Private Bill brought in to facilitate building operations which affected the view from Richmond Hill, we are not called on to offer any opinion here. It is enough to say that it was rejected in a full house by an overwhelming majority, under the impression (well founded or ill founded) that the arrangement embodied in the measure would injure the picturesque amenities of the neighbourhood.

As a cognate illustration of the sympathetic temper of departments sometimes supposed to care nothing for taste and sentiment, may be mentioned the successful appeal made to the Charity Commissioners to spare the Trinity Almshouses.

We have noted in preceding journals many instances of the determination of some of the leading Municipalities in England, to the full extent of their present powers, to keep street advertising within decent limits. Here it must suffice to note, that during the year the Commissioner of Police refused to renew the licences of omnibuses the windows of which were defaced by advertisements, and that on appeal to the Law Courts his action has been upheld. In the City of London the authorities have instituted successful prosecutions in cases where sandwich men and advertising vehicles were sent into the thoroughfares. The County Council have also secured the condemnation of some monster hoardings erected for advertising purposes, and, in a case which has engaged the attention of the Superior Courts, have obtained judicial confirmation of their rigid enforcement of the prohibition of sky signs. In some places the new device of footpath advertising has been visited by the magistrates with appropriate penalties.

These cases are cited only as illustrations of the willingness of public authorities to impose restraints. But their power of intervention is at present very narrow and almost accidental. It remains to arm them with adequate authority for the express purpose of preventing serious and unnecessary disfigurements.

At Eastbourne a serious attempt has been made, thanks to a

member of our Council, Mr. Charles Roberts, to induce the directors of the Pier Company to banish the eyesores from their property, and it can hardly fail to be ultimately successful.

We note with pleasure that in some of the new editions of Messrs. Black's Guides, reference is made in the description of pleasure resorts to their condition in respect of advertising disfigurements. Editors of other series will, it is hoped, follow the example, and the result will be to convince residents that the matter affects their profits. Our members would do well, when making enquiries at lodging agencies, &c., to press for information on this topic.

We have succeeded in many ways in maintaining and extending public interest in our subject. Fairly detailed reports of the proceedings at our General Meeting appeared in the principal journals, and a great deal of comment followed—sometimes thoughtful and well informed, and sometimes not. From time to time letters written on behalf of the Society have appeared in one or other—sometimes in many—of the leading journals. These had at least the good fortune to stir up opinion and excite thought. Among the subjects which in this way have been thrust by gentle force upon considerable sections of the newspaper-reading world are: (1) the case for the Rural Advertisements Bill, with immediate reference to the opposition of a Member of Parliament who claims to be inspired with zeal for the farmers' interests; (2) the disfiguring effect of monstrous signboards on the views from the Thames Embankment; (3) the opportunities afforded by holiday travel for spreading the light.

Individual members have it in their power to assist us greatly by taking advantage of suggestive incidents as they come under their notice to enforce the essential moral.

It should not be left to the officials to do all the work of newspaper persuasion. Both editors and readers view with a suspicion, which we cannot pronounce quite ungrounded, communications bearing the stamp of an organisation.

Those who wish to know what the Society, as a Society, has done in overcoming the inertia of popular sentiment, are invited to examine the extracts we have collected from the journals of the year.

Some of our friends think our propaganda has already had some positive effect in checking the spread of disfigurement. This is, of course, a matter in which precise verification is impossible. But whether we are entitled to claim a share in it or not, we can at least record with gratification the persistent effort to improve the type of poster. It would be perilous to express an opinion as to how far the new varieties deserve to be called in the higher sense "artistic"; but many of the wall pictures of to-day are, it will be generally confessed, entertaining and pleasing. Even within the compass of the modern school there has been distinct advance. The proportion of merely aggres-

sive, or of vulgar, or of equivocal designs diminishes, and that of wholesome and graceful designs increases from month to month. We must repeat here that our Society has never been opposed to the use of posters in appropriate places, and that, so far as we fight against enamelled plaques, huge painted boards, framed cardboards, and sky-signs, we are directly enlarging the field of effort of those who devote themselves to pictorial invention on paper.

Side by side with this improvement in the posters, has gone the creation of monstrous and novel puffing devices, chiefly by the aid of gas and electricity. As to these, the only consolation is that sooner or later the easy-going public will lose its temper, and say that endurance point is passed. Thus every flagrant abuse of the existing liberty may be philosophically regarded as an object lesson as to the need of rational regulation.

Even more consolatory is the steady progress achieved in their respective fields by the several Societies whose aims are akin to ours, but whose operations are of a distinctly constructive kind. The Kyrle Society, the Commons Preservation Society, the National Trust, the Selborne Society, the Metropolitan Public Gardens Association, and the Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings should have the warmest sympathy of all who wish to see Beauty and Dignity respected as elements in modern life. We are all engaged in different parts of the same work; but it is the happiness of those who labour for most of the Societies named to know that theirs is the kindly propaganda by the doing of good deeds. Every improvement they effect creates the atmosphere in which improvements grow.

Some encouraging and stimulating communications have been received from American well-wishers. In some districts, at any rate, of the United States, the reform we wish to effect is already in force, to the great content of everyone.

The Society for the Suppression of Street Noises, of which mention was made in our last Journal, has been signally successful in obtaining public recognition of the importance of the question with which it is concerned. Apart from the personal sympathy which many of our members feel with the effort to remedy the precise grievance, it has been of controversial service to our cause to have had the general issue raised whether Freedom means unlimited licence to annoy others.

It is a matter of importance to dissipate the idea that in desiring to subject to public control the display in public places of advertisements addressed to the public eye, we are contravening the principle of liberty and individualism. We may therefore note as one of the memorable events of the year the appearance, in Mr. Lecky's "Democracy and Liberty" of a passage in which the right doctrine is clearly and unequivocally asserted:—

"The State cannot undertake to guarantee the morals of its citizens, but it ought at least to enable them to pass through

the streets without being scandalised, tempted, or molested. The same rule applies also to some things which have no connection with morals; to unnecessary street noises which are the occasion of acute annoyance to numbers; to buildings which destroy the symmetry and deface the beauty of a quarter or darken the atmosphere by floods of unconsumed smoke; to the gigantic advertisements by which private firms and vendors of quack remedies are now suffered to disfigure our public buildings, to destroy the beauty both of town and country, and to pursue the traveller with a hideous eyesore for hundreds of miles from the metropolis. This great evil has vastly increased in our day, and it urgently requires the interposition of the Legislature." —"Democracy and Liberty," vol. i., p. 167.

This is, as far as we know, the first authoritative recognition by any eminent writer on political philosophy of the urgency of the question with which we are concerned. Mr. Lecky, it is well known, is in favour rather of curtailing than of extending the sphere of State or collective interference: and thus his emphatic approval of the principle of control in this instance is of peculiar value.

Since the last list was published in the Journal, 90 new members have joined our Society. There has been only one withdrawal, and that only on the ground of want of faith. It has also been discovered that the name of one well-wisher was placed on the register by mistake.

Not till September last was any direct appeal made to members for the payment of outstanding subscriptions. The response has been most cheering. We have now a balance (after the discharge of all liabilities) of nearly £100: but it must be remembered that this includes a large amount of subscriptions paid in advance for future years. We could do much more if we were assured of some income in excess of the annual half-crowns; and our satisfactory position so far is, in fact, due to the receipt of special donations or subscriptions from a comparatively small number of our members. The audited accounts for the year will, as a matter of course, appear in the next Journal.

Perhaps one of the most useful and certainly the most gracious incident of the year was a garden party given by Dr. and Mrs. Longstaff on the 4th of July, at their residence, the Highlands, Putney Heath. As a meeting place there could not have been a more delightful or more appropriate spot; and the large number of members—more than 200—who responded to the invitation, retain a very pleasant recollection of the day. An informal (and, indeed, improvised) meeting was held on the lawn. Mr. Waterhouse expressed our thanks to our host and hostess, and Dr. Longstaff replied in a speech which, if we only had a report of it to present, would be a notable feature in our present BEAUTIFUL WORLD.

But we must be content to present an account of what was said at the General Meeting. It will be kept in mind that every

speaker at that gathering spoke his own thoughts freely. Many of our members would not accept, without reserve, some of the opinions expressed. "That railway stations are intrinsically hideous"; "That towns are hopeless"; "That the masses of the English people are indifferent to the beauty of natural scenery"; are (for example) propositions which do not command universal assent.

Among other measures taken by the Council, has been the despatch of letters enclosing copies of Mr. Boulnois's Bill to many County and Borough Councils in England. We have received, in most cases, courteous replies. The Chairmen of several Borough Councils have expressed their regret that, as the measure did not extend to their areas, they were unable to suggest the passing of resolutions in its favour.* In other instances the Corporations have decided, on the same ground, to take no steps. But we are glad to be able to report a definitely favourable judgment in the following cases:—

Crewes.—The Town Council has "decided to petition in favour of the Bill."

Devonport.—The Town Council "most warmly approve of the objects of the Association."

Taunton.—The Town Council "approve generally of the scheme of the National Society."

Ossett.—The Council "approve of the provisions of the Rural Advertisements Bill."

Wimbledon.—The District Council has passed a resolution supporting the Bill.

It is pleasant to add that several of the Chairmen of County Councils, or Mayors of Boroughs, which did not give us their corporate approval, have, nevertheless become (as private persons) members of our Society.

On the other hand (to chasten our pride) the Chairman of the Essex County Council has caused us to be informed that, "it is sad to see so much energy devoted to so trumpery a matter."

As an assistance to members in spreading our ideas, two new papers have been lately prepared—of which copies accompany this journal. In the larger pamphlet the Hon. Sec. has thought it better to assume personal responsibility for the views set forth, but there is hardly a consideration embodied in it which has not been independently suggested to him by members or well-wishers. It has been fortunate enough to receive a good deal of critical attention in a large number of journals and reviews, and, so far, has fulfilled its purpose—that of stimulating serious discussion.

* In reply, we have stated that it is intended so to modify the draft as to make the provisions apply to all boroughs that are at all of a rural character. We have urged also that large cities and towns are immediately interested in protecting the picturesque amenities of the surrounding tracts, which, though not forming part of the municipal area, are the principal, or only, pleasure ground of the bulk of the citizens.

But we still feel that there is room for papers of a more compact and popular character, and we shall be grateful if the members, who have from time to time urged us to produce "campaign literature," will try their hand at inventions in this way. There is an undoubted advantage in having variety of thought and treatment, and though the official scribe has an incurable preference for severe reasonableness, he is not at all blind to the need of piquancy and colour.

We have, in conclusion, to urge upon every member the duty of personal effort. On pages 114 and 115 of the fourth number of *A BEAUTIFUL WORLD* (December, 1894) will be found—in large legible type—an enumeration of the ways in which individuals can help. The main purpose of our Society is to stimulate and encourage personal activity. It is only through and by the members that the Society can hope to achieve any lasting and substantial good. If we do not severally take our cause seriously; if we do not think it worth thought and study and trouble, it is vain to complain of the ruthlessness of the advertiser and the apathy of the Legislature.

The Meeting of the Society, 1896.

THE Third General Meeting was held on January 31st, 1896, in the Hall of the Society of Arts.

Amongst those present were:—Mrs. Audland, H. E. Acland, E. W. Allfrey, Fred. W. Ashley, Miss Aves, J. Staines Babb, Miss Caroline Barnard, J. Barnes, W. Phipson Beale, Q.C., Mrs. Beale, Miss Clarinda Boddy, M.D., W. B. Burne, Dr. Byrne, H. R. Calder, W. D. Caröe, Mrs. David Carmichael, Miss Chabot, Lawrence Chubb, Dr. Clapham, Dr. Clemow, G. C. Colman, Mrs. Colman, Josceline Courtenay, M. Crackanthorpe, Q.C., R. J. Dormer, Miss Drewry, Miss Evans, W. B. Swete Evans, T. Mullett Ellis, C. W. Empson, B. R. England, W. A. H. Fasson, W. E. Garrett Fisher, Sir W. H. Flower, W. A. Fox, Dr. Freyer, Miss Edith Gittins, H. Goss, Mrs. Von Glehn, Alfred Perceval Graves, Sir Lepel Griffin, K.C.S.I., C. F. Hall, Mrs. Hall, The Rev. Joseph Halsey, Mrs. Halsey, C. Hamilton, Miss Sarah C. Hand, Lady Harberton, Mrs. Charles Hawkesley, E. M. Harrington, M. Hayles, A. J. Hearne, E. H. Helps, Walter E. Hewitt, Arthur Holland, Basil Holmes, George Humphreys, Miss E. F. Howard, T. G. Jackson, R.A., Ernest W. Jones, S. Johnson, Samuel Knight, Mrs. Knowling, Edward Lechmere, Mrs. Lechmere, A. M. Low, Miss Lovell, A. E. Macnaught, Miss Macdonnell, Lady Isabel Margesson, Hope Moncrieff, William Morris, Mrs. Neale, Miss Newcome, Miss Nicholl, Philip Norman, H. J. Norris, Miss Ann Norton, John Penne, F. C. Pawle, Sir Reginald Palgrave, K.C.B., Miss Penrose, Giles T. Pilcher, Henry Richards, John Richmond, W. B. Richmond, R.A., Charles Rolleston, R. H. Rosser, Mrs. H. Sylvester Samuel, Richmond Seeley, Mrs. Seeley, W. S. Seton-Karr, Miss Lovell, Dr. Sisley, B. M. Smith, J. St. Loe Strachey, H. H. Statham, F. Sure, C. Harrison Townsend, Mrs. Townsend, Miss Townsend, Thackeray Turner, A. Waterhouse, R.A., Miss Lucie Walker, Emery Walker, Humphrey Ward, M. J. Warner, J. Warner, Philip Webb, A. J. Western, L. Waylett, J. Lowry Whittle, Colonel Wild, E. D. J. Wilson, Mrs. Wilson, T. Wilson, Miss Lydia M. Webb.

MR. WATERHOUSE, the President, took the chair.

The HON. SEC. read extracts from letters received.

MR. ALFRED AUSTIN wrote : "I had hoped to be able to attend the meeting, but, at the last moment, I find it impossible. You will know, however, that the endeavour of this Society to rescue the rural scenery of England from disfigurement and desecration commands my warmest sympathy. A poet even so robust as Ben Johnson affirms :

'It is for Beauty that the World was made.'

and if in our conception of Beauty we include intellectual and moral as well as physical beauty, the line represents an Ideal which, I think, we should all strive to render actual. It is only by appealing to moral sentiment that the enthusiasm or indignation of the English people can be thoroughly aroused ; and the efforts of the Society would be more quickly crowned with success if you could convince the nation, and, through it, the Legislature, that it is *wrong* to make life unlovely, and a duty incumbent on everyone to add, to the best of his ability, to the beauty which, perfectly understood, is synonymous with the dignity and the worth of existence."

MR. WILLIAM BLACK wrote : "I am exceedingly sorry I cannot be present at your meeting ; but I hope it will be in every way successful, and also that one of the speakers will point out that if the public could be brought to set its face against purchasing any one of the commodities thus offensively advertised, the practice would very speedily cease. And it is the public at large, not any small section of it, that has its interests involved. You can only reach those advertisers through their pockets."

SIR ARTHUR BLOMFIELD wrote : "I had arranged, and fully intended, to be at the meeting this afternoon. I have read your little *brochure** with great pleasure and interest, and I am glad to say that I cordially agree with the general tenor of the views therein expressed.

The HON. MRS. R. C. BOYLE wrote : "I should very much have liked to have said a few words at your meeting, but I found that after all it could not be done. My interest in the Society, if anything, increases, and I think its influence is more and more necessary to one's comfort. I find that many feel the same."

The RIGHT HON. JAMES BRYCE, M.P., wrote : "When your letter of the 27th reached me this morning I was just sitting down to write to you to say that to my great regret it will be impossible for me to be with you, as my doctor will not let me leave Aberdeen before that day at the earliest. Pray express my sincere regrets at being unable to be present. I need not say that the aims of the Society continue to have my hearty sympathy. Offensive as are the 'spectacular' coloured advertisements which

* This refers to a paper prepared by the Hon. Sec. on the eve of the meeting. It forms the basis of the pamphlet "S. C. A. P. A. : Why it exists : What it may hope to do."

cover the walls in towns, the defacement of rural scenery is still worse. The beauties of nature ought to be regarded by us as a precious possession, to be carefully guarded, and a private owner ought not to be allowed to disfigure some charming view for the sake of a petty gain, any more than he should be allowed to destroy a noble waterfall. The educative effect of the campaign which the Society carries on will be gradual and may come slowly; but its efforts will tell in the long run, and public support grow as the value of the objects it contends for becomes better understood.

“P.S.—The paper furnishes matter for many speeches.”

MR. WALTER CRANE wrote: “I much regret, that owing to press of work, I am unable to attend the meeting of the Society, which ought to have the support of all who care for the historic associations, the beauty and romance of their own land. Ah! if it were really our own, collectively speaking, we should see to it; but what is everybody’s business is too often nobody’s business—hence the urgent need for a Society like yours, which is prepared to take up the question seriously and bring parliamentary powers to bear.

“I should just like to point out that in the matter of defacing the landscape by glaring printed boards in the fields along the main lines of railway (which to my mind is the head and front of offence, and should be stopped at once in the interest of all), the responsibility appears to rest with *one or two wealthy individuals or firms* whom I need not name. Could not these be indicted for a nuisance? And could not pressure be brought to bear on the railway companies so far as they are answerable.

“It would be interesting to know at what price the distressed agriculturist (as we are told) sells his birthright. Truly the ‘free’ Briton no longer can call his country his own, in any sense, with proprietary labels stuck all over it!

“Shame on us all, I say, for allowing it. Patriotism might begin at home.”

SIR F. POLLOCK, BART., wrote: “Must be at Oxford 31st. Cannot weshorten the name? it is a great inconvenience.”

[NOTE.—By a sort of spontaneous agreement of members “S.C.A.P.A.” has been adopted as a simple abridgment of the unwieldy designation.]

MADAME CANZIANI wrote: “May I make a suggestion? Would it not be a good thing if members would hold informal drawing-room meetings, inviting friends of their own as well as members of the Society, and having little speeches, &c.”

SIR EDWARD CLARK, M.P., wrote: “Not the least probability of being able to attend, but will give what help I can in the House.”

MR. CHARLES HARRISON, M.P., L.C.C., wrote: “I regret that, as I have to attend an important conference of delegates on the question of London Government on the 31st inst., I am unable

to be present at your meeting, with the objects of which I most fully sympathise. The only precedent that I know of, which has passed into law, are the provisions in the Thames Conservancy Act, 1894, and I should like to see the principle further extended so as to cover the objects your Society has in view."

SIR JOHN HUTTON, L.C.C., also wrote to express his regret that he was prevented (by the same cause) from being present.

[MR. BOULNOIS, M.P., L.C.C., who had hoped to attend, was, it may be explained, unexpectedly detained at the conference referred to.]

MR. LECKY, M.P., wrote: "I need scarcely say I sympathise cordially with the object of your movement. I hope to have the pleasure of voting in the House of Commons for a Bill for the protection of rural scenery."

Sir W. M. Conway, Mrs. Fawcett, Mr. Arnold Forster, M.P., Mr. Walter Hazell, M.P.; Sir William Hunter, K.C.S.I., Sir John Lubbock, M.P., Mr. Preece, C.B., Mr. Briton Riviere, R.A., also sent letters of regret and goodwill.

MR. WATERHOUSE addressed the meeting: Besides the number of our friends whom we rejoice to see here to-day we have had numerous letters from others expressing their inability to be present. There is one whose death we all deplore whose many engagements and ill-health prevented his ever attending our meetings (though he was a Member of the Council). But there was no one who thought more highly of our Society, or worked more heartily in sympathy with it, or more earnestly wished it success than the late President of the Royal Academy. You will remember the words which Lord Leighton addressed to us at our last meeting. I will quote from them—"Never more than in our over-ridden days was the soothing and restful atmosphere that breathes from natural scenery precious and needed." And you will, I am sure, join with me in grieving that we shall never have his powerful advocacy again wherever the interests of nature and art are in any way suffering.

The other day Mr. Balfour, when receiving the freedom of the City of Glasgow, pointed out how much had been done within the last fifty years in great municipalities, of which Glasgow was one, in improving the moral and physical well-being of the town population. It is no doubt a perfectly true and encouraging fact that wherever a certain number of people are crowded together, even in comparatively small numbers, much has been done for their education and for their health. But is it not time (those of us, at any rate, who are in this room ask ourselves) that something should also be done if not to improve, at any rate to preserve, the amenities of life—amenities which it appears are sure to be encroached upon wherever people crowd together, if there be not a keen sense on the part of each individual of what is due to his neighbours in this respect.

Within the last two or three generations the population of this

island has enormously increased, and the towns are rapidly absorbing more and more of the country, and that in a most unlovely way. Does it not, therefore, behove the community to guard most jealously the natural beauties which remain against destruction and degradation, and this not for ourselves alone, but for those who come after us? Ought we not also to endeavour to foster such a general desire for decorum and beauty in our minds as to keep even our towns as far as possible free from sights and sounds which degrade town life, and which terribly interfere with the enjoyment of what is intended to give charm and attraction to the cities in which we dwell?

The unnecessary emission of smoke from our chimneys, the exhibition of ungainly signs—a product of the self-assertion of the day; the enormous and gaudy posters which make it impossible to appreciate the beauty of the adjacent architecture upon which, we all know, so much money and thought is yearly expended; the shrieks of the newspaper boys (which, however, are very much more exasperating in the northern towns than in London); the foolish repetition of the same enamelled plates preventing the travelling public recognising their destination when they reach it—these, and countless other illustrations of the abuse of English liberty, when prevented by a selfish disregard of the feelings and the enjoyment of the general community we would gladly do battle with, and seek to remove.

A popular writer in this month's *Nineteenth Century* says, "Every year national life grows everywhere less varied and less picturesque, and more unlovely. The gaiety of nations dies down as the beauty around them pales." We know and we regret all this, but at present we confine our attention to the first of these evils—the correction of the abuse of public advertising. We are constantly asked what our Society has done so far in checking these abuses, to which we reply that beyond some marked successes it has influenced a large amount of public opinion. This I take to be our great work, and by far the most fruitful work upon which we can be engaged.

If we can persuade the public that offensively advertised goods are not necessarily better or cheaper than those which rely on their own excellence as their recommendation, I think we shall have accomplished something.

If we can open the eyes, not only of their customers, but some, at any rate, of the advertisers themselves, to the selfishness which characterises a system of setting at nought the feeling of others, we shall have accomplished something more. If we can so far excite public interest in our endeavours as to make the public desire combined action to check the disfigurement of the beautiful world in which we live, we shall, indeed, not have existed in vain.

We never expected that the advertising monster, whose capacity for spoliation is so great, would be destroyed in a year or two. It has long done its evil work. It is well supplied with

the munitions and sinews of war. It had taken more or less possession of England and English waters long before we raised our protesting voice. We have need of patience and determination to overcome selfishness on the one hand and callous apathy on the other. Still we may, I believe, take some encouragement from the fact that a decided check has already been put on field advertising, which, at one time, threatened to leave no beautiful spot undesecrated.

Although it is a humiliating consideration that our boasted liberty should be so far overstrained as to allow the self-seeking of the few to destroy the precious heritage of the many (I mean the beauty of the country which we call our own)—a heritage belonging to rich and poor alike, to the poor rather than to the rich; though it is humiliating to witness, with a few brilliant exceptions, the supineness of our legislators on this great question; though we may regret the personal lukewarmness of our legislators—I believe that the time will come, if we are true to our convictions, when we shall have secured such a weight of public opinion on our side as to make our rulers open their eyes and ears to the importance of our appeal.

SIR LEPEL GRIFFIN, K.C.S.I., moved the first resolution: "That it is a national interest to protect rural scenery from unnecessary disfigurement, and to maintain dignity and propriety in the aspect of our towns."

It is, no doubt, somewhat of a national disgrace that there should be in England—this country of beauty—any necessity for a Society such as this at all. On the other hand, I think that there is no Society now in existence which has in it more possibilities of good, and which is more consonant with the highest education and culture than the Society of which our honoured President has spoken to-day.

I have just been reading, as I have no doubt most of you have, the interesting paper which has been drawn up by our Honorary Secretary. Let me here dwell on the fact already emphasised by our President, that even from a utilitarian point of view the *abuse* of advertising—I do not say the *use*—has a deadening and weakening effect upon English industry and art. The conditions under which our work is now carried on by means of lying puffs and absurd posters on our walls are disgraceful.

The handicraftsmen of Florence, in the condition under which their best art and work was produced, did not plaster their walls with pestilential advertisements. I think we may see in the general depreciation of English work and the less esteem in which it is held in the world, the very sign of the evil which is here denounced.

You must remember that this vast system of advertising is a very new thing, and, if you will go back only a few years—it is wonderful how soon we become accustomed even to the most odious things—you will see there was none of this monstrous wickedness in advertising, especially in the matter

of English scenery. I made a tour in America about twelve or thirteen years ago. There the advertisements, which disfigured the scenery, struck me as something quite new. This was in 1883, and I said I had seen nothing like it in England. You know how proud our American cousins are of the Mississippi,—which, for the greater part, is a most hideous stream. In the north, however, about 200 miles from the sea, it really strikes into very beautiful country. There is the famous town of St. Paul's; and here, amidst this glorious piece of scenery (the first I had seen along the Mississippi) my eye rested upon the words, in letters 20 feet high, "Smith's Chewing Tobacco is the best." It is difficult to express what a shock such an apparition gives one for the first time; and I remember that in a little book I wrote about America, on my return, I dwelt on this defect in the American eye and conscience. I think, however, now, that England can in the abuse of advertising almost give points to America. Unless we can surround our population with beautiful things; unless in our Board Schools we can inculcate—what we certainly do not inculcate now—a love of art and beauty, I think we shall have done very little to promote our aims. You must understand that in England to-day there is very little genuine love for, or appreciation of, beauty, and the higher we go the less enthusiasm we find. The Houses of Parliament, I should say, taking them all round, are perhaps the most Philistine and the least fond of art of any association in the world; and it will require a great deal of pressure to be brought to bear before we can induce the Government and Parliament to take up the work.

MR. WILLIAM MORRIS: Let me in the first place say that I think the Society have done absolutely right in pressing the point of the advertisements which disfigure rural scenery rather than making too much of the point of the disfigurement in town. As soon as you get anything like public opinion to desire some reasonable regulation of advertisements in the towns, there are the municipalities—and some of them, like our own London County Council, would be very anxious, I believe, to do all they possibly could to force public opinion. We owe a debt of thanks to that member of the County Council who succeeded in getting passed the other day a resolution to the effect that the London County Council should take cognisance of every valuable piece of historical building which was threatened with destruction—a most important resolution I think.

Next, we have to remember that the enormous majority of the people of the country do not care one straw about natural beauty. They have, I allow, a certain sort of pleasure in wandering about in the fields and enjoying the fresh air, but, as for looking at nature in detail with anything like observation, it is a fact that the greater part of the people of this country are entirely without eyes! Unless you can use your eyes, and unless the use of your eyes makes you suffer, nothing will be

done. Then, the farmers are willing to make a little money, without regard to beauty, and it may be said they are entitled to do that. In point of fact, that is the position: We have to get a majority—an effective majority, which will make enough noise about Reform to get it carried. We have then a very difficult task before us, but in the meantime it is well to consider if we cannot to a certain extent mitigate this evil. I would call your attention to the wisdom—the commercial wisdom—of this matter of advertising. In the first place, take my word for it, it is only under very peculiar circumstances that advertising ever pays. And yet, my friends, I tell you plainly, people all over the country, in all kinds of businesses, spend enormous sums of money and half ruin themselves in advertising, the result of which is that they do not sell much more. The truth is, it is only on these two conditions advertising pays: the thing must cost little or nothing to make, and it must attract everybody's money. The advertiser must enter into a life and death competition with all the other advertisers. A few succeed and flourish, but the greater part give in, and those that give in—well, their names appear in the *Gazette*. As to those goods which cost nothing to make and a lot to advertise, ought we not to avoid paying for them in hard cash. On the whole, we have a right to see that our money, if we possibly can, should not be wasted.

I cannot help saying that there is nothing for it but for us to slowly build up some kind of public opinion which shall allow us to have our own way, and that, of course, will be a very long job indeed. In these matters, I must tell you I am not, and never can be, a practical man; but I am perfectly willing to fall in with a scheme which has the slightest chance of success, and to give my most whole-hearted support to it, even if it be only an *ad interim* measure. This matter cannot be left from day to day: while the grass is growing the steed is starving.

My resolution says: "That it is a natural interest to protect rural scenery from disfigurement." Now there are a great many things besides placards and so forth that are permanent disfigurements. One permanent disfigurement occurs to me, a disfigurement at Mapledurham, on the Thames, which is no doubt one of the most beautiful spots in England—in the world. There is a sort of bank there. The Great Western Railway wanted more room; it would have been a very easy thing to get that room on the land side, away from the river without spoiling the place, but instead of doing this (which would have been comparatively harmless) they put up a hideous wall of blue brick, to the utter ruin of the view. It was nobody's business, and it went by default.

In taking up this matter of the boards that are stuck about our fields, I think we have done very well. It is very piteous, whilst travelling along the railway, to see some pretty piece of scenery disfigured, and one says, "It is horrible; I cannot look at it."

I also think that the Bill introduced in the last Session was a

very right kind of Bill to put before the public. It condemned as a nuisance that which it was worth people's time and trouble to abate if they possibly could, and practically asserted: "That it is of national interest to protect rural scenery from unnecessary disfigurement." That resolution I most cordially sympathise with, and beg to second.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

MR. W. B. RICHMOND, R.A., moved the second resolution: "That this meeting, impressed with the serious injury done by the practice of indiscriminate spectacular advertising, regards the Rural Advertisements Bill, which was brought in by Mr. Boulnois, in the Sessions of 1894 and 1895, as a measure of urgent importance, and commends it to the goodwill of the new House of Commons."

With regard to the advertisements in Town, I hold, with Mr. Morris, that we cannot do very much. You see people will go on advertising; we are not in the millennium, and people will be vulgar; but what we can do is to impress, each one of us, on everyone with whom we come into contact that to issue these swarms of huge, ugly posters is an odious thing. Now why should not our advertisements be limited as to size? That seems to me the first thing to see to. If a thing is vulgar, it is, of course, vulgar whether small or large. A vulgar advertisement is, however, very much more offensive when drawn eight feet than when it is two feet.

There is a point of primary importance, and that is, that no advertisements should be allowed to be placed upon any building whatever except railway stations. Surely it is a very impudent thing to interfere with the work of a great architect, and even simple houses ought to have some respect paid to them. In my neighbourhood—Hammersmith—there is a block of buildings entirely covered from head to foot with advertisements. The windows are covered, and the people in these rooms live in darkness for the sake of a shilling or two.

With regard to railway stations, they are such hideous things that it does not really matter whether they are made more hideous or not; but it is a great public nuisance that one should always be mystified as to the name of one's station.

There is another form that advertisements are taking elsewhere. I was in my garden and I heard sudden reports of artillery; presently from the sky fell masses of green and red paper, advertising a tooth powder. These fell all over my garden, and I am not exaggerating when I tell you that these were, at least, spread over two acres; it took my gardener a week to collect all those pieces of paper which were blown out of the guns into my garden.

The other day I was walking between Hammersmith and Kensington, and it happened to be blowing a gale of wind; a young man was hurrying down the street with a bundle of slips which he threw in handfuls into the roads, and the streets of Kensington were literally covered in a most disgraceful fashion. But

note the practical result. Half a dozen of these papers were thrown immediately in front of a cab-horse and he bolted.

Now somebody said that local authorities have power to stop nuisances; well give them power, certainly, but it is no use unless you are prepared to badger the local authorities. I have had two years at that, and I know that as long as the vestries are composed of the kind of people who compose them now you will never get anything decently done by them, unless you are prepared to badger them.

With regard to the country, that is a very much more serious matter than Town. I should say Absolutely forbid them, and have done with it. It is no use mincing matters. I say there should be no advertisements in the country.

At first, we must bring before the peoples' minds that this advertisement nuisance is a very distasteful thing. If every member of this Society makes up his or her mind to ventilate this subject they will do a great deal more than a collective body.

MR. CRACKANTHORPE, Q.C. : The immediate point of the resolution which has been read by my friend, Mr. W. Richmond, is to call attention to Mr. Boulnois' Bill. Mr. Morris, in speaking, has said there were great difficulties in the way. I should like to say a word or two in favour of the practicability of the Bill, because, not being a poet like my friend Mr. William Morris, I have, in the course of my daily practice, to deal with practical matters. It is said that you will never get the local authorities in rural places to take an active interest in the matter, and my friend, Mr. Richmond, seemed to be of opinion that unless there was someone behind, badgering—as he graphically and emphatically expressed it—these local authorities, we should be, when this Bill was passed, exactly where we were before.

I should like to call attention to the fact that some eight or nine years ago Messrs. Hudson, of St. Paul's Churchyard, put up an enormous sky sign, which attracted considerable attention in the public Press. There was a chorus of disapproval from nearly every journal in London, and Messrs. Hudson very speedily succumbed to that cry, and took down their sky sign. By its erection they were, in fact, blotting out one of our national cathedrals. But what was the result of that on public opinion? There was brought into Parliament a Bill, which passed both Houses and is now law, prohibiting, as from July, 1891, the erection of any sky sign whatever within the Administration of the County of London. As I understood Mr. William Morris, he thought that the vested interest of the farmer, in his own field, which contained the board and paid his rent thereby, might be an insuperable difficulty in passing these bye-laws, or, indeed, with dealing with the matter effectually at all. Now, as to vested interest, there were at the time that Act was passed between eighty and ninety sky signs in London, and every one of the owners petitioned against the Bill, and there was a civil engineer who was very strong in his opposition, for he had patented a monstrous object twenty feet high, weighing half a ton, regardless of the sacrifice of human life had

it fallen down. That was a case in which the vested interest was put on one side by the wisdom of Parliament at the instance of the London County Council.

The matter does not stop here, however, because, quite lately the Conservators of our beautiful Thames—for it is a beautiful river since the construction of the Embankment—succeeded in passing an Act, or rather in getting a section inserted in the Thames Conservancy Act of 1894, which absolutely enables the Thames Conservancy to prohibit—this is a local authority—any advertising whatever on the banks of the Thames. Is there less sense of beauty in the minds of our rural authorities? I think not. I believe a great deal can be done by this Bill of Mr. Boulnois, but I agree very much with every speaker who preceded me that it is useless to attempt legislation of any kind unless public opinion is ripe for it, and the great advantage of a society like this is not only that it forwards legislation but that it moulds public opinion.

In the leaflet that is issued by the Society I find a passage which struck me as I was reading it just now as singularly pregnant with suggestion. It says, "It is particularly urged that the sympathies of all who are concerned with the training of the young should be enlisted." I would begin much earlier than with those who read the newspapers, for I am certain we shall get the co-operation of the Press. I would begin in the nursery. I would endeavour to instil into the infant mind the true character of those advertisers in a way which probably they themselves would not particularly agree with. Let me suggest, ladies and gentlemen, and particularly ladies, that there is a chance in your nurseries to bring about this effect on the alliterative principle—which commends itself to the advertiser—and that we should pay him back in his own coin, and beat him on his own ground. Now, it has just occurred to me to write down one or two sentences which I think the infant mind would speedily imbibe and which it would be very difficult in after life to forget."

We might begin in this way:—

"Carter's little liver pills are abominable as an advertisement, angering and annoying us all;" or

"Carter's little liver pills blur, blot, and blight the bounteous beauties of Britain; they mar the majesty of our mountains, they vilify our valleys, and shut out our sea views."

In London there are many of us who are weak in our h's, the following would be useful:—

"Owbridge's lung tonic interferes with the happiness of hundreds of hard-worked holiday makers."

A man would never displace his h's after that.

Others are weak in their r's, as I was when a boy. My mother taught me to say three or four times straight off:—

"Around the rugged rocks the ragged rascals ran."

Another much better and a little more useful in its application.

There is a man named Reckitts who indulges in blue. I think the following would answer :—

“Reckitts ruins rural retreats and renders road and rail repulsive.”

A primer so prepared for the use of elementary schools would, I am quite sure, create a dislike for all this advertising.

Let me suggest that the last lines should be these—speaking of those drugs which are forced upon our notice. Finish off in this way and make the children learn it by heart :—

“Boycotted not bought,
Scouted not swallowed,
Despised by the dyspeptic,
Finally and for ever forgotten.”

A little timely ridicule so applied to those over-puffed goods would be found very useful in interfering with the success of these degraders of natural scenery. I venture to make this practical suggestion to the Council, and I hope in some future leaflet we shall find a skeleton of such primer and in that way the path will be smoother for Mr. Boulnois' excellent and practical Bill.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

MR. HUMPHREY WARD proposed the third resolution: “That this meeting—approving of the principles of the National Society for Checking the Abuses of Public Advertising—accepts the report and statement of accounts* and the proceedings of the Council.”

I think that after the very practical, brilliant and amusing speech of Mr. Crackanthorpe, almost everything has been said that need be said. It only remains for us to wind up the business of the evening, I think, by congratulating ourselves on the success that has attended us so far. But in this matter, if anything has got to be done, and especially before Parliament, the sinews of war are very essential. Let us remember that this Bill of Mr. Boulnois, upon which our faith has been pinned, has been unfortunate in two sessions, mainly because the Parliament before which it was brought had, perhaps, too much to do. We have better hope for the new Parliament, and I may add that amongst the seven backers of the Bill five are with him and only two against him on general politics. That argument might have some weight for the mind of even the Prime Minister, who, I regret to remark (in a recent speech) is a little sceptical as to the good this Society might do. Prime Ministers have been converted before this, especially when a great deal of pressure has been brought upon them. I, myself, entirely endorse everything that has been said as to the possibility of working this matter through the local authorities. I have considerable belief in these local bodies; even the London County Council has rid us of the sky-signs as Mr. Crackanthorpe has pointed out. Rural authorities are, for the most part, composed of a class that, traditionally, has

* It may be as well to explain that the Report and accounts referred to are those printed in the last number of A BEAUTIFUL WORLD.

some regard and some respect for the rural beauty of England; and I think that a considerable effect may be produced by societies of this kind trying to open their eyes and convince them that their eyes were given them to see with. Let us remember that similar societies, such as the Commons Preservation Society have produced a considerable effect and have done many things in a very quiet way. I think we can be pretty well assured that we shall have at least as much success if we simply stick to our programme.

MR. S. LOE STRACHEY: I should like very much, apropos of the resolution, to take two points. The first of them is, the duty of the members of the Society to impress upon the public that our Society exists for the purpose of "checking" the abuses of public advertising, and is not a society for the purpose of abolishing advertising altogether. I find that when you try to convert people to join this Society they say: "It is quite useless! it is quite hopeless; you cannot stop the poster." Our object should be, if possible, to avoid any appearance of endeavouring to stop it. We do not want to stop the poster—we want to keep it in its proper place.

The second point is: whether it would not be possible for this Society to take a positive as well as a negative view of its duties, and not merely to try and check objectionable advertising, but also to encourage a better form of advertising. In the Report there are one or two suggestive paragraphs, and the pamphlet prepared by our Hon. Secretary encourages that line of thought. It appears to me that it should be our object, if we can, to encourage the good kind of advertisements and the good kind of poster. It might be possible to hold an exhibition of decent as against vile posters. It would prove to the public that we could encourage the respectable poster, and would also prove to them that we were not enemies to advertising, but merely wished to stop its abuse.

I should like to say a word or two of congratulation on behalf of another society. The Executive Committee of the National Trust for the Preservation of Places of Historic Interest has asked me to express to this Society their hearty sympathy with its objects and of their desire to do everything they can to help on its work.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

MR. H. H. STATHAM: At the last moment I would say a few words in support of this resolution, which hardly needs further support. I confine myself to one topic which has been, I think, omitted, and that is, in regard to Mr. William Morris's difficulty in applying the local machinery to stop the farmers from putting up advertisements in his field. No doubt, as he says, it is a very hard thing upon Hodge personally not to make a little money, but it should be remembered that it is not only one Hodge who acts in this way, but Nobbs, Stokes, and Nokes come all along the line, and then it becomes a subject of national interest.

There are a large number of persons who do not feel the annoyance that we feel on this subject, and who take the line that they will not interfere to occasion injury—injury to poor

men. It is not the action of the one poor man in doing this, but of the several thousand poor men that becomes a public nuisance.

One other thing—as to the effect of advertising in the towns. It is not only a question of disfigurement to the streets, it is a question very often of destroying the architectural beauty. A man wishes to make himself more conspicuous than anyone else in the same line. He puts up letters in front of his house bigger than somebody else, each man endeavouring to have a larger advertisement than his opponent. The first resolution says: “It is a matter of national interest to maintain dignity in the aspect of our towns.” Now, it is certain that architectural effect, and above all the scale of architecture, must suffer seriously if people are allowed to go on increasing the size of the letters they use for the advertisements. I beg to join heartily in support of the resolution.

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, before putting this resolution, I must call upon our treasurer, Mr. John Richmond, to say a word.

MR. JOHN RICHMOND (the hon. treasurer): I do not wish to keep you on such a dull subject as finance. It is a subject which touches us at a tender point, but I think the financial condition of the Society is fairly satisfactory. You will have noticed the balance-sheet in the November number of A BEAUTIFUL WORLD. Since then, from the beginning of the new year, subscriptions have poured in upon us; people have responded readily and kindly. At present we have £70 at the bank; but I regret we have against it about £50 of outstanding bills, chiefly for printing. Now, in a society of this kind, which depends upon the public, and depends upon bringing its claims before the public by its journal, &c., we must have printing, and the printing must be legible and clear—and such printing is costly. Perhaps our journal is a little extravagant in its form, and more costly than similar publications, but the dignity of the Society is maintained both in appearance and also in reality. It is not supported by advertising.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

MR. ALFRED PERCEVAL GRAVES: I do not think we should separate without passing a very cordial vote of thanks to our President. Quite recently, in A BEAUTIFUL WORLD, I was very much struck, and also delighted, in reading a lecture of his, part of which was reproduced in its pages. I think nothing could show more clearly what Mr. Waterhouse's feelings are concerning the subject that has called us together. I speak as a traveller in educational wares, after which expression I suppose you have suspected the presence of a Government inspector of schools, and I have in the course of my educational career been in four or five different parts of England. I possess no beautiful country district now; I am now relegated to the gloomy depths of Southwark—a very great change from the beauties of Somerset. In my country district I was very glad to find that these pestilential advertisers had not penetrated so far as might have been ex-

pected. I was glad also to find that upon our railways there were some pretty little gardens.

One speaker implied we were doing nothing in our schools to further the objects of this Society. This is not the case. There is a society which is called the Art in School Society, which does a very fair share of work in our schools—amongst other things by circulating engravings. I often regret that our children are not taken more to picture galleries, where the beautiful works could be pointed out to them; and I think very much the same thing about those lovely haunts which are still accessible, such as Epping Forest. I think it is quite possible to help forward this work, and if the children of the upper classes, and their fathers and mothers, were to send pictures, and even scrapbooks, to the elementary schools, it would help the matter forward.

MR. BASIL HOLMES: As the secretary of the Metropolitan Public Gardens Association I am very glad to have the opportunity of testifying to a public meeting how very cordially the Association sympathises with the work of this Society. Many of our members are ladies and gentlemen who reside in the country, and they willingly devote some of their time and substance in bringing the country, so far as they are able, to the crowded districts of London by the creation of public gardens in the midst of poor surroundings, and I am quite sure that they will feel gratified at the efforts of this Society in protecting the beautiful country scenery in which some of them live. Only yesterday I received a letter from a gentleman well known in America asking me if I could put him in the way of obtaining circulars or other particulars of the English Society for Checking the Abuses of Public Advertising. He says I shall understand his solicitude about this matter when he informs me that he is chairman of the Committee of the Massachusetts Trustees of Public Preservation. His name is Mr. Charles Elliott. I shall have pleasure in asking the Hon. Secretary to supply his wants, and I hope the movement will spread from England to America. I have pleasure in seconding the vote of thanks to our distinguished President.

The proposition was then put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

THE PRESIDENT, in returning thanks, said he felt himself to be a most unworthy president, but, at the same time, he believed he was an enthusiastic member of the Society, and he was glad to have this opportunity of addressing the meeting for the purpose of throwing off the praise from his own shoulders to those of his colleagues.* As president he was much indebted to Mr. John Richmond, the treasurer, for the way in which he kept the accounts; to our honorary auditor, Mr. Hardcastle, for overlooking these accounts. Further, as a Society, they owed a debt of obligation to the Council of the Society of Arts for lending them this beautiful room.

* It must not be set down to ingratitude that here, as elsewhere, the Hon. Secretary has ventured to omit some very kind references to his own part in the work of the Society.